3

Sociology and Journalism

Discussing the sociological inquiry of journalism is much like discussing journalism scholarship without a frame. This paradigm of journalism research—with its focus on people, patterned interactions, organizations, institutions, and structures—is the ongoing standard against which much inquiry into journalism has been evaluated, to the extent that the frame's existence has become largely invisible. Sociology has long existed as the background setting for evolving journalism scholarship, even if much of the recent work on journalism no longer derives necessarily from sociological inquiry.

The Shape of Sociological Inquiry

Webster's Unabridged Dictionary (1983: 1723) defines "sociology" as "the study of the history, development, organization, and problems of people living together as social groups." Once pegged as the "science of society," sociological inquiry provides an elaboration of some arena of behavior in social networks, reflecting "any general interest in social processes" (Williams 1983b: 295). The term "society" has emerged as so central to sociological inquiry that it has replaced "community" as the dominant way of conceptualizing groups (Schudson 1991).

Yet the term "society" is itself imprecise. It denotes with varying degrees of exactitude a large complex of human interactions or systems of interaction (Berger 1963). Beyond its invocation of "a common band of people," four main motifs have been thought to characterize its examination: (1) a

debunking motif, by which sociology sees through the facades and backstages of social structures; (2) a fascination with society's less respectable sides, organizations, institutions, and structures; (3) an interest in cosmopolitanism; and (4) an insistence on relativization (Berger 1963). Central to each motif is a focus on people, particularly as they organize themselves into groups involving systematic patterns of interaction.

As a discipline, sociology originated in "the coming of modernity—in the dissolution of the traditional world and the consolidation of the modern" (Giddens 1987: 15). Nurtured in different directions by Karl Marx, Emile Durkheim, Max Weber, and George Simmel, sociology was long torn between functionalist and Marxist leanings, on the one hand, and by the culturalist thinking established by Robert Park, John Dewey, Margaret Mead, and Robert Cooley, on the other. Each of these trajectories shared a common aim: "stat[ing] the obvious, but with an air of discovery," qualifying an often-assumed premise that most of the time people know what their actions are (Giddens 1987: 2).

The variegated nature of the discipline's foundation generated a certain degree of dissonance over the years. In Anthony Giddens's view, sociologists

> dress up what they have to say in terminology which seems to deny to agents the freedom of action we know ourselves to have. . . . [Therefore, sociology is in a] doubly redundant position, not only telling us what we already know, but parading the familiar in a garb which conceals its proper nature. (Giddens 1987: 2–3)

Though it could be argued that such remarks remained at odds with Giddens's own practice of sociology, the degree to which laypersons felt they were able to access, gauge, and evaluate sociological phenomena was marked. No wonder, then, that Richard Rovere, by no means a typical journalist, observed that "those of us who have been educated in the twentieth century habitually think in sociological terms, whether or not we have had any training in sociology" (quoted in Schudson 1997b: 49).

Sociologists examine social conduct in a number of ways. They perform an anthropological function, showing people of one culture what it is like to live in another culture. They identify the complexity in social systems, dressing the simple and the everyday in complex frameworks, and they target the unintended, latent, and accidental consequences of everyday activities so as to make those consequences manifest. This notion—which extends the Durkheimian premise that we live inescapably under society's logic (Durkheim 1915/1965)—suggests a need to continually look for the hidden reasons for behavior. Sociologists also study the long-term patterns

of institutional stability and change, with a concern for the demonstrated impact of the past on the present.

Through each focal point, the reigning function of sociological inquiry has been to provide a wide-ranging research setting that targets people and the interactions among them, the organizations and institutions in which they reside, and the structures by which their lives proceed. While sociology resembles the other social sciences in that many are concerned with "the problem of collective action, of how people manage to act together" (Becker 1986: 11), sociological inquiry positions its target of analysis squarely within the network of individuals engaged in patterned interaction in primarily complex settings.

The Sociology of Journalism

With these premises in mind, sociological inquiry has emerged as germane to the study of journalism around the world. Cueing journalists as agents of modernity, sociology found its way into journalism research in accordance with an emphasis on people, with an eye both to the patterns by which they grouped themselves into organizational and institutional settings and to the surrounding structures, functions, and effects through which they worked. Though the journalism of the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Latin America, and elsewhere differed markedly in form, common to all sociological inquiry into journalism was an emphasis on the systematic actions, practices, and interactions by which journalists maintained themselves as journalists. Although extensive scholarship queried the identification of journalists as professionals (e.g., Henningham 1985; Zelizer 1993a)—to the extent that Elihu Katz (1989) suggested displacing the idea of the journalism professional with that of the journalist as scientist—journalists were seen within this view as sociological beings who systematically acted in patterned ways that had bearing on the stature and shape of the journalistic collective at large.

In the United States, the sociological inquiry into journalism was born of a particularly fertile set of historical circumstances that helped shape scholarship—by example or by contrast—elsewhere in the world. It germinated both from a burgeoning interest in journalism during the 1920s, spearheaded by Robert Park at the University of Chicago, and from the widespread establishment of the social sciences during the 1930s as a preferred mode of academic inquiry and the consequent emergence of communication schools in the United States during the following decade. In the latter set of circumstances, journalism's eventual co-opting by communication schools

was often solidified along the parameters of sociological research, which proved a fertile means for thinking about journalism as a phenomenon. Journalism's development as a focus of social scientific study was thus largely associated with sociology's ascent in the academy.

Early efforts moved first in the direction of a blend of social scientific and humanistic inquiry. Robert Park and others of the Chicago School were instrumental in focusing on journalism as a target of humanistic sociology, and Park's efforts at identifying journalism as a locus for sociological inquiry, spurred by his own earlier career as a reporter, helped put journalism on the analytical map of many U.S. sociologists. But the main colonization of journalism within the sociological paradigm in the United States took shape in another form during the 1940s and 1950s, largely through studies examining journalism as a political phenomenon often connected to electoral processes. Although the idea of a hypodermic needle model of media influence had been around since World War I largely as a folk belief, by which it was argued that the media, and journalism, unidimensionally affected the public in strong and direct ways, scholars offset that notion during the post World War II years. Wilbur Schramm (1949, 1954, 1959), though not trained as a sociologist, did much to establish a view of journalism as systematic activity that was shaped through the lens of communication processes. Paul Lazarsfeld, Joseph Klapper, and Charles Wright, among others, took part in the immediate postwar thrust to use administrative bureaucratic apparatuses to position journalism in the larger world, and they worked from the Bureau of Applied Social Research at Columbia University to develop a detailed picture of the intersection between journalism and the public. Klapper (1949/1960) argued that the effects of journalism and the media were minimal, showing that the most definitive effect of media exposure was the reinforcement of already existing opinions. Wright (1959) introduced a systematic template for thinking about the wide-ranging effects of media and journalism from a functional perspective. Lazarsfeld and his colleagues established in *The People's Choice* (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, 1944) that journalism's influence on political attitudes during electoral campaigns was elaborated by suggestions of a two-step flow of influence, mediated by opinion leaders. That idea was further developed by Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld when they argued in *Personal Influence* (1960) that journalism played a less powerful role in shaping public attitudes than had been established by the hypodermic needle model. Paul Lazarsfeld and Robert Merton (1948) laid out a series of effects that the media, including journalism, were thought to have upon the public, including an ability to narcotize the people they addressed. While each of these efforts was instrumental in positioning journalism within a larger setting, none of them focused on the internal

workings of journalism. Instead, they saw journalism as one type of media output with an effect on the public, and their analysis was less targeted to journalism per se than was the analysis exhibited in later scholarship.

These efforts introduced a mode of academic research that raised questions about the agendas to which sociological inquiry could be put. The U.S. mode of scholarship—labeled "administrative" by Lazarsfeld (1941)—denoted empirical research generally used in the service of government and mass media institutions (Rogers 1997). Over the following decades, the administrative mode of sociological research was held responsible for narrowing the target of inquiry and understandings of the larger world in which the media and journalism existed. In an important critique of the research agenda set in place by Columbia's Applied Bureau for Social Research, Todd Gitlin (1978: 207) argued that the search by Lazarsfeld and his colleagues "for specific, measurable, short-term, individual, attitudinal and behavioral 'effects' of media content and the conclusion that media are not very important in the shaping of public opinion" drained academic attention from the ongoing power of the media, consolidating and legitimizing the capitalist structures of ownership, control, and function that scholars were supposed to analyze. Although the issues were not related only to journalism, their impact on an understanding of journalism's position in the world was demonstrable nonetheless. Elsewhere in the world, sociological inquiry developed in conjunction with what came to be known as "critical" research. More European in following and derivative of the Frankfurt School, the Institute for Social Research, and the work of critical scholars from Germany like Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, this research viewed scholarly endeavor as necessarily critical of the same institutions that were underwriting the administrative research so popular in the United States. Although by the 1930s many of these scholars were already in the United States, and in 1944 Leo Lowenthal produced a critical paper on the cult of celebrity in U.S. magazine journalism, their influence was nonetheless felt more strongly elsewhere, where scholars made choices about which approach to follow often in association with the kinds of academic journals available at the time and the kinds of articles sought for publication.

