

2016

From Protest to Press: An Examination of Paradigmatic Changes in News Making and their Effects on Social Movement Evolution

Melinda Guillen
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorstheses>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Guillen, Melinda, "From Protest to Press: An Examination of Paradigmatic Changes in News Making and their Effects on Social Movement Evolution" (2016). *University Honors Theses*. Paper 321.
<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.266>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Running Head: News Making Paradigms and Social Movement Evolution

From Protest to Press:
An Examination of Paradigmatic Changes in News Making and their Effects on Social
Movement Evolution

by
Melinda Guillen

An undergraduate honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Bachelor of Arts
In
University Honors
and
Communication Studies

Thesis Adviser
Dr. Lee Shaker

Portland State University

2016

Table of Contents

Abstract..... 3

Introduction..... 4

Thesis Statement..... 4

Professional Journalism.....5

Citizen Journalism.....10

New Media Journalism..... 13

Discussion.....16

Conclusion..... 21

References.....22

Abstract

In discussions of the expansion of the new media environment in journalistic endeavors, academics have begun focusing on how this expansion affects social protest movements' interaction and successful interaction with news making. The manner in which news is created and reaches the masses has adapted, sometimes reluctantly, to the explosion of new media communication technologies. One controversial issue has been the impact the contemporary media environment has made on social movements, specifically with protests. Researchers argue that the contemporary media environment has been a tool used by protests to partake in more effective information diffusion to the masses. This paper is an analysis of the discussions regarding the impact that the news-making shift has had on protest news media involvement. This paper focuses on three different journalistic paradigms that have occurred/are occurring and the ways in which protest movements interact with each: professional, citizen, and new media. Through an intensive literature review of the available research, findings point to the breaking of the news monopoly and a redefining of the meaning of making news; both proving supportive and inhibiting to protest movements. Further research must explore isolated ways to measure what this impact means for different kinds of movements and news producers.

Key words: *Social protests, protest movements, news making, and journalism*

Introduction

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. (1963) once wrote, “a social movement that only moves people is merely a revolt. A movement that changes both people and institutions is a revolution.” Individuals who give life to social protest movements, with a fire for justice and societal change, play an irreplaceable role in our communities, our country, and our world. A protest movement, as defined by Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) is a “sustained and self-conscious challenge to authorities or cultural codes by a field of actors - organizations and advocacy networks - some of whom employ extra institutional means of influence” (p. 115). Social movements and protests have come and gone in a variety of social themes, sizes, success levels, and communication strategies. Movement actors have realized that one of the most important tools available to them is news media; gaining this institution’s attention, with the ability to create and mass distribute news, is crucial to their overall success (Corbett, 1998). This tool, however, is changing and social protests are evolving to adapt to its changes.

According to Tarrow (1998), social movements as they are known today were first prompted in the 18th century due, in part, to the outburst of commercial print newspapers. The concept of “making news,” however, has been in a state of renovation since it entered the realm of mass communication. News travels fast now in the 21st century. It is written under newspaper headlines and in online blogs. It is viewed on Facebook timelines and professional agency websites. It is captured on iPhone cameras and journalist notepads. The people involved in the creation and distribution of news adapt, sometimes reluctantly, to the explosion of new media communication technologies. These changes that news making has produced affect the way in which social protest organisms interact with news agents, the general public, and ultimately, obtain success in their movements.

Thesis Statement

This thesis will explore news making through three different journalistic paradigms to discuss the way in which social protests' interaction with the creation of news has evolved to continue creating the environment necessary for successful movements. The journalistic paradigms are as follow: the era of professional journalism, the era of citizen journalism, and the current era of new media journalism. The creation and distribution of news went from being owned and controlled by mainstream media outlets, with professionally trained staff and individual company agendas, to an outburst of managed information in the form of amateur and grassroots news organizations, the control went from the hands of a few to the hands of many and so, social protests have adapted to fill the growing need of their own "hands" in the news making process.

