Alan Bass

University College of the Cariboo

Shifting the Balance: Citizens, Employers, Journalists and the Internet

As any journalism student learns, journalism defines itself by high ideals. While the weight each ideal is given varies from person to person, discussions about the meaning of journalism generally focus on concepts like truth, balance, fairness, objectivity, independence, monitoring the powerful and so on. At the heart of it all is a deep sense of service and responsibility to readers and viewers. As Tom Rosenstiel and Bill Kovach have put it: "Journalism's first loyalty is to citizens" (51).

As any working journalist knows, these ideals take a beating in the workplace. In an oft-quoted comment, A.J. Liebling once said, "freedom of the press is guaranteed only to those who own one" (30). This remark deftly exposes the chasm that separates the ideal from the reality of professional journalism. No matter how devoted journalists are to their various ideals, most are also employees whose assignments and output are ultimately subject to the scrutiny, assessment, approval and agenda of those who employ them.

In essence, the central existential problem facing professional journalists boils down to the fact that they serve two masters—one being the citizens who read, view or listen to their work and depend upon journalists to live up to their high ideals, and the other being the people or institutions that employ journalists and depend upon them to contribute to the welfare of the corporation. Balancing the interests of these two groups has never been easy. In this paper, I will briefly discuss the increasing pressure to shift that balance towards corporate interests and suggest how the rise of the Internet as a mass medium may afford journalists the opportunity to shift that balance back towards the interests of citizens.

Journalists and Employers

At one time, most employers of journalists at least gave lip service—and some perhaps really believed—that the best way journalists could contribute to the welfare of the company was by being given the freedom

to live up their journalistic ideals. The old notion of the "Chinese Wall"—the belief that the newsroom should operate completely independently of the business side of the operation—epitomized this idea. In a sense, there was an implied contract between the journalist and the employer that gave the journalist the ability to put the needs of citizens first, at least in making day-to-day journalistic decisions. Employers respected the professional integrity of their journalists, and journalists respected their employers. Of course, there were always publishers who violated this unwritten code, but the code itself was considered the accepted norm of the industry.

In recent years, however, there have been increasing questions about whether this implied contract does or even should exist. During past decades, as journalistic operations have become smaller units in a shrinking number of enormous global corporate entities, as marketing and entertainment values permeate news operations, as profit agendas cause newsrooms to shrink, more and more questions are being asked about whether journalists are still free to do the kind of journalism they learned about in textbooks. In a 1999 article for *Nieman Reports* that examined this trend, journalist Lou Ureneck summed up the troubling situation this way:

> Greed is wrecking the newspaper business. Budgets are being squeezed to the point that some newspapers no longer adequately report news about their communities. Media conglomerates that increasingly control the press care more about keeping their shareholders content and less about the quality of the news they convey or their responsibilities as special members of larger communities.[1]

New forms of corporate organization and stockholder ownership are pushing journalists to pay more attention to serving the interests of their corporate masters. In Canada, where the dominant newspaper chain, CanWest Global, has come under criticism for forcing its newspapers to run corporate-imposed editorials and for spiking or revising columns and reviews deemed contrary to the owners' beliefs, one CanWest newspaper summed up the new equation nicely. In an editorial responding to criticism of these practices, the company's flagship *National Post* opined: "Press freedom is freedom from state censorship, it is not the freedom of journalists to write whatever they choose, regardless of the opinions of their employer."[2]

The Rise of the Internet

The other major development of the past decade is the rise of the

Internet as a mass medium: the number of people accessing the Internet worldwide has grown from about 20 million people in 1995 to about 500 million today. In North America, about 180 million people are Internet-connected (compared to about 112 million who read a daily newspaper.)[3] Although broad statistics such as these can be misused—not everybody who is connected is a frequent user—studies indicate that as new users become more familiar with the Internet, their use of the medium grows.[4]

There is no question that the Internet has had an enormous impact on the practice of journalism, particularly since the mid-1990s when the development of the World Wide Web began pushing the Internet into public consciousness. By the turn of the century, most newspapers and broadcast outlets owned Web sites on which they published news.[5] Many employ technicians, graphic artists and Web developers to ensure their sites present material in ways that make use of hypertext-linking and the Web's multimedia capabilities.[6] Textbooks on online journalism have been published and courses offered at journalism schools to teach students the new skills they need to craft news and feature stories for presentation on the Web. Increasingly, journalism students are exposed to the idea of "convergence"—the Web's capacity for combining print, sound and video in one globally accessible medium—and are taught how to tell stories using all three modes.