The path to journalism's sociological study developed more cautiously in the United Kingdom than it had in the United States. Though sociology was slower to arrive in the academy in the United Kingdom than in the United States, with only a few sociology departments in U.K. universities as late as the 1950s (Tumber 2000: 1), it was one of the first academic settings to take note of what journalism had to offer. Of interest were the ways in which journalism helped socialize individuals into upholding certain norms, values, and beliefs via institutions, and British sociologists thereby

positioned journalism easily alongside education, the legal system, the family, and religious institutional settings. Although the dominant paradigm of structural functionalism persisted as a way of conducting sociological inquiry, over time dependence on it softened, particularly as sociologists in the United Kingdom experimented with new analytical settings and alternative methodological approaches. In the 1960s and 1970s, sociology became the embodiment of the social sciences across the United Kingdom, and with it came a burgeoning interest in journalism as a potential setting in which to examine sociological concerns.

Efforts in this regard were led by sociologist Jeremy Tunstall, whose book-length study of British journalists, *Journalists At Work* (1971), paved the way for thinking about journalism through a sociological lens, leading one scholar to observe that "much of Jeremy Tunstall's prolific output has concerned itself with how journalists behave" (Stephenson 2000: 84). Others, including Michael Tracey (1977) and Philip Schlesinger (1978), followed Tunstall's lead as they began to elaborate the sociological contours of the British TV newsroom. Steve Chibnall (1977) offered a detailed picture of the relations between the police and crime reporters, while Peter Golding and Philip Elliott (1979) provided a comparative examination of the newsroom in broadcasting organizations in Sweden, Ireland, and Nigeria.

Key here were evolving discussions, seen differently by journalism professionals and academics, as to whether journalism constituted a profession or a craft (Splichal and Sparks 1994; Bromley 1997, in press). Although later efforts in the United Kingdom departed from what one scholar called "the British disposition to empirical sociology" and traveled instead the path of cultural studies as a way of focusing journalism's inquiry (Bromley in press), the early endeavors in sociology nonetheless facilitated journalism's continued academic study.

Elsewhere, sociology left a different kind of imprint. In France, the work of Gabriel Tarde and Roland Barthes and the influence of structuralism turned sociological inquiry toward the humanities, as Edgar Morin urged French scholars to develop what he called a "sociology of the present" in their approach to journalism (Mattelart and Mattelart 1992: 22). A sociological interest in journalism was evident in Germany already at the turn of the century—when Ferdinand Toennies, Karl Knies, Karl Buecher, Albert Salomon, and Emil Loebl mentioned journalism's role in shaping public sentiment (Hardt 1975; Lang 1996)—but it was clearly articulated by Max Weber when in a 1924 address to the German Sociological Society he called for multiple studies of journalistic practice, journalistic professionalism, and the career prospects of journalists in different countries (cited in Lang 1996: 13–14). In the 1960s in Latin America, Scandinavia, Asia, and the Middle

East, journalism was co-opted by schools of communication that were particularly strong in sociological inquiry (Marques de Melo 1988, Chaffee et al. 1990; Rogers 1997). In each case, sociological inquiry offered a compelling way to shape journalism's study, often under the rubric of communication. In each case, too, the ascent of sociology in journalism's study was by and large resisted by journalists and journalism educators, who found its theoretical impulses problematic for the continued training of journalists.

The amount of sociological scholarship on journalism prompted scholars to attempt wrestling the material into coherent organizational schema. Schudson (1991), for instance, identified three main trends emerging from such research—mainstream sociological research, scholarship on the political economy of news, and culturological approaches to news. Yet it is primarily the first trend identified by Schudson—mainstream sociological research—that constitutes the body of research most often identified as sociological inquiry, work concerned chiefly with social organization and occupational sociology. Gaye Tuchman (2002) revisited Schudson's typology, arguing that the three types of research were more complementary than had been suggested at first. In the United Kingdom, Howard Tumber (1999) classified research on the sociology of news by the point at which it entered the news-making process—production, economics, sourcing, and ideology. Sig Hjarvard (2002) developed a four-cell grid for thinking about journalism's study: research focusing on selection or construction activities and research formed as micro-level or macro-level analysis. In each case, sociology offered a valuable way of tracking journalists' simultaneous existence in occupations, organizations, professional communities, and institutional settings, revealing how they were constrained and empowered by their interactions with others.

A more targeted track across time than those displayed by existing classifications reveals three main temporal waves of sociological inquiry on journalism. Each wave progressively broadened the setting against which journalism and journalistic practice were examined yet remained steadfast to the principles of sociological inquiry.

Early Sociological Inquiry: Journalists as Sociological Beings

The early sociological inquiry of journalism provided a gradually broadening frame through which to consider journalism as a set of interactions and patterned behaviors. Propelled by developments outside the academy that forced a closer look at journalism's workings—such as the convening in the

United Kingdom of two Royal Commissions on the Press, one in 1947 and another in 1962, which led to the establishment of press councils and a formalized training system for journalists (Bromley 1997; Bromley and O'Malley 1997)—this early research forced scholars to think about journalists as part of an environment inhabited by other people, resources, agendas, pressures, and interests. It started with a consideration of the finite and identifiable practices involved in journalistic work and gradually expanded to examine the larger settings in which journalists interacted with each other.

Gatekeeping, Social Control, and Selectivity Processes

Early journalism research focused on discrete journalistic practices, limiting analysis to a locus that could be easily examined. Gatekeeping research was one of the first academic areas to be applied to journalism in the United States during the World War II era and postwar period. Following upon Kurt Lewin's work (1947) in social psychology that examined how people went about making decisions, the gatekeeping studies saw "gates" as the codes by which people admitted or refused entry of certain information to a given system. David Manning White was first to apply the gatekeeping idea to journalism and news-making routines, and he devised a study of the story selection process among newswire editors, where he found that eight news items were rejected for every one selected as newsworthy (White 1950). He concluded that news selection operated on the basis of subjective choice, with the wire editor acting as a "Mr. Gates" who subjectively classified items in deciding what counted as news.

From this largely psychosocial explanation, "gatekeeper" became a household term in journalism scholarship. Though White himself was not a sociologist, his analysis opened doors in the sociological analysis of journalism. Gatekeepers came to be seen as capable of blocking, adding, and changing information, and as they were identified as a range of individuals or groups who determined which information an audience received, notions of journalistic practice broadened. Gatekeeping thus opened the door to considerations of what happened to a news story once it entered the channels of news making. However, the study did leave open the possibility that Mr. Gates simply possessed an idiosyncratic view of life, and it remained for other researchers to link it with the news setting itself—that is, to make the study sociological.

Such a development was not long in coming, and sociological terms of analysis helped redefine the process originally identified by White as subjective selection. Over the years that followed, White's finding was reinterpreted in ways that reflected the broadening reliance in journalism inquiry

on sociological terms of reference. "Subjective selection" was redefined as evidence of a collective thought process by which journalists made their selections. Using sociological terms such as "task orientation," "employer-employee relationships," and "interpersonal relations," Walter Gieber (1964; based on his earlier work, see Gieber 1956) provided evidence of an early form of social control when he found that later wire editors used group-think to evaluate news in basically the same way as had Mr. Gates. Gatekeepers were located across the whole chain of news makers (McNelly 1959); Mr. Gates himself was reexamined and found to be unchanged (Snider 1967); and the gatekeeping findings were found to be stable across gender differences (Bleske 1991), patterned in their invocation of newspapers of record (Whitney and Becker 1982), more group oriented in local news settings (Berkowitz 1990), and a viable foundation for a broader model of journalistic practice (Janowitz 1975). In the latter case, Morris Janowitz claimed that gatekeeping was circumscribed by notions of professional journalism, including the development of technical expertise, professional responsibility, neutrality, objectivity, and the notion of balance. Pamela Shoemaker (1991: 4) elaborated the multiple gatekeepers in news making, noting that the notion might have been "well-studied" but was "hardly worn-out." Eventually, gatekeeping came to include more broadly the idea of "knowledge control" or "information control." These variations on the gatekeeping concept prompted an interest in the effect of gatekeeping more broadly—how gatekeeping controls were set in place, where in the communication process they occurred, and what were their consequences. Equally important, however, was the resonance generated by gatekeeping as a way of thinking about the workings of news. No surprise, then, that it was again invoked when thinking about online journalism (Singer 1998).

Journalistic inquiry became significantly more sociological with Warren Breed's classic study "Social Control in the Newsroom" (1955). A sociologist by training, whose Ph.D. dissertation examined the newsroom, Breed applied one of the most frequented concepts in sociological research—social control—to journalism. Recognizing that no society could exist without "social control," a term for the various means by which a society tries to bring its recalcitrant members in line with consensual behavior, he set about isolating how modes of social control were implemented in what claimed to be a democratic environment. Breed found that while ideally the newspaper should have been a "democracy," in fact the publisher set policy and the reporters followed it. Breed concluded that journalists' actions were by and large motivated by their search for a conflict-free environment and their need for reference group formation.

Breed's article helped establish that journalism's standards tended to be largely unwritten yet were willingly followed by journalists in forming a wide range of behaviors. It also offset any remaining assumptions that news making was generated on the basis of an editor's personal whim, doing so by utilizing literature on social organizations and the sociology of occupations, relying on participant observation as its method, and developing a focus on the production processes involved in news work. A classic functional analysis, the study bore both its strengths and weaknesses. Through social control, the newspaper was thought to maintain its own smooth functioning as well as that of existing power relationships in society. While this suggested that journalists directed rewards and motivations toward colleagues rather than readers, it also portrayed journalists acting only according to normative behavior and existing within a world populated exclusively by other journalists. Journalists thus had no connection with audiences, a greater external world, or history. Nonetheless, Breed's article suggested a context for journalism that involved a flexing of authority and power, directing journalism's study away from empiricist notions of reflecting reality and toward more critical ones of producing it.