Professional Journalism: the gatekeepers of the world (news)

"The media bring a manufactured public world into private space." (Gitlin, 1980, p. 1). For many, the prevailing understanding of journalism was that it served as a wide lens, window, or magnifying glass on the world (Tuchman, 1978). Following the birth of mass communication and development of journalistic institutions in the 18th and 19th centuries (Splichal & Dahlgren, 2016), news agencies held control over both audience and information distribution, having almost all of the power to reach the masses. According to Gans (2004), newsmakers in the golden era of professional journalism were assumed to paint a realistic picture of the nation, using observations and interviews, for their audiences to experience. The news actors involved in the professional journalism paradigm are the professionals of the trade: journalists, broadcasters, and editors who, together, form part of the greater agencies. These professionals usually formed part of larger news organizations, making "news" more a reflection of a social institution with the following functions: making information available to consumers, forming alliances with

other social or political institutions, and taking entitlement of the interpretation of events because of its professional training and nature (Tuchman, 1978). News making, as it was interpreted in this professional paradigm, also underwent a transformation within itself with its progression from pamphleteering and penny press to radio, print, and broadcasting. The journalistic themes in this particular model are characterized as the following: story selection, ethical objectivity, implied values, frame assignment, and journalistic expertise.

The ethics of professional journalism

In the traditional sense, mainstream media outlets and schools of journalism were best known for their values of professionalism and objectivity. According to Tuchman (1978) professionalism in the news room was correlated with journalist flexibility and served two purposes: to minimize idiosyncrasy in stories and to allow reporters to control their own work through usage of the norms given by external agencies. News professionalism meant that everyone in a news room shares in the work load, not taking into consideration individual specialties when necessary, because the ultimate bureaucratic goal is to get the job done (Tuchman, 1978). News making in this paradigm was also most prized for its objectivity, or the expectation that news makers would sacrifice their personal opinions for the sake of obtaining rewards for their employer and producing accurate and authentic news for their audience (Gans, 2004). Many scholars and audiences alike rebuked news agencies for distortion in story and source gathering, favoring one party over another, or not providing enough details for audiences to make their own conclusions (Gans, 2004), however, journalists' attempts at keeping their personal opinions out of the stories they write are noble.

The gatekeeping effect

Journalists in the professional paradigm are trained to make decisions and choose what sources and story topics fit their agencies best, although oftentimes these decisions are under deadline (Gans, 2004). This process is often referred to as gatekeeping. Gatekeeping, as defined by Ali and Fahmy (2013), is the method in which certain individuals, in this case professional journalists and their agencies, pick and choose what articles, images, and sources they want to showcase in their specific media space. Two ways in which gatekeeping has played out in this paradigm is in story selection and framing. The framing of an article or story can be determined by the tug of war that editors and journalists have in the news room (Gans, 2004). Editors are usually audience-driven with the ways in which they desire to frame a story and journalists are more source-driven (Gans, 2004); usually the editors, the ones with the most power, prevail in these situations (Gans, 2004). Visual news has its own hierarchy of story selection and framing as well; camera angles, select interviews, and filming environment all play key roles in framing stories (Tuchman, 1978).

It would be naïve to assume that news agencies and their journalists did not interview and write with preconceived and pre-placed values, and it is these same values that were crucial in determining story selection and frame of story. According to Gans (2004), the top eight journalistic values that most news agencies had were: altruistic democracy (ex. using the term “grassroots movement” to encourage citizen participation; violators of civil liberties or constitutional protections for criminals are less newsworthy than censored library shelves), responsible capitalism (ex. prizing the good faith of businessmen and women; criticizing communism and socialist economies), individualism (ex. self-made citizens), ethnocentrism (ex. during the Vietnam war, casualties on “the other side” were given impersonal descriptions such as “body count”) social order (descriptions of natural, technological, social, and moral disorder

implies the type of order that is valued), moderatism (ex. discouragement from extremist behaviors), national leadership (suggests maintaining order through good leadership), and small-town pastoralism (ex. valuing small agricultural towns over other communities; suburbs are killing small towns therefore receive bad press) (Gans, 2004). It is apparent that news agencies in this paradigm expressed the value of topics and ideologies through word usage and coverage selection and thus implicitly and explicitly relayed them to their readers. The things that were deemed newsworthy were often those broad country ideals that news agents reflected onto their audiences, for example: pro-smallness, pro-democracy, pro-economic growth, and pro-individualism. Events and sources that reflected the ideals valued by news agents were not only given attention within the press but also were painted in a more positive light, and visa versa. The compilation and overall news culture of this time had serious implications on protest movement coverage.