One thing most journalism textbooks have in common is the insistence that the Internet and the Web do not change the essential nature of journalism. Yes, the Internet frees journalists from the restrictions of old-media news cycles by enabling news to be printed or broadcast virtually as it happens. Yes, the Internet gives even a small-town journalist the potential to reach a global audience. But the ideals of journalism—truth, balance, diversity of opinion—remain in place. "First-class journalism, broadcast and communication schools inveigh against sloppy reporting, editing and producing, and try to instil in their students the need for accuracy, balance and fairness," writes Roland de Wolk in the recently published *Introduction to Online Journalism*. "These standards, so important to the profession, must be carried into the new medium as well" (xiv).

Back in the workplace, however, the situation is more complex. The Internet's rapid growth and its ability to merge pre-existing media naturally caught the attention of investors, including powerful mass media companies and other corporations. In the corporate world, the idea of convergence has come to mean a converging of assets, leading to a frenzy of mergers and acquisitions designed to build a strong, global capa-

bility in all media. The leader in the race to global corporate convergence is of course, America Online Time Warner, formed in January 2000 through the takeover by Internet service provider America Online of the traditional media giant Time Warner. The new company is a behemoth—its holdings include a massive fee-paying Internet audience of more than 30 million people, an Internet browser, proprietary software, film studios, music companies, television stations, cable operations, cable news broadcaster CNN and a bevy of magazines including *Time*, *Fortune*, *People* and *Sports Illustrated*. Other companies in the media, computer and Internet world are scrambling to catch up—the software giant Microsoft, the Internet portal Yahoo, global media companies like Bertelsmann and the News Corporation are all manoeuvring for competitive advantage in a converged media world. Later in 2000, the convergence race also hit Canada as newspaper, Internet, telecommunications and television assets were bought, merged and otherwise subsumed into the new companies CanWest Global and Bell Globemedia. All this activity has sparked a great deal of worried public discussion about whether we are in danger of surrendering freedoms to this new "MediaBorg," as *Salon* magazine put it in a recent series on media concentration.[7]

Many journalists are also troubled by the rise of these technology-driven media giants. For many news workers, convergence mergers have resulted in layoffs.[8] For others, convergence means being expected to prepare reports for multiple media. A print reporter, for example, can be expected not only to prepare a report for the next day's newspaper but also to file stories throughout the day to the employer's Web site and to prepare a report for the employer's television network. Journalism unions have complained that this is the journalistic equivalent of an assembly-line speed up and warned that these additional news packaging tasks will force reporters to spend less time investigating and researching stories and reduce their ability to talk to a wide range of sources.[9] Concerns have been expressed that many of these new media giants seem not to recognize the traditional journalism model of public service, seeing their journalistic units as just a profit centre like another part of the company. "The longstanding theory and purpose of journalism are being challenged today in ways not seen before," Kovach and Rosenstiel have warned. "Technology is shaping a new economic organization of information companies, which is subsuming journalism inside it. The threat is no longer simply from government censorship. The new danger is that independent journalism may be dissolved in the solvent of commercial communication and synergistic self-promotion" (18).

