Abstract
This in-depth case study examines attempts to transform a traditional newsroom to one oriented around civic journalism principles, offering a unique look at the resistance toward those principles even in a digital environment that facilitates new audience relationships. Civic journalism emphasizes understanding and addressing community concerns from a citizen perspective. This study finds that journalists still struggle to integrate citizens’ contributions into newsroom practice in meaningful ways.

As audiences have become increasingly involved in creating digital news content, their relationship with journalists has changed, creating disruption in many newsrooms. This in-depth case study explores management attempts to shift journalists’ normative orientation from an inwardly facing newsroom perspective to an externally facing community one. To do so, it draws on lessons from experiments in civic or public journalism, which during a period of greater industry stability in the late 1980s and early 1990s sought to focus journalists’ attention on understanding and addressing community issues and concerns from the perspective of citizens rather than elites.

Civic journalism enjoyed only limited success – many journalists were resistant – and industry attention soon shifted to the emerging Internet. Yet the Internet, particularly the rise of social media and other forms of user involvement in the news, potentially brings civic journalism concepts back to the fore.

Focusing on one independently owned news organization in a medium-sized U.S. city, this article examines how civic goals are faring in the digital age. Community relationships and forms of engagement fundamental to civic journalism are at the center of management’s mission, vision and new initiatives. This case study explores newsworkers’ understanding and acceptance of this approach, as well as its perceived relevance to newsroom practices, norms and digital products.

Findings suggest that journalists are highly selective in their embrace of the civic journalism goals in the organization’s formal position. They have incorporated some aspects of “community engagement” in their perceptions of proper journalistic work, though not necessarily in ways that mesh with management views or with the rationale underlying civic journalism. Engagement is often relegated to “less serious” topics or even housed on separate sites, distinct from the organization’s core products, and public deliberation continues to be viewed warily.
Civic Journalism Values

Civic Journalism: Theory and Practice

Civic or public journalism, which posits that the news media in a democracy should actively foster public deliberation and debate, gained attention around 25 years ago, when some journalists and scholars raised questions about traditional journalism practice and the resulting coverage of civic issues.5

The perceived failure of news coverage to serve as a useful guide to citizens in a deliberative democracy led some organizations to experiment with initiatives that “attempted to encourage a more citizen-engaged press that would, in turn, facilitate improved citizen involvement with issues of public concern.”6 The central idea of civic journalism is that newspapers should “move beyond purely reporting events to become vehicles for public education, debate and structured discussion of public issues,” a concept that can be traced to John Dewey.7

While there is not universal agreement about the principles undergirding civic journalism,8 it typically calls for reporting that intentionally enters the political process to promote deliberative democracy.9 Three main civic journalism goals have been identified:

1. To connect to the community.
2. To engage individuals as citizens.
3. To help public deliberation in search of solutions.10

The goals build on each other. The first is the simplest to articulate and most straightforward to implement. Engaging individuals as citizens is more difficult as it requires accommodating feedback and dialogue. The final goal of promoting public deliberation, the most difficult to achieve, is often at odds with journalists’ self-perceptions as observers rather than social activists.

Research has shown that journalists, particularly at smaller outlets that have implemented civic journalism projects, approve of many of its aspects.11 This approval, however, is limited. Journalists tend to like aspects that most align with traditional practices and are more skeptical about those that challenge professional authority.12 Different dimensions of civic journalism are perceived and institutionalized in different ways. Journalists tend to support the first two goals of connection and engagement but view fostering public deliberation as outside the purview of journalism.13 In general, journalists are far more likely to adopt new tools and practices that do not threaten their core news values and culture.14

Although early models of civic journalism have fallen out of favor in the digital age, numerous news organizations have made associated practices part of regular work.15 More richly interactive news sites, which enable engagement with the product and audience members, have reinvigorated debates about the potential and practice of civic journalism,16 including its deliberative goals.17 More broadly, the shift in attention to digital platforms and user contributions to them has made a focus on community relationships and audience engagement increasingly commonplace in newsrooms.18

However, the mere provision of options for interaction does not necessarily increase connections between newsworkers and publics, nor does it create de facto spaces for public deliberation.19 Newspapers’ early online offerings supported connection and engagement but typically lacked features that facilitated deliberation.20 Although subsequent adoption of social media expanded opportunities for audience interaction, newsroom response varied; some journalists quickly embraced social tools and others remained skeptical for much longer.21
This research interrogates the negotiation of civic journalism ideals in contemporary newsrooms by examining management goals, newsroom practices and online news products:

RQ1: How does the organization’s management discuss its mission, vision and goals in relation to journalism practice and newswork?
   RQ1a: How do these discussions relate to the values of civic journalism?