Implications on protest movements

There are many reasons why movement actors always made it their goal to make it onto mainstream media: recruiting, challenging the authority, to appeal to third parties, for protection through publicity, intimidation, and addressing of grievances (Gitlin, 1980). Because of the reign of professional journalism, which conquered the mass media realm during this time, there were clashes between protest movements and mainstream media sources over the negotiation of meaning. Both protests and media are heavily involved in taking reality and forming their own interpretation of events that occur and suggesting that their perspective is reflective of ‘reality.’ (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993). A frame, according to Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) is “a central organizing idea, suggesting what is at issue. It deals with the gestalt or pattern-organizing aspect of meaning” (p. 118). Taking control of this “meaning” is essential for protest movements

because of their agenda in formulating their cause for audiences to sympathize with. Often, however, movement actors had a hard time establishing themselves in mainstream media because in order to do so they would have to accept some sort of dominant cultural code; something they were usually working to fight against (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993).

Another difficulty that protests had was acquiring significant public attention without being noticed by the professional news creators and distributors first (Gitlin, 1980; Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993). This reign meant that the power of making news was in the hands of professional journalists through news agencies. According to Gillmor (2004), this monopoly was often referenced as “Big Media” and often treated journalism as a lecture. News agencies presented news and audiences had the option of accepting it or not, and if the audiences attempted to comment or engage in discussion news agencies had the power to publish the interaction or not (Gillmor, 2004). During this era, successful movements were dependent on news media agencies for mobilization of participants, validation of their cause, and enlarging the scope of their sympathizers (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993). Agents in protest movements often relied on “making it big” in the news in order to become well known and universal (Tarrow, 1998). According to Gamson and Wolfsfeld (1993) “receiving standing in the media is often a necessary condition before targets of influence will grant a movement recognition and deal with its claims and demands (p. 116). The cycle of availability and suitability linked journalists with both their sources and their audiences (Gans, 2004). According to Gans (2004) this relationship was unbalanced depending on how much power the sources had: entities with more power were more accessed and sought out by journalists than those with less power, who often had to produce havoc to make the news. Other potential actors could also have a stake in these

interpretations, politicians and world leaders, for example, who had more influence on news agencies than actors in protest movements did (Gans, 2004).

According to Gamson (1975), the meaning of success for protest movements was dependent on certain outcomes, some of which are formal recognition, new advantages and acceptance from the major antagonist. The conflict of interest, described in the previous paragraphs, that journalism had made activism and positive framing a difficult goal to achieve. The audience-centered frame instead of source-centered one left movement coverage at the disposal of media agency editors and the elite (Gitlin, 1980). Activists who fought for basic democratic rights were usually labeled as “extremists” or “militants” in the news (Gans, 2004), concepts that were not of journalistic value and thus framed in a negative light.

For these reasons, during the period of time in which professional journalism was the only means of making and receiving news, movements were more dependent on news media than newsmakers were on movements. News informed the audience more about the actors than about the issues, more about opposing parties than the content of the opposition, and it provided a limited scope of the social protest’s narrative (Klandermans & Goslinga, 1996). Any form of coverage however, though distorted, framed incorrectly, or lost among other media topics, was still a sign of cultural and social importance for protests (Gitlin, 1980).