The Many-to-Many Challenge

Nevertheless, as a mass medium, the Internet is structurally very different from traditional "mass media" such as television, radio, newspapers and magazines. What gives traditional media its "mass" status is essentially the fact that it is delivered to large numbers of people. Traditional mass media is a "few-to-many" system, in which a relatively small group of professionals creates and packages a media product and delivers that product to a mass audience. Depending on the product, those professionals will include content creators such as actors, musicians, artists and journalists and packagers such as audio, film and video technicians and printers. The role of the user is typically limited to consuming the product. The Internet, on the other hand, is structurally a "many-to-many" system since any computer user is able to create and deliver content as well as consume it. It is a mass medium in which mass participation can take place at both ends of the delivery spectrum.

For some, this "many-to-many" quality has infused the Internet with an aura of almost revolutionary empowerment. In 1993, as the existence of the Internet was only just beginning to enter mass consciousness, writer Howard Rheingold proclaimed:

> The political significance of CMC (computer-mediated communication) lies in its capacity to challenge the existing political hierarchy's monopoly on powerful communications media, and perhaps thus revitalize citizen-based democracy. The way image-rich, sound-bite-based commercial media have co-opted political discourse among citizens is part of a political problem that communications technologies have posed for democracy for decades. The way the number of owners or telecommunications channels is narrowing to a tiny elite, which the reach and power of the media they own expand, is a converging threat to citizens. Which scenario seems more conducive to democracy, which to totalitarian rule: a world in which a few people control communications technology that can be used to manipulate the beliefs of billions, or a world in which every citizen can broadcast to every other citizen? (14)

You might think that journalists, committed as they are to the free dissemination of ideas, would enthusiastically embrace the freedom made possible by the Internet. Ironically, however, many mainstream journalists' first reaction to this idea was, to shamelessly borrow a phrase, one of fear and loathing. It didn't help that the best-known proponent of the

Internet's liberating possibilities for journalism was Matt Drudge, operator of the Web-based Drudge Report, who saucily mocked the U.S. journalistic establishment by proclaiming that because of the Internet "anyone with a computer and a modem can be a journalist." Drudge, of course, rocketed to international renown for fearlessly reporting scandals and gossip that mainstream media wouldn't. Drudge's most famous scoop came at the expense of a mainstream journalism publication when in 1998 he reported that *Newsweek* was holding a report by one of its top investigative reporters that U.S. president Bill Clinton had an affair with 21-year-old intern Monica Lewinsky and then illegally counselled her to lie about it while under oath. Of course, once Drudge had published the story, mainstream media outlets were quick to pick up the story and make it their own, leading to a period of scandal-mongering that longtime Washington columnist Sandy Grady called "the worst performance by the American press my eyes and ears witnessed since I began covering Washington in 1974."[10]

Journalism and the Internet

If journalism is defined by its ideals, then many of the stories published by Drudge and by mainstream publications won't qualify as good journalism. But in the end, that doesn't change the validity of Drudge's central point—the Internet brings the cost of publishing down to where it is within the reach of ordinary people. It turns Liebling's dictum about freedom of the press upside-down. The Internet makes it possible for a person of average means to own the digital equivalent of a printing press and to publish documents that have the potential to reach a massive audience. We saw evidence of this in the aftermath of the Sept. 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States. Several Internet users in the area of the World Trade Center, for example, turned their personal Web sites into running accounts of what they were seeing and hearing around them, some even posting digital photographs or videos of the carnage. According to the *Online Journalism Review*, an account published on the Web site of a hobby train enthusiast attracted 25,000 visitors. A 19-year-old student in Florida quickly put together a multimedia tribute site that attracted 2.6 million visitors within a few weeks. "The ease of publishing to the Web and the magnitude of the tragedy combined to create a surprising public eager to pore over every version of events and surprising number of witnesses able to provide it for them," wrote reporter Amy Langfield.[11]