Perhaps the single piece of research that most cogently advanced a general understanding of news selection processes was that of Johannes Galtung and Marie Ruge (1965). Their study of gatekeeping and selectivity remains even today one of the most influential pieces on news making, showing how what appeared to be basically a simplistic and restrictive frame for understanding journalistic practice and news production was a "process of successive selections, according to a number of news values or criteria which affect the perception of news events" (McQuail and Windahl 1982: 105). This research tackled precisely what had been left undeveloped in preceding studies—the criteria of selection and rejection. Moreover, it outlined not only what was presumed "natural" about news but also what could be seen as "cultural."

Arguing that the notion of "newsworthiness" was in fact a complex set of 12 criteria,[3] Galtung and Ruge stipulated that the more criteria an event satisfied, the more likely it would be reported. Each factor existed according to three hypotheses: an additive hypothesis, by which the more factors an event fulfilled, the greater the chance the event became and stayed as news; a complementarity hypothesis, which argued that if an event was low on one factor, it compensated by being higher on another factor; and an exclusion hypothesis, by which an event low on all factors did not become news. Though some saw the theory as too psychological, depending too much on individual selective perception, untestable, and not open to falsification (e.g., Rosengren 1974), Galtung and Ruge underscored the patterned and

predictable nature of the selection process and introduced a constructed view of news making that complicated the idea of selection in journalistic work.

Over the years, extensions of Galtung and Ruge's thesis drew support for their original findings. Extended to the United Kingdom, James Halloran, Philip Elliot, and Graham Murdock (1970) applied the hypothesis to coverage of demonstrations and showed how the media framed a peaceful British demonstration against U.S. presence in Vietnam as a violent protest merely by clipping photographs to emphasize violence. Sophia Peterson (1979, 1981) interviewed reporters in different countries who supported the criteria, while attempts in Germany to replicate the study received mixed results (Schulz 1976, 1982; Wilke 1984a, 1984b; Wilke and Rosenberger 1994). As recently as 2001, Tony Harcup and Diedre O'Neill found that Galtung and Ruge's original suppositions remained relevant. They also noted that the work needed to remain open to inquiry rather than be seen as a closed set of values for journalism in all times and places.

These early studies helped set in place an entry field against which the sociological inquiry of journalism could develop. Establishing the notions of gatekeeping, social control, and selectivity processes as relevant to an understanding of news making, this scholarship pointed to a set of influences, external to the mindset of an individual journalist, which would prove to be valuable building blocks on which to construct more complex portrayals of the settings in which journalists worked. Primarily originating in the United States, the literature that developed here proved highly adaptable and easily transportable across geographic boundaries, lending an aura of universality to the sociological claims on which it rested.

Occupational Studies:
Values, Ethics, Roles, and Demographics

From sociology's early days, scholars addressed the occupational settings in which journalists worked, delineating how journalists crafted their identities through values, ethics, roles, behavior, and socialization patterns. Extensive research established the notion that primarily Western journalists, repairing to a primarily U.S. model of professionalism, set standards of action around values like responsibility, accuracy, impartiality, balance, objectivity, and truthfulness (e.g., McLeod and Hawley 1964; Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman 1972). Although much of this literature focused on U.S. journalists (Roshco 1975; Levy 1981), discussions of news values continued to draw scholars' attention around the world as journalists were expected to accommodate new contexts, technologies, and challenges. This remained the case even though the perspectives detailed here were

often found to differ from those displayed in other parts of the world
(e.g., Ruotolo 1987). Alongside the examination of values was a substantial
literature, particularly drawn in the United Kingdom, about journalists'
occupational settings. Jeremy Tunstall almost singlehandedly developed the
literature on the occupational life of journalists, where his examination of
the patterns of career entry and maintenance among a variety of specialist
journalists—political reporters, provincial journalists, newspaper editors,
circulation managers—showed the shared attributes of occupational and
professional life, regardless of specialization (Tunstall 1970, 1971, 1977).
Anthony Smith (1978) tracked changes over time in the values of British
journalists, while the work of others (Elliott 1972, 1980; Kumar 1977;
Golding and Elliott 1979) further developed the nuances of journalists'
occupational setting.

   Work on ethics and ethical standards, lodged equally in philosophy and
sociology, was everpresent though uneven. Prevalent before the 1930s
(Crawford 1924) and after the 1960s in the United States (Gerald 1963;
Christians, Fackler, Rotzoll, and McKee 1983; Starck 2001), its unevenness
was attributed to the rise of positivism in discussions of journalistic practice
that pushed ethical concerns for a time to the background of scholarly atten-
tion (Christians 2000). Against the discussion of values like trust, responsi-
bility, honesty, and accountability, these studies, primarily drawn in the
U.S. context, surveyed the responses of editors and publishers to ethical
quandaries (Meyer 1983, 1987), discussed the ethical values implied in
news work (Merrill 1974; Goldstein 1985), or addressed the practice and
teaching of ethics in journalism (Elliott 1986; Klaidman and Beauchamp
1987). Theodore L. Glasser and James Ettema (1998) used the ethical stan-
dards of vice and virtue to establish their view of journalists as custodians of
a moral order. Beyond the United States, Kaarle Nordenstreng and Hifzi
Topuz (1989) conducted a UNESCO study that surveyed journalistic ethics
in North America, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and Asia;
their study included a collection of ten different ethical codes. John Hurst
and Sally White (1994) examined ethics in Australian journalism, while
Andrew Belsey and Ruth Chadwick (1992) studied the U.K. context.
Clifford Christians and Michael Traber (1997) considered the application
of what they called "universal values" across nation-states in different
world regions, arguing that ethical standards of behavior were established in
patterned ways regardless of nationality.

   The demographic characteristics of the journalistic community proved
to have lasting interest for journalism researchers. In the United States, in
particular, large scale surveys and general overviews tracked from various
perspectives who journalists were and how they entered and stayed in the

workplace (e.g., Lichter, Rothman, and Lichter 1986; Becker et al. 1987). One particularly comprehensive survey conducted in the mid-1970s (Johnstone et al. 1976) was repeated over the years that followed (Weaver and Wilhoit 1986, 1996). The interest in demographics prevailed across geographical contexts. David Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit's study of U.S. journalists was replicated in 21 countries and regions, yielding a picture of "the global journalist" (Weaver 1998), and in 2003, Lars Willnat and David Weaver (2003) further applied the survey to foreign correspondents stationed in the United States. Across Europe, Africa, Asia, North, Central, and South America, Slavko Splichal and Colin Sparks (1994) tracked journalism students and their occupational trajectory, while Anthony Delano and John Henningham (1995) conducted an industrywide study in the United Kingdom for the London College of Printing, and John Henningham (1993) profiled the impact of the multicultural background of Hawaiian journalists on the news they produced.

Relevant here was work on journalists' role perceptions (Cohen 1963; Janowitz 1975; Roshco 1975). A plurality of roles and role perceptions emerged, as in Wolfgang Donsbach's (1983) consideration of which roles remained uppermost among reporters of different nationalities: German reporters saw themselves taking on tasks characteristic of active players in a democratic system, while British reporters, like their American and Canadian counterparts, did not. A large literature on the professionalization of journalists simultaneously codified professionalism as a refinement of journalistic practice—with a commitment to certain values of objectivity, impartiality, nonbias, accuracy, and balance—and established it as a way to control behavior and to bestow status and prestige (e.g., Windahl and Rosengren 1978; Ettema and Whitney 1987; Soloski 1989). In Philip Elliott's words, "professionalism is when skill and competence in the performance of routine tasks become elevated to the occupational ideal" (Elliott 1972: 17). Sociological work on professionalism struck a high when interest in professionalization among journalists was also strong. Hence, it peaked in the 1960s but receded over the following 30 years (Tunstall 1996). Nonetheless, work by Hugh Stephenson as late as 2000 still tracked the professional mores among British journalists, even though discomfort over the question of whether journalism was best characterized as a profession or a craft lingered substantially beyond the early occupational studies and continued to be reflected in contemporary discussions of journalism (e.g., Henningham 1985, 1990; Bromley 1997). Its persistence suggested that at some level the earlier distinction between craft and profession did not adequately capture the full world of journalistic practice, succeeding instead in cutting part of the picture from view. The impossibility of simultaneously

embracing both notions—craft *and* profession—suggested how limited the dichotomy actually was.

When combined with the early work on discrete journalistic practices, the scholarship tracking journalists' occupational settings set in place an increasingly complicated frame against which to envision the making of news. Bringing to the forefront issues like values, roles, and ethics, what emerged from this literature was a growing recognition that journalists crafted standards of action collectively with others and that those standards in turn structured journalists' approaches to news.

Normative, Ritual, and Purposive Behavior

As journalists' occupational settings became more elaborated, how to define journalistic behavior became a focal point of sociologically minded scholars intent on delineating how journalists worked. Scholarship on normative behavior was the most prevalent stream of this research, taking the implications of earlier work on journalistic practices, roles, values, and ethics and establishing that the patterned and collective nature of journalism was central to understanding it as a sociological phenomenon.