RQ2: How do newsworkers perceive the organization’s mission, vision and goals in relation to journalism practice and newswork?
   RQ2a: How do these perceptions relate to the values of civic journalism?

RQ3: How do online news products reflect the organization’s mission, visions and goals?
   RQ3a: How do these products reflect the values of civic journalism?

Methods

Case studies are optimal for investigating contemporary phenomena in real-life contexts.22 This study used in-depth, triangulated data from a single case to explore how people in different positions in a news organization interpret the same changes, similar to the approach taken by Nip and Robinson.23 Although ours is hardly the first study to examine newsroom transformation amid industry instability, the Midwestern media organization examined here has taken a unique approach to envisioning and implementing civic journalism tenets.

The independently owned company produces a 50,000-circulation daily newspaper and associated websites; at the time of this study, it also ran a market-leading TV news outlet. Over the past several years, it has experimented with multiple changes to its products, mission, workforce, management and organizational structure: separating content from product, implementing a “digital-first” policy, instituting multiple rounds of layoffs, converging the print and television newsrooms, reorganizing staff around topical areas, and most recently selling the TV station to a much larger company. To explore connections between products and mission, this study draws from in-depth interviews and questionnaires collected from newsworkers and managers, along with examination of internal company documents and news websites.

In August 2012, a newsroom manager circulated a recruitment email to 124 journalists, editors and administrators, asking them to be interviewed for this study.24 Over the next five months, researchers interviewed 20 employees. Interviewees included the CEO, a vice president, editors, a graphic designer, a columnist, and reporters with newsroom experience ranging from a few months to more than 30 years. Most interviews lasted at least an hour and focused on the individual’s role and response to changes in the company. Interviews were transcribed in full, coded and recoded for themes. At least two researchers coded each interview.

Newsworkers also were invited to complete an online questionnaire in late August 2012. Open- and closed-ended questions addressed four broad topics: company changes, a company mission document, the relationship between journalists and the community, and the adoption of digital technologies. In total, 42 people participated in the online questionnaire: 12 self-identified as those previously interviewed, 21 self-identified as those who did not volunteer to be interviewed and nine submitted their responses anonymously. Questionnaire respondents also included a wide range of employees, from recent college graduates to veteran journalists to the CEO.
Additionally, researchers examined the organization’s two core news websites and separate sites associated with two community-based reporting initiatives to assess how each reflected the company’s stated mission and goals. The first initiative focused on education reform; it launched in 2012 but was short-lived. The second project launched in 2013 and engages with issues of innovation, urbanism and diversity in the community, attempting to use storytelling to foster “an exchange of local knowledge and a sense of possibility.” Together with the interview and questionnaire data, the website analysis enabled the researchers to identify how civic journalism goals are executed in news products. The sites were analyzed in 2013 and again in 2015 to determine what movement, if any, the organization had made toward aligning its products with civic journalism values.

Findings

RQ1: Articulation of Civic Journalism through Organizational Mission, Vision and Goals

Despite the many changes in the organization, engaging the community through reporting and storytelling has remained a core value. A 2012 position statement articulates the company’s mission and vision, summarized as “To Engage, Connect, and Inform Communities.” The goals expressed within the statement align closely with those of civic journalism, particularly in highlighting a desire to engage community members in a conversation about important civic issues to work toward community solutions.

For example, the first of four strategic initiatives focuses on reforming the company by “changing our relationship with the community and effectively delivering on brand promises” through “refocus[ing] our efforts on building community around critical topics such as effective education, government and economic development.” Journalists were urged to approach news reporting as participants, people able to contribute to and promote dialogue around key local issues – that is, to see themselves as collaborators and facilitators of community change.

The company statement also called on journalists to view community members as “true experts” and to open up more space for their contributions to news products and production:

[Community members] are the ones who know these issues most intimately, and we need to honor that by giving them more direct ways of communicating their knowledge to the communities that thirst for that content. This means rethinking how content is made and beginning to focus much more strongly on effective facilitation and curation, than merely finished, packaged reports.