This is an important development in the Web's evolution; while the ability to self-publish in the early days of the Web led to millions of personal pages devoted to subjects like family pets and family vacations,

more and more people are using the Web to weigh in on public issues. Drudge's idea that anyone with a computer and a modem can be a journalist has caught on to the point that Web-based self-publishing operations like Blogger now have hundreds of thousands of users whose readers no doubt number in the millions. Many of these Web-based personal publications are still little more than open diaries and are unlikely to ever appeal to an audience beyond the author's family and friends, but others have developed areas of specialty that do attract considerable interest. Many of these writers spend much of their time mining the Web to post annotated hyperlinks to sites with information they know will interest their like-minded readers. What's even more interesting is the fact that this hyperlink-driven writing, which has come to be called Weblogging, is beginning to attract the attention of journalists, who are using the format to communicate more directly with readers, adding information and reflections on the subjects they write about in their professional lives and often inviting readers to converse with them online. Prominent practitioners include Dan Gilmore, who writes about high-tech issues for the *San Jose Mercury News*, political commentator Mickey Kaus, and magazine editor Andrew Sullivan.[12] One of the most successful Webloggers is MediaNews author Jim Romenesko, who began publishing his daily report about the North American media business from his home in the mornings before going to work as a writer for the *St. Paul Pioneer Press*. Because of the thoroughness of his reports and his ability to get inside dope from other journalists, reading MediaNews regularly quickly became a habit for many North American journalists. In 1999, The Poynter Institute, a journalism think-tank and training facility, hired Romenesko and made MediaNews a primary component of its Web site, making Romenesko the first journalist to successfully transform this experiment in non-traditional news reporting into a salaried position.[13] While few journalistic Webloggers have been able to duplicate that feat, some are expanding their reputation beyond their original readership and building a direct relationship with readers. One sure sign that Weblogging is gaining mainstream status is that its style is being picked up and experimented with by some traditional publications, including the *Guardian* newspaper and the *Minneapolis Star-Tribune*.[14]

Journalists are using the Internet in other ways to forge more direct relationships with their readers. Some are doing it by creating their own Web sites. Others are participating in subject-based e-mail list servers. Some are creating their own e-mail lists. Declan McCullagh, for example, is a reporter who writes for the online publication CNET. His primary interest is the intersection of politics and computers, an interest

obviously shared by many of his readers. McCullagh has developed a Web site called Politech and also maintains an e-mail list of readers. He posts not only his own stories there but also communiqués from his readers, many of whom are themselves movers and shakers in the worlds of politics and high-technology. Indeed, McCullagh allows sources to post to the e-mail list to rebut material in his stories, keep readers informed of developments and sometimes to debate each other. That McCullagh respects his readers is clear—when he was subpoenaed to testify recently in a court case, he sent an emergency message to his list, seeking his readers' advice as to his rights in such a situation.[15] Interestingly, some major newscasters including the CBC's Peter Mansbridge and ABC's Peter Jennings have started compiling e-mail lists so they can transmit their daily ruminations about their upcoming newscast. In this case, e-mail is clearly being used as a marketing tool, but that doesn't detract from the fact that the process is also enabling these journalists to connect with their viewers in a direct and personal way outside of the restrictions of the newscast format.[16]

One can't help but wonder if what we're seeing here is an early version of a new kind of journalism, one that grows out of the Internet's potential to forge a direct relationship between journalists and readers, one that could free journalists to truly give their "first loyalty" to citizens. I don't want to exaggerate the impact of the Internet on the relationship between professional journalists and readers or its limitations. Few professional journalists have been able to emulate Jim Romenesko's success in turning independent Internet-based work into a significant source of revenue, let alone a full-time occupation. Canadian columnist Donna Laframboise, for example, made an interesting effort to continue writing her column online after being laid off by the *National Post* following the CanWest takeover. But her effort to raise more than $10,000 from visitors to her Web site did not succeed.[17] And as writer Tim Cavanaugh sarcastically noted in a recent piece about an upsurge of amateur Weblogs following Sept. 11: "For all the bitching they log about the mainstream media, none of the bloggers are actually cruising the streets of Peshawar or Aden or Mogadishu. Thus they're wholly dependent upon that very same mainstream media."[18] This comment could also be applied to many so-called "alternative" news sites on the Web. Sites such as Z-Net and AlterNet in the United States and Straight Goods and Rabble in Canada tend to publish more commentaries than news stories.[19]

Still, one doesn't have to look very far to find original reporting work on the Web. Some of that work directly challenges mainstream journalism, such as that produced by activist-oriented Indymedia sites.