Standardized codes of action were seen as a central way of repairing to normative behavior, and many discussions were derived from the U.S. setting, particularly from issues surrounding the professionalization of U.S. journalists. Although Bernard Roshco (1975) argued early on that journalistic values were not an absolute, and Linda Steiner (1992, 1994) showed that both career manuals and textbooks often rested on an implicit sense of an "ideal" journalist, as late as 2000 U.S. journalism textbooks still employed a shared professional prism in their discussion of journalistic norms (Brennen 2000). While the norms of primarily Western, if not U.S., journalists regarding objectivity, accuracy, balance, and impartiality were not similarly followed in other countries (e.g., Hallin and Mancini 1984), they nonetheless struck a certain resonance with journalism scholars. Related here was a large literature on the sourcing practices of journalists (e.g., Sigal 1973, 1986; Tiffen 1990; Schlesinger and Tumber 1995), whereby the symbiotic relationship between source and reporter was found to take the shape of an exchange model that exchanged information for publicity. Though such literature borrowed both from sociology and political science, it is discussed here in the chapter on political science.

Not all of this early work was enthusiastic about the norms and professional mores by which journalists worked. The work of two British sociologists—Stanley Cohen and Jock Young—was ahead of its time. In a collection titled *The Manufacture of News* (Cohen and Young 1973), journalists'

norms, images, practices, and conflicts surrounding the coverage of deviance and its effects on the public were comprehensively tracked. Forward looking for its recognition of the ideological positioning of journalists, the book concluded with a section called "Do-It-Yourself Media Sociology." Other work of this ilk included that of Stanley Cohen (1972) and of James Curran, Michael Gurevitch, and Janet Woollacott (1977; Curran and Gurevitch 1991), each of which positioned journalists' codes of action against prisms that complicated their reasons for acting in certain ways. The occupational practices afoot in certain kinds of journalism were also tracked, such as war and terrorism reporting (Schlesinger, Murdock, and Elliott 1983; Morrison and Tumber 1988), investigative reporting (Glasser and Ettema 1989b, 1998; Protess, Cook, Gordon, and Ettema, 1991), crime reporting (Chibnall 1977), social welfare reporting (Golding and Middleton 1982), and the work of foreign correspondents (Batscha 1975; Pedelty 1995). Each was seen to invoke strategic aims not necessarily related to codes of objectivity or impartiality.

By the late 1960s, normative explanations of journalistic behavior were no longer the only way to explain practice. One area of scholarship, primarily British in origin, followed the work of Emile Durkheim (1915/1965), Robert Bocock (1974), Victor Turner (1974), Steven Lukes (1975), and other social anthropologists to develop an address to the rituals and rites by which journalists worked (e.g., Chaney 1972). While this stream of research became increasingly attractive over time and eventually spread to U.S. scholars (e.g., Carey 1989a; Ettema 1990; Lule 1995), its first appearance drew attention due to its unusual application of rites and rituals to workers in industrialized societies. As Philip Elliott (1980: 141–142) then argued, while ritual as a concept appeared to have "little analytic value" and implied what seemed to be a unitary view of society, its durability in a "skeptical if not secular age" suggested that it functioned centrally in the exercise of power. In that sense, journalistic stories that relied on social order, by showing a nation-state stable under threat, overcoming threat, or working via consensus, were evidence of an enactment of political ritual of the highest order. Similar findings were suggested in Cohen and Young's (1973) examination of news of deviance.

Another stream of primarily U.S. sociological research began to see collective action through a social constructivist lens. Largely influenced by symbolic interactionism and social constructivism in sociology, these scholars presumed that journalists acted as agents of the social construction involved in meaning making rather than consolidating influence. The agenda became one of seeking out the purposes by which journalism created one reality instead of another.

Two salient examples here were the work of Gaye Tuchman and of Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester. In a groundbreaking article, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," Tuchman (1972) pointed scholars in the direction of critiquing norms by suggesting that journalists engaged in objectivity for strategic reasons. Arguing that objectivity functioned primarily to help journalists avoid the consequences of their actions, Tuchman turned on its head the long-standing reverence for objectivity by reducing it to a means for achievement of strategic aims. Part of a broader quasi-revolt in sociology against the cult of value-free social science, Tuchman's work was a touchstone in pushing scholars to think more critically about journalists' values and norms.

Also central was Molotch and Lester's "News as Purposive Behavior" (1974). Ushering in the study of what Schudson called the "sociological organization of newswork" (1991), they claimed that all news production was the result of purposive behavior. Journalists worked according to a typology of news stories by which they could organize their coverage of news events, and they often organized their approach to stories in accordance with how they fit the typology. At heart here was the idea that news was a constructed reality shaped according to some underlying notion of social power; the process of news creation was seen as a kind of accounting procedure determined by the needs of those with access to media and utilizing complementary activities of promotion, assembly, and consumption. Journalism was thought to reflect not a world "out there" but the practices of those with the power to determine the experience of others. While Molotch and Lester's work complicated the "reality claims" of most journalists and placed journalists on a continuum with other kinds of workers, its overly tight explanatory scheme left unaddressed the basic question of whether or not everything in journalism was as purposive as their research proposed.

Effects Research

One long-standing consequence of the sociological interest in journalism was the appearance of studies that viewed journalistic practice through its effect on the public. Primarily originating in the United States, these studies built upon those earlier circumstances by which journalism came to be seen as a legitimate focus for sociological inquiry. Although this area of interest became the signature of mass communication curricula more than of inquiry into journalism per se, it nonetheless was shaped in part through the sociological study of journalism. Studies of journalism's effect were drawn from various areas of inquiry—the work of Herbert Blumer and the Payne Fund studies of cinema, the early interest of Paul Lazarsfeld in mass communication effects, Lazarsfeld and Stanton's work on audience

research, Lazarsfeld's partnership with Robert Merton at Columbia, and the work of Leo Bogart on the newspaper industry, to name a few. From these earlier works and others, a slew of effects came to be attributed to journalism over the years that followed.

Though called "media effects" rather than "journalism effects," work on journalism followed the broader scholarly flips over what kind of effects to measure: small or large, limited or strong, short term or long term, direct or indirect, intended or unintended, latent or manifest. Examined by scholars whose disciplinary association was both within and beyond sociology, journalism was seen nonetheless to play various sociological roles.

Of primary relevance was the work of Kurt Lang and Gladys Lang (1953), whose analysis of the MacArthur Day Parade showed how a particular event was covered by the news media and thus focused attention on journalism's role in fixing the boundaries of the collective. Lang and Lang's elucidation of journalism's "unwitting bias," by which television viewers were given a more exciting event than were real viewers, showed how TV produced a mistaken impression of widespread support for MacArthur and his politics. Following in the vein of this work, British scholars James Halloran, Philip Elliott, and Graham Murdock (1970) conducted a similar close analysis of an anti-Vietnam War rally in London that was presented in ways divergent from the experience of those who took part. Years later, Daniel Dayan and Elihu Katz (1992) established a broad typology which extended the logic of media's bias to the structuring of news events marking the celebrations, conquests, and contests in different cultural settings. Examining the function of media events across settings, they broadened notions of how the media worked under such circumstances.

Also relevant was the more wide-ranging scholarship of Elihu Katz, which extended from his early study with Paul Lazarsfeld of the two-step flow of information (Katz and Lazarsfeld 1960) to consider a repository of effects shaped and nurtured by journalism. In Katz's work with Jay Blumler (Blumler and Katz 1974), journalism was seen to play a role in uses and gratifications research, where it was argued that journalism, like the media more generally, played a minimalist role in a range of private and public actions. Although the uses and gratifications tradition had been key in underscoring journalism's relevance—as seen in Bernard Berelson's (1949) classic study "What Missing the Newspaper Means," which considered the impact of a 1945 strike that halted operations at the major New York City newspapers by demonstrating a far-reaching connection between people and their newspapers—the later work in uses and gratifications set the stage for thinking about a wide range of journalism effects. It also traveled indirectly around the world, as when the electoral study conducted by Jay Blumler, Roland Cayrol, and Michel Thoveron (1978) introduced to French scholars the uses and gratifications research then popular in the United States (Neveu 1998).

Following this early work, an interest in journalism's effect on the public became a natural part of sociological inquiry on journalism. Other work showed how journalists established the public agenda under the name "agenda setting" (McCombs and Shaw 1972), shaped learning processes (Greenberg 1964; Robinson and Levy 1986), closed the knowledge gap (Blumler and McQuail 1968), structured reality (Lang and Lang 1983), created a spiral of silence in the political environment (Noelle-Neumann 1973), cultivated certain notions of reality (Gerbner and Gross 1976), and set off special times for celebration and community (Dayan and Katz 1992). The residuals of thinking about journalism through its effect on the public even turned up in some literature not usually aligned with the effects tradition; Schudson's most recent book-length discussion of the sociology of the news, for instance, considered what he called "information effects, aura effects, and framing effects" (Schudson 2002: 62).

This research established a route for thinking about the impact and positioning of journalism in the real world. Although over time it came to be known less as inquiry into journalism than into the media more generally, it nonetheless left its imprint on thinking about journalism. Equally important, this research further established sociology's role as the background lens through which to consider journalism's trappings. At the same time, however, it was roundly critiqued by a number of sociologists who felt it was insufficiently attentive to issues of power and control (e.g., Gitlin 1978; also see Rogers 1997).

* * * * *

What did all of this early sociological research on journalism suggest? Simply put, it set the stage for the sociological inquiry that followed. Inviting much of the critical work that came to the fore in later years, these works suggested a more complicated portrait of journalism, shaped at first by the questions of gatekeeping and social power and elaborated in the occupational studies conducted primarily in the United Kingdom. At the same time, however, the explanatory frames offered here were limited, largely because of what was taken to be (purposefully or not) highly indicative and generalized statements about how journalism worked.