Citizen Journalism: Professional curators of amateur collaborators

It is no coincidence then that, in the mid 1980s, social movement scholars began to move away from the idea that social movement agents developed ideas sporadically and consequently and moved toward studying them as active and engaged organisms. Social movement actors were seen more active in the assembly and sustainment of their message meaning (Benford & Snow, 2000). The term citizen journalism, as coined by professional journalists, refers to “the

practice of involving members of the public in mainstream acts of journalism” (Watson, 2011, p. 2). As Gillmor (2004) put it, “We [professional journalists] need to recognize and, in the best sense of the word, use their [readers] knowledge. If we don’t, our former audience will bolt when they realize they don’t have to settle for half-baked coverage; they can come into the kitchen themselves” (p. 111). In this case, the participation in news making shifts from strictly being for professional journalists to amateur ones obtaining a shot at collaboration. Other scholars more narrowly define citizen journalism as the “contribution to discussion in the public sphere, whether in the form of simple information, synthesis, reporting, or opinion” (Nah et al., 2015, p. 400). Citizen journalism went by different aliases as well, some of them being participatory journalism and open source journalism (Aly & Fahmy, 2013). The evolution from broadcasting to conversation had initiated among many big media companies, and not always in a neat way (Gillmor, 2004). As serial entrepreneur and producer Steven Rosenbaum, once recalling “Broadcast: New York” magazine’s shift in 1992 to audience suggested stories, described it, “our technology was no different from any other station in New York or anywhere in the United States for that matter. All of us had phones; it’s just that we were choosing to answer them when viewers called” (Rosenbaum, 2011, p. 15).

Citizen journalism began as a manner in which professional news agencies could gain the interests of their audiences again. At this time the country was undergoing a major shift in media access and distribution. As Gillmor (2004) described it, news transcended news organizations and was being created in the hands of regular people. By 1980, according to the MacBride report, the definition of professional communication was starting to blur (Splichol & Dahlgren, 2016). It was through these blurred edges that user generated content, or UGC, emerged and obtained a foothold in mainstream news agencies (Nah et al., 2015). For example, in 1998,

during Hurricane Bernie, the Charlotte Observer used an amateur blog to report the story for the first time (Watson, 2011). In 1995, after the Oklahoma City Bombing, the use of Internet as a forum for news agencies was well underway (Watson, 2011). The methods that they used were a direct reflection on how protest movements were developing to fit this changing journalistic culture. This journalistic phase in isolation was short lived with the Internet phenomenon creating more access to journalistic tools and software for the general public.

Implications on protest movements

In the midst of a more interactive news environment, protest movements began to evolve their organisms to cater to the demands of the audiences they were wanting to reach and the new tools mainstream media was producing. The World Trade Organization strike in Seattle, WA, for example, was well underway during the development of citizen journalism. Social protests have always known that mainstream media was capable of showing the dramatic aspects of protests without information or context, however for the first time, movements such as the WTO strike were able to interact with mainstream media journalists in order to provide more context and information about their movement. Although mainstream media still had the capacity to act as an information gatekeeper, a lot of the information that protest movements provided, this concept was revolutionary in the protest-news relationship. There are many scholarly concerns about the misuse of citizen journalism, both by the producers of content and from mainstream media outlets. Citizen journalism has also been widely criticized because of the ever-present risk of amateur journalists being exploited by mainstream media (example: CNN's unpaid iReporters) (Sienkiewicz, 2014). Citizen journalism, as mentioned before, was news agencies way of reaching out to their audience in order to gain back their prestige and the interest of their readers. This historical moment, this method of groundbreaking collaboration between agency and reader

was short lived with the outburst of information and media tools the Internet began to offer its consumers.

New Media Journalism: The current condition

For the first time, audiences have the capacity to set the agenda for news, to share “newsworthy” things with each other across the globe, and to create software and services that aid in these endeavors *without* the consultation or moderation of mainstream news media (Bowman & Willis, 2005). This new media journalistic paradigm then, beginning in the 20th century, is the era in which the world is currently living in. Citizen journalism as it was first created, ended with the 90s, however citizen involvement in journalism did not. The new media journalistic paradigm brought the world of journalism to what it is now because it gave audiences the ability to create and distribute news without mainstream news agencies intervening. This is an era in which some audiences are not content with simply collaborating with news organizations so they create their own grassroots news resources (Domingo & Heinonen, 2008).