Frustrated by how the anti-globalization movement was covered by mainstream media, activists launched the first Indymedia site at the 1999 anti-globalization protests at Seattle. The site adopted an open submissions policy, accepting contributions from anyone with information, observations and even video from the protest site. The Indymedia model is now a virtual no-cost franchise, with more than 60 centres scattered around the world operated by a loosely united group of "media activists."[20] Some other Web sites are experimenting with "open-source" or "collaborative" journalism, including Slashdot, Kuro5hin and Metafilter.[21] Other sites, such as those that collect and publicize consumer complaints about products and companies, or those that investigate and publish correctives about Internet hoaxes, may not be journalistic in any traditional sense, but they do provide an interesting glimpse into new ways the Web can be used to gather and publish public-interest information.[22] Along more traditional lines, many small Web sites have been created to cover news about specific industries or specific issues. Some have even been successful enough to attract the interest of mainstream media buyers. The Smoking Gun (purchased in 2000 by CourtTV), for example, specializes in investigative court reporting. A good many others, such as Newsbytes (purchased in 1997 by the *Washington Post*), cover high-tech issues. Some, such as the high-tech site C-Net, have themselves become Internet publishing powerhouses.[23] Alternative sites like AlterNet and Straight Goods are also making an effort to provide some original reporting: Straight Goods even had a correspondent in Afghanistan for a while, although after his arrest by the Taliban it was disclosed that he had no previous journalism experience.[24]

As anyone involved with Web publishing is quick to point out, it's a mistake to think one could launch a serious Web news publication without some capital investment—servers must be bought, software acquired, high-speed telecommunications lines leased and professional employees do insist on being paid. Indeed, the question of how to make money on the Web is dogging even mainstream organizations. (Alternative sites, like AlterNet, Straight Goods and Indymedia, depend heavily on donations and volunteers.) Nevertheless, the entry cost is far below the investment required to purchase a printing press and a building to house it, to say nothing of the costs associated with distributing a big slab of paper to people's doorsteps every day. Even the corporate world is beginning to realize that the Web is a very different medium from newspapers, magazines, television and radio. One widely quoted consultant's report recently warned the corporate sector that in order to maximize the profit potential of the Internet, companies must realize that the distribution-

control model that fuelled dominance in old media simply won't work on the Web. "New technology, by empowering consumers, will end media companies' control over distribution," concluded the report prepared by Forrester Research Inc. "Consumers will use guides to assemble media experiences, forcing media companies to refocus on content and audiences."[25]

It's a new medium and nobody really knows for sure how it will evolve. There can be no doubt, however, that the person sitting at the computer—a consumer and a citizen—appears to be the current beneficiary of this new content production and distribution model, the Internet. Never before have so many people had such a wide selection of information sources to choose from. Instead of having to make do with what they get from a local newspaper or broadcaster, anyone with Internet access can log on to a search site and query his way through as wide a range of information as he chooses. For example, after U.S. forces began bombing Afghanistan, there was a significant increase in the number of U.S. visitors to British newspaper and broadcast news sites, where they were able to read news reports purged of the patriotism that had crept into so much U.S. reporting.[26]

Connecting Citizens and Journalists

The Internet poses a great opportunity for journalists, not just because it offers the possibility of a wider range of employers or even because it may widen the possibilities for self-employment, but also because it can enable individual reporters and writers to develop a relationship with readers independent of the platform provided by any particular employing organization. Today, a beat reporter who works for a major daily newspaper may build a sterling reputation among readers for independent reporting and good writing. But if that reporter leaves her job—whether because of an economic downsizing, a disagreement with an employer or simply to work elsewhere—the reporter loses the readership she developed. The Internet makes it possible for the reporter to take her readers with her. Perhaps some reporters' reputations will be so high that employers will be clamouring for their services, bidding against each other to attract that reporter and the readers she brings. Recently we've seen this principle at work in the hiring and salary negotiations of certain television news program hosts—Paula Zahn, Connie Chung, Katie Couric and others. Is it possible the same dynamic could operate for Internet-based print reporters too? More importantly, if a reporter's presence were the key to bringing in a certain group of readers, would that journalist not also gain more power over the kinds of stories she wrote and the conditions under which they were produced? In their critiques