Mid-Period Sociological Inquiry: Organizational Studies of Journalism

A second stage of sociologically motivated inquiries, from the late 1960s onward, looked toward broad organizational settings as a way to examine

the patterns of interaction among journalists (e.g., Ettema and Whitney 1982; Bantz 1985). Although as early as 1937 Leo Rosten looked at the settings in which journalists worked through a sociological lens in *The Washington Correspondents*, here organizational theory, and particularly the ethnography of work places, became a favored perspective, particularly in the United States, for considering journalistic practice and journalism.

Rendering journalism more similar to than different from other social settings, these studies saw news as a manufactured organizational product like other manufactured goods. Individual preferences, values, and attitudes mattered little once journalists were socialized within the organizational setting. The basic argument, according to Schudson (1991: 143), was that "the central problem for understanding journalism in liberal societies [is] the journalist's professed autonomy and decision-making power. This perspective tries to understand how journalists' efforts on the job are constrained by organizational and occupational routines."

Here an emphasis on organizational constraints began to displace a focus on the values, ethics, roles, and norms of individuals. At the same time, the inevitablity of social constructions and their organizational function were accepted as part of most research conceptualizations.

Organizational Theory

The earliest studies in this vein used social control as a means to explain journalistic interaction within an organizational setting (Warner 1971; Sigelman 1973). The first extensive study of journalism, utilizing in part organizational theory, was Edward J. Epstein's *News From Nowhere* (1973). Begun as a paper for a political science seminar at Harvard, Epstein's analysis suggested that organizational and technical constraints managed the making of news. Staking his claim on organizational theory, Epstein argued that most of what we regard as news was derived from the organizational tensions involved in producing news. So-called news norms needed to be accomplished through organizational routines: A time bias, for instance, was resolved by dividing news pieces into types (such as spot news or delayed news), while a bias toward the unexpected depended on covering routinized events (such as press conferences). Certain composite pictures of the world thus resulted: California was seen as bizarre, curious, and unpredictable, largely because the logistic difficulties involved in transporting stories quickly to New York City rendered timeless stories "of perennial interest" the more economically and technologically feasible option for including news from the West Coast.

Debunking many of the prevailing normative explanations for journalistic practice, Epstein's work was valuable because it successfully positioned

journalists as workers in a setting (Epstein 1973, 1975). At the same time, however, organizational theory introduced a somewhat lopsided view of how news worked, positioning the journalist primarily as an organizational actor and filtering a view of news work through a technologically specific lens that changed rapidly over time.

Other work followed the lead set by Edward Epstein, with research by Bernard Roshco (1975) and Charles Bantz (1985) tracking the ways in which normative, professional standards of action often needed to be accommodated to the needs of the organization. In the United Kingdom, work by Philip Elliott (1972; Golding and Elliot 1979) and Philip Schlesinger (1978) examined the organizational imperatives afoot in television production. More so than the earlier work, their organizational studies exhibited the broader differences between the administrative and critical impulses of sociological research. Roscho, working in the U.S. context, appeared to provide a more sympathetic view of news work than did Golding and Elliott, who aired concerns about the threat to the autonomy of public service broadcasting in the United Kingdom:

> We view the evidence presented here as strong support for an interpretation of broadcast news as a systematically partial account of society, an interpretation with disturbing implications for broadcasters' claims of neutrality, and not least for our understanding of how political and social opinions are formed. (Golding and Elliott 1979: 1–2)

Nonetheless, in both the U.S. and U.K. settings, this work expanded journalism's inquiry by showing how journalists worked with the values and priorities imposed upon them by the organizational setting. The basic logic of this research prevailed in more contemporary scholarship and leaked into more popular discussions of the news. For instance, journalists writing with a sociological flair offered organizational views of how journalists needed to accommodate various organizational pressures during political campaigns (e.g., Greenfield 1982; Rosenstiel 1993).

Newsroom Ethnographies

Sociological studies of journalism came into their prime, particularly in the United States and the United Kingdom, during the 1970s and early 1980s. Although valuable information continued to be compiled on journalistic work routines, work values, and organizational constraints, scholarship in the United States increasingly took the form of ethnographies, which offered a way of extending participant-observer methodology into a grounded tool

for exploring journalism. Touted as providing an anthropological take on the newsroom, and borrowing largely from the techniques and conceptual vocabulary of ethnomethodology, these studies were driven by grounded questions that tried to see the world through the news worker's point of view, tracking primarily decision-making processes regarding who decided what was newsworthy, how, and why.

The development of ethnography as a valuable approach to research on journalism was not accidental. Derived in the United States from the Chicago School of urban ethnography during the 1930s, scholars like Robert Park, W.I. Thomas, and Ernest Burgess implemented different kinds of studies of journalists and established simple guidelines for ethnographers that underscored the similarity between ethnographers and journalists. Robert Park told ethnographers, just "write down what you see and hear, like a newspaper reporter" (quoted in Kirk and Miller 1986: 40). Everett C. Hughes (1958) drew attention to the conditions under which a profession could be thought to evolve, moving the focus in research on the professions away from givens for all circumstances and onto the conditions by which those givens varied, showing that ethnography could constitute a useful way to do empirical research and think about professional life. A renewed interest during the 1970s and 1980s from scholars like Joseph Gusfield, Erving Goffman, and Elliot Friedson and from anthropologists like James Clifford, George Marcus, and Clifford Geertz further underscored the view that ethnographic studies provided a different way of understanding the complexity of social life, in that they generated detailed accounts of the laws, rules, and practices by which a given group existed.

For journalism research, this had particular value. In the United Kingdom, Philip Schlesinger (1978) conducted an extensive ethnographic analysis of British news making that borrowed from a healthy tradition in British empirical media sociology to revitalize the study of news organizations. Philip Elliott (1972) spent 4 months trailing a television production team for a British documentary program, and Tom Burns engaged in lengthy participant observation at the BBC (1977). Yet the main work here came from the United States. Three main newsroom ethnographies were published during this period, by Gaye Tuchman, Herbert Gans, and Mark Fishman. They took the form of what John Van Maanen later called "realist tales," displaying a near complete absence of the author from the finished text, a documentary style that provided minute and often mundane details of the practices under study, an attempt to produce the participants' point of view, and an interpretive omnipotence (Van Maanen 1988: 47–48).

Gaye Tuchman's *Making News* (1978a) and a number of related journal articles (Tuchman 1972, 1973) resulted from a 10-year odyssey.[4] Interested

in the constructedness of news and its positioning as purposive behavior, Tuchman set about demonstrating that news routines were in fact necessary accomplishments that served strategic purposes for journalists. For Tuchman, news was a frame through which the social world was routinely constructed, and her goal was to show the devices of construction used by journalists as they learned to accommodate the organizational and other constraints of their work.

Tuchman's work was critical in reconstituting academic understandings of journalistic practice. Not only did she refuse to accept the received view of journalism at face value, but she also offered a way of thinking that situated journalistic practice in the circumstances of its use. Key journalistic practices—classifying news, verifying facts, and upholding objectivity—were seen as practical contentions for journalists: Hard and soft news, for instance, were distinguishable not because they reflected inherent attributes of news but because they made scheduling more predictable and manageable. Although Tuchman's categories were not mutually exclusive, their positioning as a continuum of classifying practices was nonetheless helpful in mapping journalistic routine. Using similar logic, she argued that fact verification was simply practical activity geared to deadlines (1973, 1978a).

In each case that Tuchman analyzed, news was defined as a result of the accommodation to organizational constraints. Her detailed analysis of news work and its codification as strategic behavior left an influential imprint on the study of journalism. Its links with earlier work—both on journalists and their organizations and on the constructedness of news—made Tuchman's research a landmark study in inquiry on journalism. Cited most often for its emphasis on strategic behavior, Tuchman's introduction of the concepts of strategic rituals and organizational routines into news making was seen by scholars as valuable (e.g., Reese 1990; Lule 1995).

In an ethnography drawing from a similar long-term investment in a research setting, Herbert Gans's *Deciding What's News* (1979) adopted a commitment to pluralism that underpinned a number of themes central to news making—the organization of stories, the link between sources and journalists, problems related to values and ideology, problems related to profits and audiences, and political censorship. From a somewhat uneven 10-year research period, Gans concluded that journalists operated by adopting external preference statements about real life that he consequently labeled "news values."[5] Asserting that journalists could not do their work without these values, he claimed that they used them in deciding what made news, constituting what he termed "paraideology"—a journalistic worldview that was conservative, was reformist, and embraced Progressive movement values from early 20th-century America.

Introducing the question of ideology into sociological research on journalism, Gans's scholarship altered the focus of sociological inquiry. Not only did he fine-tune the examination of journalism as a work environment with its own values, practices, and standards of action, but he pointed other researchers toward the issue of values establishment and maintenance as well (Entman 1989: 344). His work also demonstrated the mainstream media's upper middle class bias, showing news to be reflective of the upper or upper middle class white male social order (Bird 1990: 383). However, he did not go as far as he might have in teasing out the complications involved in ideological consciousness, and he implied a pluralistic view of values that did not sufficiently consider their conflicted public status.