This idea connects directly to the civic journalism agenda of developing a well-informed populace through citizen deliberation, with practical implications for newsroom routines, sourcing patterns, and relationships between journalists and audiences. The notion that journalists should think less about finished stories, and more about other forms of storytelling that facilitate discussion, was being enacted at the time of this study primarily in the form of online “notebooks.” These were blogs in which journalists reported on stories in progress and shared content normally omitted from a traditional news report.

Additionally, the position statement calls on journalists to proactively promote discussion around local issues, providing the space for community members to foster their own connections. Under this vision, news products take on a transformative role of promoting public deliberation: “Each product uses its unique attributes to provide remarkable experiences, and directs people to easy entry points in the network for their desired level of engagement.”
Company executives, in other words, saw the role of local media as delivering not just information or entertainment but also “community-building journalism.” In this construction, journalists are asked to be an active part of their community. “The overall goal is to connect and engage our communities,” one editor said. “We’re trying to enrich context.”

Although all journalists were expected to be involved in these efforts, in December 2011 the organization hired a designated “community builder,” tasked with fostering engagement on a key public issue, education reform. His role was to connect civic leaders, citizens and journalists, developing a network of people with common interests (a public) who worked toward solving local problems. “If we can get our community talking about more substantive issues and dealing with more substantive questions than we currently do, I’ll see that as a success,” he said in an interview, echoing civic journalism goals. This effort yielded a website featuring various community voices, including those of students, teachers and education analysts, who discussed the state of local education and offered ideas for improvement. Unlike traditional reporting, the content on this site called for reform, featuring views on potential change-oriented solutions.

In short, the organization’s leadership articulated a commitment to all three goals of civic journalism and specified that supporting deliberation in search of solutions should be part of its work. It outlined a multifaceted approach to journalism that placed the company in a strategic community-building role, seeing its “journalism” as fundamental to citizen engagement with civic issues.

**RQ2: Newsworkers’ Perceptions of the Mission, Vision and Goals**

In practice, however, this mission and vision took on different forms depending on individuals’ roles and ideas about how the goals should be executed. Consistent with previous research on journalists’ views of civic journalism, this study found that practitioners embraced certain aspects – mostly those related to community engagement – and made efforts to incorporate those aspects in their work. But their support did not necessarily extend to supporting public deliberation in search of community solutions.

Interviewees expressed diverse views on what constitutes connecting, engaging and community building, but generally understood them in the context of more traditional journalism practices or familiar ways of doing newwork:

In the old days, it was just providing the information. Now … it’s almost like we’ve opened the newsroom door, and we’ll welcome them into our newsroom, so to speak, literally and figuratively. At one point we even talked about we [could] even set up a place in the newsroom where people from the community can come in here and sign into a laptop and do their reporting in here, or do some research, or get involved in sitting [in] news meetings and things like that.

Probably the most significant change we’re seeing now in terms of our relationship with the community is actually being much more proactive about asking them, what is it that you want? What is it that you expect from us? And then trying to actually act upon that information. In the past, there was a fair amount of arrogance. We’ll tell you what you need to know. We’ve got it all figured out. Let us filter it for you.

But some newsworkers saw the roles of collaborator and facilitator as contrary to the proper functioning of journalism and journalists:
Engaging communities, that’s fine. But to be the driver behind change, I don’t know that we should undertake that role. … I just don’t see it as a journalist. When I go to meetings, for example, I don’t participate. I don’t feel it’s my role to raise questions for somebody else to ask at the meeting or put my opinion into it. We’re supposed to be neutral. By driving change, how is that being neutral?38

There’s a lot of discussion about community engagement and being part of the community. Not we observe and then we tell you what happened, but more being a part of the thought process. Should we be doing that? I don’t know. … I don’t know if that’s what we should be doing.39

Despite their commitment to traditional practices, newsroom interviews indicated widespread embrace of some level of community engagement and involvement. But many journalists thought of this relationship in terms of content and formats that had little to do with foregrounding important issues or supporting public deliberation about them.

For instance, several interviewees believed that interacting on social media and including community members’ sports contributions were good examples of connecting and engaging with the audience.40 The examples they offered typically fell well short of public discussion about issues of civic importance. “I think any community involvement is probably a good sign,” one journalist said, offering an explanation: “Maybe they’re a marathoner, and they write about how to train for a marathon, or coaching their kid’s t-ball team, or those sorts of things.”41

Others said the leadership’s vision of community building and engagement had not been well defined, and they remained confused about what it meant in practice. “For a number of years, [company leaders] have been talking about connecting to the community,” one staffer noted. “But I don’t know that they really know what that means, still.”42 Others said the mission and vision statements were loaded with jargon and buzzwords that did little to clarify expectations or operationalize how to actually do anything.