Although almost anyone is able to create something and call it news, it takes a mastered skill and commitment to successfully create and maintain a grassroots news website or organization. The websites, tools, and content that is readily available to any fingertip must be constantly nurtured, given attention, and take a certain level of leadership to become an influential source for the public (Bowman & Willis, 2005). For these reasons, a new entity, with a newness and phenomenon in its work, in the news making game has risen up to the challenge. For the first time computer programming has merged with journalistic endeavors to provide a new tools, framework, and a new culture altogether (Lewis & Usher, 2013). Many reporters and professional journalists scoffed at the thought of amateurs creating content worth publishing in

news outlets, however there are a myriad of people and organizations dedicating themselves to making sure the content they receive is accurate and intelligible. Resistance groups such as the Shams Network (SNN) and the Local Coordinating Committees of Syria (LCC), fully dedicated their resistance to the online sphere (Sienkiewicz, 2014) during uprisings in Syria. Their roles involved compiling and spreading citizen-made videos after first putting them through a system that verified their origin and authenticity. This resulted in objective and well-organized pieces of news that gained these organizations positive reputation in the professional sector, such as BBC Arabic (Sienkiewicz, 2014). Although this was an interactive way in which resistance movements could aid in the creation of news agenda and content, mainstream media made sure that groups like the LCC and the SNN were not falsifying or tampering with any information they provided in order to advance their own political or social agendas (Sienkiewicz, 2014).

The Syrian uprising, for example, also gave birth to organizations who acted as social media monitors sifting through online citizen reports in order to distribute them to outside sources, some of which included mainstream media outlets (Sienkiewicz, 2014). These entities have been referred to as “hacker journalists” or “programmer journalists” (Betancourt, 2009; Minkoff, 2011; Royal, 2012 as cited by Lewis & Usher 2013). Programmer journalists are people who have taken it upon themselves to express their creativity and desire to aid in pro-social movements by using the digital computer and technical software they have already mastered (Lewis & Usher, 2013). Professionals and grassroots journalists alike “have been drawn to this hacker ethic-its DIY energy and entrepreneurial spirit—and hackers likewise have become increasingly invested in preparing journalism to tackle its digital future” (Lewis & Usher, 2013, p. 603). One of the ways in which programmer journalists are achieving their goals is through the invention and use of open-source software. Open-source software is a name used

for any software that allows for availability and transparency in computer programs that are able to be adapted by any who so wish to use them (Lewis & Usher 2013). This open-source software is a platform built by programmers on which other parties, programmers, and journalists can find common ground (Lewis & Usher 2013). Some of the most popular grassroots news producers come from similar platforms.

Podcasts for example, are online audio recordings which often contain news that is created and distributed by grassroots movements (Bowman & Willis, 2005). Although podcasting went from being used solely by grassroots to mainstream a year and a half after its beginning, it allowed amateur news organizations to compete on the same level with and obtain more audience attention than mainstream news (Bowman & Willis, 2005). After Hurricane Katrina, Flickr, a photo-sharing platform, went from photo sharing to photojournalism as mainstream news sites began broadcasting user images (Bowman & Willis, 2005). This is yet another example of how an idea which began in grassroots news sharing, in this case done by users through the photos they took of the events during Hurricane Katrina, became quickly adopted by mainstream media.

New media implications on protest movements

People are listening to grassroots news media. Live streaming, for example, allowed members of the Tahrir Square protest to film and upload a sniper killing civilians (Gregory, 2015). This video crossed digital international boundaries overnight and there were more views on the video through this method than they ever had through CNN (Gregory, 2015). The open-source software platform has also become a valued commodity among movements and their actors. Because the motivations to get involved in this type of information filtering and news creation are not profit or ownership driven but are driven by reputation, reward, and an interest in