of journalism employers, Ureneck, Kovach and Rosenstiel all stress how vital it is to journalism that proprietors share the journalistic commitment to the welfare of the citizen.[27] They're right, of course. The unanswered question is: Who will persuade proprietors of that? Who but journalism's other master?

If what defines journalism is its ideals, and if journalists can persuade the public that good journalism has value, there is no reason that journalists shouldn't be able to use the Internet to form a stronger bond with the public, a bond that is independent of the journalist's relationship with any particular publication or employer. If a good journalist's first loyalty is to citizens, the Internet should provide journalists with the means to express that loyalty more fully and for citizens to demand it.

Notes

1 Lou Ureneck, "Newspapers Arrive at an Economic Crossroads," *Nieman Reports* Special issue (Summer 1999): 3. Ureneck's article provides an excellent description of the dismantling of the so-called wall between the newsroom and the business operations of North American newspapers.

2 *National Post* 19 Jan. 2002: Editorial page.

3 Agencies that gather Internet statistics differ somewhat in results. I have drawn from Nua, which compiles results from several sources <www.nua.ie/surveys/how_many_online>. Newspaper readership statistics are for 1997 as reported by the Newspaper Association of America <www.naa.org>.

4 Lyra Research, "Media Power Shift: The Consumer Takes Control in an Emerging Web-Driven Society," *Content Intelligence* 28 June 2001 <www.contentintelligence.com>.

5 Felicity Baranger, "Growing Audience is Turning In to Established News Media Online," *New York Times* 27 Aug. 2001 <www.nytimes.com>

6 For a good sampling of multimedia news presentations see Jonathon Dube's "Online Storytelling Forms" at the *CyberJournalist* Web site <www.cyberjournalist.net/storyforms.htm>.

7 Scott Rosenberg, "The Media Borg: Assimilating the Web," *Salon* 26 June 2001 www.salon.com/tech/feature/2001/06/26/locking_up_the_web>.

8 CanWest laid off about 130 people from the *National Post* in September 2001. AOL and its divisions, including CNN, have several times announced layoffs since the AOL merger with Time Warner.

9 "At present, journalists do not have the time and resources to accomplish their work in one media, let alone two or three. It is ludicrous to expect professional journalists to be covering complicated issues and wondering whether they are writing a 30-inch newspaper story or a 30-second news clip." A statement by Peter Murdoch, vice-president media for the Communications, Energy and Paperworkers Union of Canada, in a news release dated July 31, 2001.

10 Quoted in J. D. Lasica's "Internet Journalism and the Starr Investigation," a case study scheduled to be included in a textbook pending publication by the Columbia University Press. The case study can also be accessed at <www.well.com/~jd/starr.html> under the section entitled "The Sourcing Problem."

11 Amy Langfield, "Democratizing Journalism," *Online Journalism Review* 13 Nov. 2001.

12 J. D. Lasica, "Blogging as a Form of Journalism," *Online Journalism Review* 24 May 2001; "Weblogs: A New Source of News," *Online Journalism Review* 31 May 2001, and Alex Kuczynski's "Me-Zine Journalism for Fun and (Sometimes) Profit" *New York Times* 9 July 2001. To view examples of journalists' Weblogs go to: www.kausfiles.com, www.andrewsullivan.com and, for Dan Gillmor's Weblog: http://web.siliconvalley.com/content/sv/opinion/dgillmor/weblog/ The Blogger Web site is at www.blogger.com. One of the most interesting and informative Weblogs on journalism and the Web is Lasica's own "New Media Musings" at http://jd.manilasites.com.