However, despite the skepticism and confusion, many still felt that engagement and community interaction were important parts of their jobs and of journalism more broadly. As one editor noted:

We’re trying to engage our readers and customers and members of the community more. I think that’s a good thing to be a partner to interact with the community rather than just say, ‘Here’s the newspaper. Read it.’ … Our role should be to more interact and set agendas either through our reporting or through projects. I think we’ve served a pretty important role there.43

Many questionnaire respondents reflected a similar commitment to building community relationships and fostering engagement, broadly defined. Nearly three-fourths agreed with each of the following statements: “news organizations should help strengthen their communities,” “members of the community should have input into our coverage decisions,” and “a journalist’s job is to foster community engagement in civic matters.”

Yet respondents also demonstrated a more traditional view of journalism, with nearly 90 percent agreeing with the statement, “a journalist’s job is to reflect what is happening in the community.” This adherence to traditional views alongside acceptance of some civic journalism
The tension surrounding perceptions about community interaction and engagement, and their implications for journalism practice, also was articulated in discussions about the rapid pace of change for the industry and the organization. That change generated great uncertainty. One editor, for instance, wondered how “this idealistic stuff about relationship-building, community partnership” meshed with “the day-to-day grind of meeting audience needs and getting the product out.”

In summary, newsworkers did not fully embrace the leadership’s mission and vision in daily practice. While many agreed that audience connection and community engagement were important, they tended to think about such things in the context of topics such as sports and local events. Few were interested in adopting practices that would encourage public deliberation around civic issues, seeing these practices as outside the realm of journalistic work.

**RQ3: News Products’ Connection to the Mission, Vision and Goals**

The 2013 analysis of the newspaper and television websites focused on features that support civic journalism goals to investigate how the organizational mission and vision were expressed in core news products. The sites were central to the company’s relatively new “digital-first” strategy, so the inclusion of some civic journalism features indicates they were being at least partially operationalized online. However, the initiatives fully dedicated to community building and public engagement were housed and produced separately, with their own design, logos, URLs and color schemes marking them as distinct from the organization’s primary brand. Their connections to the news organization were buried on subpages, such as the mission or “about” page, or reflected in staff email addresses that use the company domain.

The core sites did contain some features related to community connection, though many of these were hardly novel. For example, users could access email addresses or online forms to contact individual staffers or the newsroom in general; users also could submit story tips or letters to the editor. However, such features not only predated the advent of social media but typically were located on distinct “contact” pages unconnected to stories or bylines.

Moreover, in March 2013, two elements directly tied to community engagement were moved from the newspaper homepage to subpages, reducing their visibility as part of a site redesign intended “to call more attention to the most compelling and relevant content.” A “Your Voice” section, which allows users to contribute news items, vanished from the homepage sidebar and instead was integrated throughout the site. “Daily Conversations,” which enables users to comment on local issues, was moved alongside other community-based items such as letters to the editor. This “Daily Conversations” section did reflect the organization’s desire to facilitate a search for solutions to community problems. Community members’ views were explicitly solicited about state laws regarding drones, tax relief for low-income families, city redevelopment measures and state marijuana laws.

In addition to these two community-oriented sections, the newspaper site featured reporting from “community contributors,” citizen journalists who often drew on personal experiences to provide content on sports, lifestyles and health. These contributors did not typically produce content related to core civic issues such as government, schools, or local politics and policies.

Some social media features also indirectly supported deliberation, such as “sharing” options for posting stories on popular social networks. The television site listed Twitter accounts...
for on-air personalities, and featured videos encouraging conversation via the organization’s social media accounts.

The newspaper site had an interactive feature on prominent 2013 legislative bills, following their progress through the state legislative season, but generally lacked other features to support engagement and deliberation. With the exception of links to voting information ahead of the 2012 election, links to sources of civically oriented content were rare.