the common good (Lewis & Usher, 2013), more and more programmer journalists are dedicating their energies putting together transparent and accurate information on the same injustices that protest actors are trying to bring to light as well. So fast are these successful grassroots news organizations rising however, that organizations such as The Daily Kos (political analysis weblog), Technorati (blogosphere tracker), and Wikipedia news related pages (twice as likely to be visited than the NY Times) all have more citizen traffic than mainstream news companies (Bowman & Willis, 2005). Another figure, Elliot Higgins, came into the light of the public through his Twitter and blog accounts (Sienkiewicz, 2014). Higgins, not having support or leverage from mainstream media, dedicated his time to studying and compiling amateur provided information on the weaponry situation going on in Syria in 2011 (Sienkiewicz, 2014). Having no professional expertise, Higgins was able to learn about the multi-faceted topic of firearms in order to cross-reference and assess the rumors that were spreading in mainstream media on this topic in order to provide his viewers and the general public a more accurate and informed account of stories (Sienkiewicz, 2014). Higgins' project was funded in its entirety through his account on Kickstarter, a website through which he received donations from his audience and also a large chunk of mainstream news reporters who relied on his information for their own news production (Sienkiewicz, 2014). James Miller, yet another figure, an information analyst and compiler for the University of Birmingham website EA Worldview, dedicated his time to cross-checking UGC in social media sites, wiki-maps, and mapping software in order to transform thousands of informational data into a seamless and accurate narrative for his live blog (Sienkiewicz, 2014). These narratives have been cited in news agencies such as *The Atlantic*, *The Guardian*, and *Al Jazeera*, but Miller earns wages that are below poverty level for his work (Sienkiewicz, 2014).

Discussion

It is uncontested that journalism and news making have undergone tremendous transformations within the last couple of centuries. The creation of news went from being the sole responsibility of professional, objective, and mainstream news companies to the common right of any individual with access to a life experience and the Internet. The same people who once relied on mainstream news to let them know what was deemed important in their communities now have the capacity to set their own agendas and share them with the world. The realm of journalism has always been, in part, owned by the audience (Gillmor, 2004) and they have always had a lot to say. Even during the reign of professional journalism, readers and audiences alike have wanted to make contact with journalists. However, it was not until the birth of citizen journalism that news agencies finally opened those doors, picked up the phone lines, wrote back in the comment section, and allowed audiences to take a small part in helping set the tone for what is important and news worthy. Although audiences have a myriad of things to say when given the chance, scholars argue that professional journalists will still always have a place in pulling facts together with discipline and gathering large audiences (Gillmor, 2004). Perhaps it has been time, however, to begin to redefine what it means to be a journalist and what it means to create “news.” This shift can best be explained by the description provided by Clyde Bentley:

The main difference between traditional journalism and citizen journalism is that traditional journalists are sent out to cover things they don't really care about; in other words, the next city council meeting isn't going to make or break their lives. But a citizen journalist is not out to cover something, but to share it. For them, they want to tell everybody about their passion. (as cited in Bowman & Willis, 2005, p. 8).

A valiant effort on the part of the citizenry, this desire for sharing information will at some point have to be reigned in to provide ethical and accurate news creation. Part of the redefinition of news must then begin with the schools in which give birth to journalists and

professional news creators. Some schools have already caught on. Seeing the growing relationship between programmers and journalists and wanting to nurture it, many of the nation's top schools of journalism, such as Northwestern University and Columbia University, are offering double majors and scholarships in computer science (Lewis & Usher, 2013).

One idea proposed by Sienkiewicz (2014), is for professional and amateur journalists alike to promote and nurture an interpreter tier of journalism that has organically already begun to take place. This interpreter tier's main focus would be to mediate the relationship between the influx of UGC and news publications, whether they are professional or completely grassroots. Sienkiewicz (2014) argues that this type of three-tiered relationship already exists (from content creators to interpreters to news outlets), but the role of the content interpreter has become more vital with the increased volume of UGC. Nurturing, giving more credit to, and promoting this middle tier of information interpreters, this curating of information, whose members dedicate their years and efforts to following movements and events in order to provide the most accurate account for their consumers, will prove vital for the integrity of journalism as it stands now. Protest movements greatly benefit from the cultivation of the interpreter tier because, through a systemic and more trusted organization of information, protests will acquire more accurate frames in the news, they will have more opportunities to engage in the news making process, and more professional or grassroots news agencies will trust the integrity of the information they receive, leading to new channels of audiences and movement value in national and world affairs. Scholars such as Hermida, Flew, and Diakopolous (as cited in Lewis & Usher, 2013) argue that a lot of the computational and new media journalism tools will enhance and uphold the ethics and standards that professional journalism carved in stone during its rule.