Another newsroom ethnography was that of Mark Fishman, a graduate school contemporary of Gaye Tuchman. Driven by many of the same issues as in Tuchman's *Making News,* Fishman's *Manufacturing the News* (1980) was motivated by a 1976 crime wave in New York City in which most reporters doubted the existence of the crime wave yet continued to report it. Embarking on a 2-year ethnography of a small California newspaper, he found that the organization of the paper's reporting staff into beats, including crime, was a bureaucratic and organizational necessity that legitimated the government sources from whom journalists received most of their news and led to a uniform way of presenting the world that operated in tandem with constraints on news making. Fishman drew a picture of a bureaucratically constructed journalistic universe, where bureaucratic needs determined how journalists moved through a beat territory, their exposure to news sources, how they made decisions about what they witnessed, the permissable times at which events could be reported, how they defined a factual or suspicious account, and how they identified errors and controversies. When in doubt, journalists presumed the smooth functioning of things, and news emerged as ideological because it was produced through procedures that kept the world consonant with implicit and explicit ideological frames. This study broadened notions of social power to typify the organizational structure of the journalistic setting. Fishman also advanced the importance of constructivism in news, underscoring the essentially complex and complicated links between journalism and other worlds.

Recent research has both echoed and questioned the tenor of the original news ethnographies. The workings of oppositional news attracted several more recent ethnographers (e.g., Meyers 1994). Nina Eliasoph (1988) showed that the same rules applied as in the early ethnographies but for different purposes. Criticism of late laid the blame more on the ethnographies' continued resonance among scholars than on the degree to which they validly represented what was going on at the time they were written. Arguing for

their limited generalizability, Simon Cottle (2000a) lamented that they had set in place a number of orthodoxies in news study that were no longer characteristic of contemporary production practices; he pointed out that contemporary journalism was shaped more by corporate presence, satellite and cable delivery systems, the multiple nature of journalistic work, and the standardization of contemporary journalism than by the circumstances described by the newsroom ethnographies. He also argued that the ethnographers saw news work through a narrowed lens that did not prevail over time, failing to differentiate across types of news work and news organization; paying insufficient attention to issues like nationality, ethnicity, and gender; and detailing norms to which many if not most journalists no longer subscribed. The limitations he mentioned in effect addressed contemporary journalism researchers themselves: The fact that no one has updated the news ethnographies to address many of these changes in journalistic practice offers a curious epilogue to the centrality they have long occupied in journalism scholarship.

How representative were the findings of the newsroom ethnographies? Their similar focus was facilitated by the fundamental similarities in their structure. Employing parallel methodologies of participant observation and implementing research in roughly the same time era of the 1970s and 1980s, all examined the organizational settings of large urban centers (in two cases, New York City). All used the news organization to examine the relationship of values to practices, and all shared an emphasis—whether macrosociological or microsociological—on patterned behavior, with one focal point of analysis—usually the newsroom—frozen in order to flesh out the practices by which it was inhabited. These similarities are important because they enhance what appeared to be the generalizability of the research, yet the degree to which these studies reflect journalism more generally is questionable.

At the same time, the ethnographies set in place certain—by now—overused frames for thinking about journalistic practice. Perhaps nowhere is this as evident as in the lingering currency of "the newsroom" as a metaphor for journalistic practice, a currency largely due to the studies that used newsrooms as stand-ins for the broader picture of journalism. While emphasis on the newsroom as a research setting made sense for ethnographers, it has since been generalized far beyond its relevance to news making. Few, if any, news organizations operate with the same degree of dependence on "classic" newsrooms that they displayed in earlier decades, and decisions taken at a far more diverse set of venues—in the field, internet or telephone exchanges, social gatherings, publishing conventions—should not be left out of the picture. In so privileging certain settings over others, what counts as evidence has here been narrowed.

Methodological questions also haunt the ethnographers. Did journalists themselves define categories of news or were such categories simply an artifact of academic analysis? Why were such categories typically constructed along routine versus nonroutine dimensions, and was the routine stressed because it was so difficult to study the non-routine? Although Tuchman addressed some of these questions, the fact that two of the studies developed residual categories—Tuchman's "what a story" and Gans's "gee whiz story"—to accommodate holes in the classification schemes being offered (see also Berkowitz 1992) deserves some consideration. Furthermore, each of these studies fell short somewhat because they only considered news work from the moment at which an event was approached by a journalist.

However, the newsroom ethnographies did leave a powerful imprint on the evolution of inquiry into journalism. They masterfully interrogated many of the reigning commonsensical assumptions about news work, showing that news reality was constructed, often in the name of agendas like practical work accomplishment. In addition, the links suggested here between journalism and other structures at work in the play of news paved the way for thinking fruitfully about ideology. It is important to remember that the original aim of the news ethnographies was not to suggest a far-reaching generalizability about news making but to display precise formulations by which certain sets of circumstances came into existence. The overgeneralization of ethnographic authority beyond its original positioning, by which the concrete pictures they fashioned came to stand in for more generalizable statements about how journalism is thought to work, is as much a statement about the evolution of inquiry as it is about the ethnographies themselves. It may be that we have not yet found a way to build upon the newsroom ethnographies as an integral but limited part of the sociological inquiry on news.

Later Sociological Inquiry: Journalistic Institutions and Ideology

The frame offered by the news ethnographers provided an incomplete picture of the link between journalistic settings and their larger sociocultural surroundings, and to address that insufficiency, certain journalism researchers began to formulate their work around institutional and ideological questions. Taking a critical view on the media and journalistic practice, these studies located the force of ideological positioning outside journalism, where it worked in tandem with other institutions. Journalists thus came to be increasingly considered agents of a dominant ideological order external to the news world itself.

This scholarship's key attribute was its ability to markedly complicate the frame for analyzing news. Unlike the earliest sociological work, which targeted selection activities in newsroom settings, or the mid-period sociological studies, which considered news as a social construct largely within the frame of the news organization, here the emphasis was on linking journalistic settings, routines, practices, and texts with the institutional settings that surrounded them. While some of the mid-period studies (e.g., Gans 1979) moved sociological inquiry in this direction, later studies were critical in establishing an ongoing connection between journalism and the outside world.

The Institutions of Journalism

Although an interest in the institutions of journalism had already generated scholarly work by the mid-1960s (e.g., Gerbner 1964, 1969; Burns 1969), it was primarily on the heels of the extensive research on news organizations that sociologists began to realize a need to broaden the analytical locus in which they thought about journalism. Specifically, scholars of a critical sociological bent saw institutions and their resultant problems, such as media ownership and control, as a corrective to much of the administrative work that had been produced in sociological inquiry into journalism, particularly in the United States. In the United Kingdom, the establishment of a third Royal Commission on the Press (1974–1977) intensified pressures for reform but also fine-tuned an interest in the symbiotic relationship between journalism and its institutional settings.

Scholars focusing on the institutional domain moved interchangeably between politics and economics in attempting to target the broad ties connecting journalists with their environment. Although this work drew from other disciplines in the development of inquiry into journalism, it retained a decidedly sociological flavor. Scholarship on media ownership, advertising, and commercialism (Altschull 1984; Bagdikian 1997) was accompanied by considerations of the decline of the party press due to commercial imperatives. Hanno Hardt (1996), for example, offered a view of U.S. journalism that tracked the replacement of political independence with the interests of corporate power. The problems of media concentration across Europe were widely discussed by scholars (e.g., Picard 1988; Sanchez-Tabernero 1993; Sparks 1996). In his recent book *The Sociology of Journalism,* Brian McNair (1998) focused two of his five sections on the political and economic environments of journalism.

Work in Europe and Latin America in particular examined the political dimensions of journalistic work through sociological questions. For

instance, Colin Seymour-Ure (1974) spent considerable effort investigating
the intersection between British governmental circles and Fleet Street, while
Paddy Scannell (1979) tracked postwar British television. French media
scholar Serge Halimi (1997) discussed the emergence of "the new media
watchdogs" that had developed in conjunction with the media's domina-
tion by a market mentality. Jay Blumler and Michael Gurevitch (1995)
provided a comprehensive view of the institutional pressures afoot for both
U.K. and U.S. political reporters. Governmental and global management
of information was seen as aggressively intruding upon the very structures
through which news was produced (Curran, Gurevitch, and Woollacott
1977; Curran and Gurevitch 1991; Boyd-Barrett and Rantanen 1998;
Curran 2000a). Studies of news flow facilitated an understanding of the
broader global context in which journalism took shape (Varis and Jokelin
1976; Gurevitch 1991; Hjarvard 1999). Armand Mattelart's systematic
inquiry into the nuances of the political imperatives of journalism in Latin
America (Mattelart 1980; Mattelart and Schmucler 1985) was followed by
similarly politically driven work by Elizabeth Fox, Jesus Martin-Barbero,
and Silvio Waisbord (Fox 1988; Martin-Barbero 1993; Waisbord 2000;
Fox and Waisbord 2002). Work was also conducted along similar lines
in Eastern Europe (e.g., Nordenstreng, Vartanova, and Zassoursky 2001),
and the emergence of transnational news channels drew significant
scholarly attention (Volkmer 1999; Robinson 2002). Significantly, work
on these lines was often codified as following different disciplinary tenets:
in the U.S. context much was conducted through political science rather
than sociology (e.g., Bennett 1988; Entman 1989), while some work in
the United Kingdom tended to be classified more directly as philosophy
(e.g., Keane 1991).

   Similar developments occurred surrounding journalism's economic dimen-
sions. While the groundbreaking work of Ben Bagdikian (1997) showed that
a few corporations owned much of U.S. journalism, other scholars' work
elaborated an understanding of news management and corporate presence
(e.g., McManus 1994). Robert Picard (1985) offered a detailed view of the
economic pressures inherent in the democratic press, and Robert McChesney
(1993, 1999) led a far-reaching discussion of journalism's dependence on
corporate structures. In *Rich Media, Poor Democracy* (1999), he argued
that journalism did not "give people what they wanted," as had been long
claimed, but instead failed its missions as a public service; an organized
reform of the media was necessary for the revitalization of democracy itself.