13 Jim Benning, "Romenesko Revealed," *Online Journalism Review* 7 Feb. 2000. To access Romenesko's MediaNews, go to www.poynter.org and click on the MediaNews link.

14 The Guardian's Weblog can be found at www.guardian.co.uk/weblog; the Star-Tribune's Weblog is at http://www.startribune.com/weblog.

15 The Politech site can be found at www.politechbot.com. McCullagh sent the e-mail in the spring of 2001 when he was subpoenaed to testify in the trial of an Internet activist accused of stalking law enforcement authorities. Information on McCullagh's involvement in the trial can be found at www.mccullagh.org/subpoena.

16 Peter Mansbridge's "Nightly Note" can be found at www.cbc.ca/national/tonight/index.html.

For Jennings' go to abcnews.go.com/sections/wnt/WorldNewsTonight/peterjenningssubscribe.html.

17 Donna Laframboise's own account can be found at www.razberry.com/raz/post.htm.

18 Tim Cavanaugh, "Let Slip the Blogs of War," *Online Journalism Review* 17 Jan. 2002.

19 Access these sites as follows: Znet at www.zmag.org; AlterNet at www.alternet.org; Straight Goods at www.straightgoods.ca; Rabble at www.rabble.ca.

20 Theta Pavis, "Modern Day Muckrakers," *Online Journalism Review* 15 Jan. 2002.

21 URLs as follows: www.slashdot.org, www.kuro5hin.org, www.metafilter.com.

22 Consumer complaint sites include: www.ecomplaints.com, www.baddealings.com, www.thecomplaintstation.com, and www.plantefeedback.com. An example of an Internet hoax site is www.vmyths.com. An extensive listing of hoax sites can be found at www.internet-101.com/hoax.

23 URLs as follows: The Smoking Gun, www.thesmokinggun.com; NewsBytes www.newsbytes.com; and C-Net, www.cnet.com.

24 Ish Theilheimer, "Bravo, Ken Hechtman, Citizen Journalist," *Straight Goods*, 3 Dec. 2001.

25 Eric Scheirer, "Guides Redefine Mass Media," *The Forrester Report*, December 2001. Forrester's Web site is at www.forrester.com. A similar warning was issued by Lyra Research: "Exposure and experience with the Web is changing the media consumer's fundamental attitude toward and relationship with traditional 'push' media versus Web-based 'pull' media. Users are recognizing that the Internet reduces the gatekeeping power that traditional print and electronic publishers have exercised over key content access and delivery parameters such as what and how much content is delivered, when and in what format that content is delivered, and the placement and presence of advertising in the medium. Publishers in all media must recognize a fundamental shift in power toward the consumer and must learn to create a more attractive value position for their media as Web adoption and usage increases." Lyra Research, "Media Power Shift: The Consumer Takes Control in an Emerging Web-Driven Society," published in *Content Intelligence (www.contentintelligence.com)*, June 28, 2001.

26 Kim Campbell, "For the Scoop, More Americans Turn to the Brits," *Christian Science Monitor*, 15 Nov. 2001 <www.csmonitor.com> and Caryn James, "British Take a Blunter Approach to War News," *New York Times* 9 Nov. 2001 <www.nytimes.com>

27 "Those who hold the reins of the nation's newspapers should exercise civic responsibility and demonstrate to citizens their commitment to furthering the public good. This is, after all, the source of newspaper credibility and the primary asset that will ensure, as it has in the past, a prosperous future for newspapers." Lou Ureneck, "Newspapers at the Crossroads," *Nieman Reports*, Special issue (Summer 1999): 19.

Works Cited*

De Wolk, Roland. *Introduction to Online Journalism*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 2001.

Kovach, Bill and Tom Rosenstiel. *The Elements of Journalism*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2001.

Liebling, A.J. *The Press*. Revised ed. New York: Ballantine Books, 1964.

Rheingold, Howard. *The Virtual Community*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1993.

* For references to the numerous electronic works cited, please refer to the Notes section.