Making news: Challenges for protests then vs. now

An aspect worth noting of the changing relationship between news making and protest movements is the difference in challenges that protest movements face. While protests were more vulnerable at the hand of major news sources in the professional and citizen journalistic paradigm, the age of new media has, to an extent, loosened that firm grip. Not enough, however, to discredit the necessity that professionally trained and executed news agencies still pose to society. “Journalism isn’t going to be any less important. In fact, as information gets messier and noisier, those who possess the skills to recognize important stories, find themes, provide context, and explain the significance of pieces of information will be critically important” (Rosenbaum, 2011, p. 16).

While not obtaining enough coverage was the biggest issue that protest movements faced in the professional news paradigm, obtaining too much could be the new movement challenge in this century. With the outpour of citizen created news, thousands of submissions, and a myriad of stories and angles to select from, movements face the danger of having their original intent and cause skewed by the masses, and thus, by the media environments that they reach. Steps to remedy this potential challenge have been taken however, with the rise of open-source software and dedicated “amateur professionals” (individuals who had previously worked for big media companies, privately trained people, professionals in different trades such as programming, etc.) curating and sifting through information to provide the most accurate and genuine account of the actual story.

Lastly, an important factor to note, with regards to protest movements and “news” making, is that to credit the spread of movement news solely on technological platforms and mainstream reporting, especially on the other side of the globe, would be to mistakenly reduce

the multifaceted aspect of how protests create their news to a single source (Treré & Mattoni, 2016). While getting their name and cause in the news and to audiences through journalistic means is important, it is not the only way in which protest movements obtain reputation, standing, and collaboration in and with society. Media has always been a tool through which social movements used to obtain already established goals, not the cause of the goal obtainment (Treré & Mattoni, 2016). Thus, in studying movement success with news making involvement, success should be measured through successful interaction with news makers and the public and not solely success in the overall movement message. With that said however, it is still imperative to study the relationship between media and protest movements because the evolution of a protest movement tool changes the way movement actors engage with their cause, each other, and the world.

Limitations and future research

Future research in this field should focus on the consumer aspect of the relationship between news, protest, and audience interaction *and* participation. Future research in communication studies should also focus on key elements necessary for something to start “trending.” Findings in this area could prove crucial to protest movements because it would allow them more narrowed down tools to make their cause known and cared about in wider audiences without having to rely on word of mouth or mainstream media to do so. Limitations to this are clearly time related. It is more accurate to retrospectively study something to provide exact correlations and patterns. The world of journalism and their relationship with protest movement actors is in a time of exciting evolution and future research should make efforts to aid in this advancement. Also, most research conducted in the citizen and new media realms of journalism was based on protest movements and grassroots media that started internationally. Allowing more time to pass,

research should begin to piece together the differences in protest response to the changing culture of journalism between national and international contexts.

Due to a lack of research, this paper also switched location focus throughout the paradigms. A lack of research of national news in the new media paradigm forced comparisons to be made between national and international protests and news making. While paradigmatic research that compares historical shifts within the same geography would prove more successful in providing detailed descriptions of change, the general framework of academic ideas compared in this paper are just as valuable.

Conclusion

The world of journalism finds itself in an exciting time of renovation and protest movements are taking advantage of the innovations this tool is bringing to the conversation. Social protests find themselves more connected to their news making tool with the emergence of new media technologies. Instead of passively hoping their message gets picked up and portrayed accurately by mainstream media, social protest actors now have the ability to create their own news distribution methods and relay their own frames to the masses; an opportunity never seen before.

Professional journalism is still very much needed by protest movements to engage with citizens and citizen journalism, though short-lived, opened the door for professional journalists to prepare themselves for the new media environment that soon followed. By engaging in an explication of the changes within three major journalistic paradigms in order to understand how social movements are adapting to these changes to reach successful usage of news media.