The bulk of the “community-building” reporting instead occurred on two separate websites, which offered diverse sources and in-depth reporting dedicated to specific local issues. The education site was developed to highlight innovation in that sector, with stories about education initiatives, individuals’ creative efforts and successes, and broader issues. As described above, a dedicated “community builder” hired from outside the newsroom managed this site – until his departure to take a job in the school district. Although it delved into education issues from multiple angles, this site provided little opportunity for interaction, lacking feedback channels or discussion options.

The other in-depth reporting site focused on a range of issues related to innovation, urbanism and diversity. This site, which also “lives” separately from the core news products, was launched in 2013 and continued to be maintained by a small staff. This initiative has stronger connections to the main news operations, as staff members have moved between it and the core newsroom. Its content, including guest columns from outside contributors, is cross-promoted from the primary news site. Additionally, staff members occasionally organize community events and “conversations,” something traditionally seen as beyond the scope of journalism.

Taken together, these two community-based reporting projects reflect the type of civically oriented reporting and storytelling that the CEO would like to see permeate the news culture. To date, however, they have operated on the fringes with little integration in the newsroom or primary news products.

In sum, the core news sites had long-standing features that supported some of the goals of civic journalism but were not well-integrated into daily newswork; moreover, these features did very little to support deliberation. The mission of the news organization, “To Engage, Connect, and Inform Communities,” was detectable in limited ways, but the websites overall reflected the greatest emphasis on the traditional role of “informing.” Attempts at community building and engagement occurred more on the outskirts of the organization, as part of CEO-driven projects that lacked broader newsroom integration.

Discussion

This case study explored the contemporary operationalization of civic journalism principles, examining how one news organization’s stated goals intersected with journalists’ perceptions, practices and digital products.

The findings suggest the aims of civic journalism – connect to the community, engage individuals as citizens and promote public deliberation in search of solutions – are explicitly articulated at the organizational level, for instance through mission and vision statements. But the statements generally do not indicate how journalists’ work should help achieve these aims.

Newworkers produced websites with features that support interaction and engagement – though, as others also have found, the latter tended to be peripheral to the core newsroom enterprise – but did little to promote civic dialogue about solutions to community problems. As in a pre-digital age, few journalists had internalized the idea that fostering such deliberation either was or should be part of their job.
At the instigation of the CEO, who considers himself a “change agent,” this organization did offer civic projects that served as testing ground for a style of journalism that reflects company goals. But they were developed in almost total isolation from the newsroom, with their own staffs and an online presence that did not reflect or connect directly to the organization’s well-known local brand. Newsroom reaction ranged from dismissive to apathetic. Journalists did not think of these projects as aligning with their own goals; in fact, few interviewees thought of them at all, and those who did were unclear about their function or even outright skeptical about their utility.50

This study also provides insight into the wider debate over the role of journalism and journalists in a digital era. Most journalists and academics agree that part of a local journalist’s mission is to inform citizens about issues facing their community,51 a role seen as a perquisite to any meaningful deliberation.52 Indeed, civic journalism advocates and opponents share an understanding of the importance of journalism to the health of democratic society, especially through coverage of public policy and politics.53

They disagree, however, on the route to civic health. For a quarter-century now, proponents have argued that journalists need to engage more fully with their community, tapping into local knowledge, perspectives and judgment to jointly discover solutions to problems.54 This study finds fissures between management desires to explore this kind of public deliberation and the concerns of journalists being asked to do the actual exploring in ways that they see as not valuable, potentially threatening or both. Particularly in matters of civic importance, these findings suggest that even in an inherently interactive digital environment, the professional news ethic of detachment manifests strongly. Most audience interactions remain relegated to “softer” areas such as sports and lifestyle reporting, as well as to segregated initiatives.

Significantly, though, this study also suggests digital spaces are indeed conducive to this sort of substantive deliberation. Despite skepticism and confusion among journalists about the organization’s mission and vision, new websites were being created and old ones reconfigured to reflect those goals. That said, journalists’ buy-in remains crucial to the future not only of the civic initiatives but of the organization overall. The leadership can implement piecemeal changes to promote its vision, but without commitment from those responsible for producing content and engaging audiences on a daily basis, the changes likely will fail to be fully integrated in the newsroom.

Future research should expand beyond the inherent limitations of a single-case study to focus more broadly on the relationship among management goals, journalistic practices and newsroom products in a rapidly evolving news culture. Audience interaction and engagement are features of the digital media landscape that will continue to affect how legacy news organizations move forward, meriting additional empirical assessment of the influence of civic journalism principles in an interactive, digital news environment.
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