   While much of this work drew directly from earlier research on the
newsroom and news organizations, its unidimensionality and often highly
functionalist character left many researchers in search of a term to denote

a wider phenomenon that might help explain journalism's institutional setting. "Ideology" provided one such term.

Ideology as Part of Journalistic Inquiry

While some notion of ideology was implied in earlier studies of journalism (e.g., Epstein 1973; Tuchman 1978a; Gans 1979), it was primarily in later studies that ideological analysis became a motivating force in inquiry. Typically scholars define "ideology" as that which refers to the social relations of signification—knowledge and consciousness—in class societies (e.g., Thompson 1995) or the ways in which conflicting positions about reality are "produced, deployed, regulated, institutionalized, and resisted" (O'Sullivan, Hartley, Saunders, and Fiske 1983: 110), but the term "ideology" has long suffered from a lack of precision in application. A term that came into general usage around the end of the 18th century with the Enlightenment, "ideology" in German originally meant simply "the study of systems of ideas," but it was rendered more complex after Karl Mannheim examined its workings and Karl Marx and Frederick Engels used it in the mid 1800s to refer to the maintenance of ruling class interests. Tensions between its prescriptive and descriptive uses continue to characterize its invocation even today.

Raymond Williams was perhaps first to delineate the variant attributes that come to play when invoking ideology, arguing that ideology could be defined as a "general process for producing meanings and ideas," to be contrasted with ideology as belief or as false consciousness (Williams 1983b). This notion, which pushed the term beyond assumedly static mental frameworks toward continually evolving practice, proved particularly useful in inquiry into journalism, for it assumed that ideology was dynamic rather than static, that natural meanings did not exist but were always socially constructed and socially oriented (i.e., aligned with indices of identity, like race, gender, and ethnicity), and that ideology worked according to certain attributes. Other accounts of ideology—that it worked by mystifying, generalizing certain group interests over others, naturalizing all historical contexts, promoting hegemony, and making chaos seem coherent—offered a particularly fruitful way to think about ideology (LaCapra 1985). As Dominick LaCapra argued, the charter of ideological criticism was to "disclose what ideology mystifies . . . with an implication for praxis" (LaCapra 1985: 140). In contemporary eyes, ideology was seen as "meaning in the service of power" (Thompson 1990: 7).

However, as notions of ideology gave way to the alternative idea of hegemony (Gramsci 1971), ideological critique offered a fruitful way to consider journalism. The introduction of "hegemony," which was defined

as the voluntary yielding to authority, positioned journalists as ideological agents who secured agreement by consensus rather than forced compliance (e.g., Gitlin 1980). This proved a compelling frame for linking journalism to its broader institutional environment. Hegemonic analysis also provided terms that could clarify journalism's ambiguous institutional parameters.

Scholarship in the United Kingdom led the way in incorporating ideology and hegemony into sociological inquiry on journalism, with British sociological scholars attributing to ideology a "common-sense awareness of social processes" (Glasgow University Media Group 1976: 13). Power was invoked as a way of defining normality and setting agendas. Thus, news developed not as a reflection of "the events in the world 'out there,' but as the manifestation of the collective cultural codes of those employed to do this selective and judgmental work for society" (Glasgow University Media Group 1976: 14).

A prime source of studies of ideology and hegemony in the late 1960s and early 1970s was the Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham. Perhaps its best-known scholar was Stuart Hall, who attempted to make explicit how journalists recognized and crafted news. Arguing against the unexamined assumption that pluralism works, Hall maintained that as the notion of consensus began to break down and recognition increased that labels like "deviant" and "subcultural" were constructions, reality itself came to be seen not as a given set of facts but as a mode of definition (Hall 1982). That move replaced the pluralistic or administrative model of critical research with a critical one, with models of journalistic power necessarily taking into account the shaping of the whole ideological environment as a move toward winning a universal validity and legitimacy for partial and particular accounts of the world. This meant that from the 1960s onward, ideology came to be seen as ways in which certain accounts were given validity and legitimacy, despite the fact that they were not representative. A concern for how ideological processes worked, and the ability to conceive of the ideological in relation to other practices within a social formation, generated a lingering interest in this line of inquiry: How could anything but the dominant ideology be reproduced? Reality came to be seen not as a given set of facts but as the result of a particular way of defining those facts. Particularly interested in seeing how journalists used power to signify events in a particular way, Hall (1982) analyzed what he called the "reality effect," the effect of ideology to efface itself and appear natural. The ideological effect of the media was to impose an imaginary coherence on the units being represented. Hall (1973a) also argued against what appeared to be the neutral ideology of news production and showed that meaning was constructed by various levels of coding within the news

photograph. Even though news values appeared to be a set of neutral, routine practices, in Hall's view, news selection emerged from an intersection of formal news values and ideological treatment. At the same time, Hall opened up a stream of research that examined the opportunities to decode in negotiated and oppositional ways (Hall 1973b). His recognition of the slippages that appeared alongside the dominant readings offered a new way to think about audiences alternately decoding news in accordance with their own identities (see, e.g., Morley 1980).

One of the foremost studies examining the ideological parameters of news was a set of research volumes produced by the Glasgow University Media Group. Called the "Bad News" project, the group's work was not sociological analysis only but instead mixed organizational theory, ideological critique, and language studies to analyze British television's verbal and visual coverage of industrial relations. Funded by the British Social Science Research Council on Television News, the group was mandated to uncover whether or not TV news projected bias in labor disputes, and it focused on one year of coverage of a British miner's strike. Different from other studies of the time, in that it utilized a team of researchers and a multiplicity of research methods, the group produced two initial volumes that reinforced the difficulties in maintaining a neutral stance in journalism (Glasgow University Media Group 1976, 1980). The group argued that a sequence of socially manufactured messages carried many of society's culturally dominant assumptions, and it claimed that in covering strikes and industrial disputes, television news makers tended to favor dominant interpretations of such strikes via a range of practices, including interviewing technique, shot length, word choice, and visual perspective. The worker's point of view was seen as less credible or was simply less seen than that of management.

The Glasgow group's influence on the sociological inquiry of journalism was manifest. To date, the collective has published numerous research volumes (Glasgow University Media Group 1976, 1980, 1982, 1986; Philo 1990, 1999; Eldridge 1993; Miller et al. 1998). While the group's early work focused on British TV news, its later work targeted the broader questions of AIDS representations, child sexual abuse, and mental health (Eldridge 2000). More recently, Brian Winston (2002) described a revisit to the group's 1975 research, where he argued that its essential findings remained the same.

Work focusing on ideology was also generated by U.S. scholars, where media theory began somewhere around the 1950s to work rather loosely with the notion of "ideology." Unlike the British academy, however, this was accepted more slowly. Perhaps the best known U.S. study of journalism's ideological setting was Todd Gitlin's *The Whole World is Watching*

(1980), which straddled a bridge between the U.S. ethnographies of the 1970s and later explicitly ideological work. Gitlin's own story as an activist became embedded within the story of the media that he chose to tell. A former lead member of Students for a Democratic Society, he analyzed CBS and the *New York Times* during the early period of the antiwar movement, combining his own recollections, interviews with key activists and reporters, and transcripts of broadcast newscasts to support the argument that he had long personally been interested in examining—that American journalism was ruled by "hegemony," a nonforceful domination by the ruling class. In examining the relationship between the media and the New Left in the 1960s, Gitlin found the mainstream media complicit with hegemonic structures in society. The coverage of anti-war movements that they provided offered only stereotypical challenges to the established order and portrayed leftist groups in a way that made them look foolish. In this way, journalism supported the ruling class by characterizing the New Left as violent, deviant, and silly. Gitlin found that hegemony worked in journalism in two main ways: through the structure of the newsroom and through the format of the news story. In other words, journalistic values were steady enough to sustain hegemony yet flexible enough to give the appearance of being open.

Connected to Gitlin's work was the emerging importance of journalism in the formation and maintenance of social movements. While Gitlin's work set the stage for this issue in regard to the peace movement and the Vietnam War, arguing that the frames used by the news media to cover the movement both propelled it into existence and then undermined it, scholars elsewhere displayed similar interests. In Canada, Robert Hackett (1991) used three case studies—the reporting of human rights in the context of the Cold War, Vancouver's annual Walk For Peace, and the 1986 American raid on Libya— as a way of discussing the Canadian media's treatment of the peace movement. In so doing, he offered a more upbeat prognosis than did Gitlin of the treatment of social movements by the news media. In France, Erik Neveu (1996) examined new forms of social movements, including the media's role in the demise of violence and other changes in activist behaviors. Others (Molotch 1979; Kielbowicz and Sherer 1986; Gamson 1988) considered the media strategies used by social movements in different cultures.

There were other scholars who also took a sociological view of journalism's ideological parameters as ideology began to be seen as a more integral part of journalistic decision making (e.g., Hackett 1984; Soloski 1989). In Canada, Richard Ericson, Patricia Baranek, and Janet Chan (1987, 1989, 1990) interwove notions of ideology in their large-scale examination of the various personnel involved in the news production process, while Stephen Reese (1990) offered a close analysis of the ideological tensions arising from

socialist Kent MacDougall's long-term employment at the *Wall Street Journal.* These attempts were all aimed at moving the journalistic mind-set away from its sense of self as a reflector of reality.