References

- Ali, S.R., & Fahmy, S. (2013). Gatekeeping and citizen journalism: The use of social media during the recent uprisings in Iran, Egypt, and Libya. *Media, War & Conflict*, 6(1): 55-69. doi: 10.1177/1750635212469906
- Allan, S., & Thorsen, E. (eds.). (2009). *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Benford, R.D., & Snow, D.A. (2000). Framing Processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26: 611-639.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/223459>
- Bowman, S., & Willis, C. (2005). The future is here, but do news media companies see it? *Nieman Reports*, 59(4): 6-10. Retrieved from: <http://niemanreports.org/articles/the-future-is-here-but-do-news-media-companies-see-it/>
- Corbett, J.B. (1998). Media Bureaucracy, and the success of social protest: Newspaper coverage of environmental movement groups. *Mass Communication & Society*, 1(1/2): 41-46.
Retrieved from: [https://juliacorbett.net.files.wordpress.com/2013/01/mcs-media-success-of-social-protest-corbett.pdf](https://juliacorbett.net/files.wordpress.com/2013/01/mcs-media-success-of-social-protest-corbett.pdf)
- Domingo, D., & Heinonen, A. (2008). Weblogs and journalism: A typology to explore the blurring boundaries. *NORDICOM Review*, 29(1): 3-15. Retrieved from:
<http://www.nordicom.gu.se/en/publikationer/nordicom-review/nordicom-review-12008>
- Gamson, W.A. (1975). *The Strategy of social protest*. Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press.
- Gamson, W.A., & Wolfsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 528: 114-125.
Retrieved from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1047795>
- Gans, H.J. (2004). *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news,*

- Newsweek, and Time*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press. (Original work published in 1979).
- Gillmor, D. (2004). *We the media: Grassroots journalism by the people, for the people*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly Media Inc.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching: Mass media in the making & unmaking of the new left*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Gregory, S. (2015). Ubiquitous witnesses: who creates the evidence and the live(d) experience of human rights violations? *Information, Communication & Society*, 18(11): 1378-1392. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.2015.1070891
- King, M.L. (1963). *Why we can't wait*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Klandermans, B., & Goslinga, S. (1996). Media discourse, movement publicity, and the generation of collective action frames: Theoretical and empirical exercises in meaning construction. In D. McAdam, J.D. McCarthy, & M.N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Social Movements* (pp. 312-337). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, S.C. & Usher, N. (2013). Open source and journalism: toward new frameworks for imagining news innovation. *Media, Culture, & Society*, 35(5): 602-619. doi: 10.1177/0163443713485494
- Nah, S., Yamamoto, M., Chung, D.S., & Zuercher, R. (2015). Modeling the adoption and use of citizen journalism by online newspapers. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 92(2): 399-420. doi: 10.1177/1077699015574483
- Palmer, L. (2012). "iReporting" an uprising: CNN and citizen journalism in network culture. *Television & New Media*, 14(5): 367-385. doi: 10.1177/1527476412446487

- Rosenbaum, S. (2011). Curation, community and the future of news. *Nieman Reports*, 65(2): 14-16. Retrieved from: <http://1e9svy22oh333mryr8314s02.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/summer2011.pdf>
- Sienkiewicz, M. (2014). Start making sense: A three-tier approach to citizen journalism. *Media, Culture, & Society*, 36(5): 691-701. doi: 10.1177/0163443714527567
- Splichal, S., & Dahlgren, P. (2016). Journalism between de-professionalisation and democratisation. *European Journal of Communication*, 31(1): 5-18. doi: 10.1177/0267323115614196
- Tarrow, S. (2nd ed.). (1998). *Power in movement: Social movements and contentious politics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Treré, E. & Mattoni, A. (2016). Media ecologies and protest movements: main perspectives and key lessons. *Information, Communication, & Society*, 19(3): 290-306. doi: 10.1080/1369118X.20151109699
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. New York, NY: The Free Press
- Watson, H. (2011). Preconditions for citizen journalism: A sociological assessment. *Sociological Research Online*. 16(3): 1-12. Retrieved from: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/3/6.html>