Interest in journalism's ideological parameters in both the United States and United Kingdom, however, was not universally hailed. The work of both Gitlin and the Glasgow Media Group drew the attention of cultural critic Raymond Williams in 1982, who wrote somewhat scathingly that while it had become trendy to speak of "news gone bad," the very regard for news as a cultural product was a "major intellectual gain" that was being overlooked. Lamenting journalist scholars' discomfort over the entry of sociology into ideology critique, Williams argued that a disregard for what journalists called "academic whining," a sense of outraged professionalism among reporters, and journalism's own strict separation of theory and practice undermined an appreciation for sociology's strong penchant in examining ideology. At the same time, Williams criticized both Gitlin and the Glasgow group for focusing their interest in ideology away from people and toward texts, overlooking the cultural practices by which texts were made meaningful. The point Williams was making was clear—the academy had not yet developed a place in which it could comfortably analyze ideology in all of its workings, particularly not in its application to journalism— and his concern became the rallying point for much of the cultural work that was developed later by sociologists.

The ideological line of inquiry was valuable because it showed that things are not always as they seem. It opened the door for thinking about important issues regarding representation, access, and power (e.g., Cottle 2000b). It facilitated useful discussions of taken-for-granted premises like objectivity and impartiality, which were found to be responses to the changing circumstances of news production in both the United States and the United Kingdom (Allan 1997). But ongoing questions linger regarding where to locate evidence of ideology, how to agree on its presence and force, and how to stabilize it long enough for analysis. Generally, the latent rather than manifest outcomes of ideological positioning were emphasized and a functional view of ideology's workings prevailed. In addition, much ideological work on journalism offered a somewhat narrowed vision of how journalism can and should look, with insufficient attention paid to non-Western journalism. The interest in ideology as part of journalistic practice also left little room for simultaneously considering the real life events by which journalism constitutes itself. As ideology critique moved journalistic inquiry increasingly in the direction of construction, there seemed to develop an infinite regress, by which relativizing occurred to such an extent that we can longer reach "the facts" at the heart of journalism.

How to get back to reality, as one of the privileged terms of the journalistic world, remains a quandary that has yet to see resolution.

Political Economy of Journalism

A further elaboration of the sociological inquiry on journalism blended an interest in the political domain with a focus on both the sociology and the economics of journalism. Called the "political economy of news," this scholarship related news production to the economic structure of the news organization. Political economists argued that a ruling capitalist class dictated to editors and reporters what to run in their newspapers (e.g., Garnham 1979). In this regard, most news organizations were seen as simply system maintaining, with any adversarial or oppositional journalistic practices undone by the extensive intervention of ruling elites. News here was assumed to take shape at the whim of either conservative government or big business, both of which constrained it (Golding and Murdock 1991; Curran, Douglas, and Whannel 1980; Gandy 1982; Mosco 1996).

One book that appeared parallel to the rise of political economy and embraced many of its central tenets was that of Edward S. Herman and Noam Chomsky. In *Manufacturing Consent* (1988), they offered what came to be known as the "propaganda model of journalism," by which journalism was thought to mobilize support for special interests underlying both state and private activity. Herman and Chomsky claimed, in an argument that invoked a pre-Gramscian notion of ideology, that in capitalist nation-states, journalism inevitably served the established and recognized powers that be. Servicing them was inevitable because the news was produced by a concentrated industry of profit-making corporations that reflected the status quo. At the heart of Herman and Chomsky's propaganda model was the notion that wealth and power were unequally distributed and that such distribution was in need of maintenance by the news media. Identifying five filters by which the media marginalized dissent and fostered the perpetration of governmental and private interest, they argued that only material that passed through these filters ended up as news.[6]

This subset of political science, sociology, and economics, by which the media of liberal societies were painted as authoritarian, produced a unique blend of disciplinary overlap. While the political economy of journalism offered a powerful examination of journalism's "big picture," this research proved particularly valuable for its critical consideration of a normative impulse—the notion that journalism "ought" to do better by its public. While looking primarily at capitalist democracies, and in Schudson's view (1991) in effect neglecting politics by taking democracies for granted, the

combination of normative and critical voices in this scholarship nonetheless underscored the value of interdisciplinary work on journalism. Yet, at the same time that political economists helped explore the broad dimensions of news, they did not account for the fuzzy territory in-between the daily routines of journalism and the larger political economy of society.

Where Is the Sociological Inquiry of Today?

Despite the auspicious beginnings of the sociological inquiry into journalism, much contemporary work on journalism no longer comes from sociology per se. While the centrality of sociological research has been contested (Gans 1972), it is fair to say that it is referenced widely as the established beginning of journalism studies, not only in the United States but around the world, and that sociology remains a large part of the default setting of journalism inquiry.

And yet the growth of sociological studies of journalism has been uneven. While the early work of Lazarsfeld and his colleagues produced a temporary institutionalization of sociological inquiry into journalism in the early years, and the 1970s and 1980s generated a flurry of primarily ethnographic sociological research surrounding the work of Tuchman, Gans, Molotch and Lester, Fishman, Schudson, and Gitlin, more recent scholarship has not produced a sustained interest in journalism. Indeed, the centrality of sociology in journalism studies is no longer certain. In one view from the United Kingdom, "media studies is to present-day social science what sociology was in the 1960s and 1970s: on the intellectual cutting edge, radical and challenging, essential to an understanding of how modern societies work" (McNair 1998: vii). Much contemporary work on the cultural dimensions of journalism vies with the status originally accorded sociological inquiry.

There have been exceptions, however, particularly of late. Within the past few years, three renowned sociologists—Herbert Gans, Todd Gitlin, and Michael Schudson—all revisited the inquiry of journalism with new books. Gans's *Democracy and the News* (2003) lamented the lowered public esteem of journalists and the degradation of contemporary democracy. Tracking the involvement of private corporations in public policy, rampant citizen mistrust, and a weakened democratic apparatus, Gans argued that the twinning of journalism's "shrinkage" and a decline in news audiences could best be offset by wide-ranging economic and political measures, including a more democratic economy and electoral process, more diverse newsrooms, and more active political lobbies. In *Media Unlimited,* Gitlin (2002), who spent much of the past few years addressing the news in public forums like *Dissent*

and *Tikkun,* delivered a multipronged attack on contemporary journalism and its unending torrent of information, cautioning that the public no longer received the information needed to function as a democratic collective. Gitlin called for more thoughtful boundaries to be used in information relay in the hope of offsetting the race toward more and faster information—to media unlimited—that had become a mainstay of the contemporary age. In *The Sociology of News,* Schudson (2002) offered a wide-ranging overview of the issues in journalism that remained in need of a sociological fine-tuning. Surveying the broad intersections beyond politics by which journalism connected with the world outside—the market, history, literature—Schudson delivered a less pessimistic though equally trenchant analysis of the often internally contradictory yet always complex environment in which journalists mustered authority to convey the words and images of news. Each of these authors offered views that remained in tune with long-standing tenets of sociological inquiry; significantly, however, each also tweaked and stretched the borders of sociology to think anew about journalism and politics, journalism and the economy, journalism and technology, journalism and its publics. Even though the expansion of sociology's boundaries may not have always been articulated as such, it has been the mark of much ongoing sociological conversation about what journalists are for (see particularly Katz 1989, 1992).

Newcomers also left their mark: The work of Nina Eliasoph (1988), Joshua Gamson (1998), Ronald Jacobs (2000), and Rodney Benson (2002), to name a few, reflected an invigoration of sociological interest in journalism. Eric Klinenberg's (2003) analysis of coverage of the 1995 heat wave in Chicago showed how limited, patterned, and often intractable journalists could be in reporting events beyond their expertise. Anthropologists Mark Pedelty (1995) and Ulf Hannerz (2004) both used premises of sociological inquiry to structure their discussions of foreign correspondents, and media critic Eric Alterman (2003) offered a probing consideration of journalistic bias. In France, Pierre Bourdieu, in *On Television and Journalism* (1998), offered an extended lamentation of journalism's general "structural corruption," due to the ascendancy of television and its panderings to entertainment and talk show chatter. His argument, in large part a reversal of his earlier work extolling the value of popular taste, lambasted not only journalism's populist impulses and superficiality but also the threat posed by its new forms of discourse to science, the arts, and philosophy. A collection of his students' papers, considering his work's relation to journalism, was recently compiled for publication (Benson and Neveu, in press). However, by and large, sociologists no longer seem intrigued by the wide-ranging settings of journalism, at least not to the extent exhibited by the earlier decades of research.

And yet, sociology has taught us much about how journalism works. In the three frames of sociological study discussed here, questions about journalism were explained by linking them to the practices shaping lives in a complex society. Sociology portrayed journalism and news making as a potentially conflicted environment in which the actors strove to maintain equilibrium. This view of the organizational, institutional, and structural sides of journalism suggested that journalists sought primarily to act in tandem with others inside and beyond the news setting.

Sociological research, however, also overstated certain ways of seeing journalism. Versions of how journalism works were overgeneralized beyond their applicability in the real world of news. A regard for journalists as strategic actors who move in response to their environment distracted scholarly attention from the nonpurposive, nonstrategic sides of journalistic practice. Sociological explanations of news, moreover, offered a lopsided picture of the process of news making. News begins before journalists negotiate all the contexts—cultural, historical, political, economic—in which journalism exists. In other words, sociological inquiry reduced journalists to one kind of actor in one kind of environment. It was up to other disciplinary frames to complicate that picture.