

# All about text

## Why online journalists seem reluctant to implement new media technology

Paper presented at the First European Communication Conference  
in Amsterdam, 24.-26. November 2005.

### Abstract

This paper claims that theories of media evolution provide research and analysis of online journalism with a necessary explanatory tool. The theory of *remediation*, as presented by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin, and Lav Manovich's *language of new media*, are explored and related to the development of online journalism. The paper argues that these theories - accompanied by social theory - establish a theoretical framework suited to explain and understand puzzles like why online journalism is mostly about presenting simple pieces of text as fast as possible.

Steen Steensen

Research fellow, Journalism Programme,

Faculty of Journalism, Library and Information Science, Oslo University College

## **Introduction**

Printed newspapers were supposed to die. Journalism as we knew it were supposed to be revolutionized, as technological assets of new media – hypertext, interactivity and multimedia – would work wonders on journalistic storytelling in online environments. These were the assumptions of many new media researchers and forth tellers interest in online journalism prior to the post 2000 dot.com recession (see for instance Deuze 2001; Engebretsen 2001; Harper 1998; Pavlik 1999).

To day, anyone familiar with online journalism would probably recognize these early assumptions as nothing but utopian prophesies from over-enthusiastic technological determinists. Findings in new research suggest that technological assets of new media - apart from the occasional weblog, video bit and even rarer Flash animation - for the broader part are ignored in online journalism (see for instance Domingo 2004; Matheson 2004; Schroeder 2004) or at least implemented at a much slower rate then earlier suggested (Boczkowski 2004). It seems that the output of online journalism is mostly about imparting «breaking news» as fast as possible, through old media linear text conservatism.

Does this mean that online journalism is nothing more than an additional channel for conventional media players to distribute their content? Could it even be argued that it is incorrect to consider online journalism as new media journalism?

In order to answer these questions and understand the development of online journalism, it is necessary to relate it to theories of new media. This paper investigates how the theory of *remediation* as understood by Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin (Bolter and Grusin 1999), and the new media theory developed by Lev Manovich (Manovich 2001) can be used to establish a theoretical framework by which the development of online journalism can be understood. It is further argued that this theoretical framework needs to be accompanied by social theory in order to fully understand the development of online journalism.

## **2. Is online journalism new media journalism?**

Before a theory of online journalism can be pursued, two questions must be asked: What is new media? Is online journalism new media journalism?

I will not engage in a deeper discussion on the properties of new media here, but merely adopt the understanding of the term offered by Lev Manovich. Manovich addresses the popular understanding of new media as a collective term for all digital media and claims that this understanding is insufficient:

[...] the popular understanding of new media identifies it with the use of a computer for distribution and exhibition rather than production. Accordingly, text distributed on a computer (Web sites and electronic books) are considered to be new media, whereas text distributed on paper are not. (Manovich 2001, p.19)

Digitalization, or numerical representation as Manovich labels it, is only one of five characteristics of new media, according to Manovich. The other four are:

*Modularity:* New media has a «fractal structure» (Ibid, p. 30). Each new media object is a collection of smaller objects. A picture is a collection of pixels, a movie is a collection of pictures. And each object can be modified, even when it is part of a larger object.

*Automation:* New media objects can be manipulated automatically, without the intervention of humans. The image editing program Photoshop can for example improve contrast and brightness range automatically, an even apply filters to render the image as for instance a pop art poster.

*Variability:* «Originality» is a difficult concept in new media. Every new media object can exist in numerous versions – it is not fixed once and for all.

*Transcoding:* A new media object consists of a cultural layer and a computer layer. A new media picture is recognized by humans as a cultural expression in line with all other pictures (digital or not). At the same time it is recognized by the computer by its file type, file size, type of compression etc.

How does this apply to online journalism? As pointed out by Ben Scott, one could question whether online journalism is new medium journalism, since most major players in online journalism both in US and Europe are conventional media players who treat the Internet merely as a new channel of distribution, complementing either print or broadcast as the main channel of distribution (Scott 2005). This discussion is however confused by the mix up of media and media operators. It is a conservative notion descending from the days of print and broadcast monogamy in the media business. Media operators today tend to play on more than

one horse. It's a mistake to dismiss the Internet as a new medium for journalism simply because players in old media are the key operators in this medium.

A quick comparison between a typical online journalism piece and the characteristics of new media objects as understood by Lev Manovich, leaves no doubt that online journalism must be considered new media journalism: A typical online journalism piece is *presented numerically*; it has a *modular* structure of both characters and pixels (if accompanied by a picture) which can be modified individually; it can be modified *automatically* (at least pictures – but also publishing systems at large can be seen as systems which automatically modifies pieces of journalism); it exists in numerous *variations*, at least if the piece consists of hyperlinks – then there are numerous ways to read the piece; and it is *transcoded*.

### **3. Remediation**

Since most operators of online journalism have strong affiliations with traditional media, it is necessary to establish an understanding of the relationship between old and new media upon which a theory of online journalism can be built.

Jay David Bolter and Richard Grusin present such an understanding. They apply a historical approach in their theory of new media. They claim that all new media arise and develop from old media. This was the case with photography, with film, with radio, with television and with all other media. And this is the case with new media such as the Internet.

Through out history, all new media have developed through the process of *remediation*, claim Bolter and Grusin. New media *remediate* old media, and old media is *remediated* by new media. This process of remediation follows one of two apparently opposite logics: *Immediacy* or *hypermediacy*.

The logic of *immediacy* indicates a content provider's desire to achieve media transparency, i.e. letting the user be occupied with what the medium communicates instead of the process of mediation. Using this logic, a content provider tries to put the viewer/reader in the same space as the object which is viewed/read about – hence trying to dissolve the medium. In new media, the most striking example of the logic of immediacy is virtual reality (VR). In VR, the computer interface is erased, collapsing time and distance between the user's actions and the response back to the user through the medium, thereby creating an illusion of reality. In fact, if the illusion is compromised, the medium fails.

*Hypermediacy* incorporates the opposite logic: Where the logic of immediacy seeks to erase the medium, the logic of hypermediacy seeks to enhance the medium. Using the logic of hypermediacy, a new media content provider would be occupied with the possibilities of new technology brought on by new media, thereby drawing attention to the medium and the process of mediation instead of what is being communicated through the medium. A web site using text, graphics, hyperlinks, photos, video and maybe an extravagant flash animation to communicate a simple message, would be a *hypermediated* web site, where the user's attention would be drawn to all the media possibilities in stead of the actual message. The medium itself becomes the message, to quote Marshal McLuhan.

The dichotomy of immediacy and hypermediacy equals the dichotomy of *content* and *form*<sup>1</sup>: Hypermediacy draws attention to form, immediacy to content. Immediacy is in the end the aim off all media, according to Bolter and Grusin – and then in its ultimate «form»: *transparent immediacy* (Ibid p 21-23). All media eventually strive to dissolve the process of mediation, making the user experience a fascination with content - as if it is not mediated – and not form, through which the content is mediated. And content is always the original and stronger motivator for consumers to be attracted to media engaged in journalistic communication.

Even though one would think otherwise; the two logics of remediation are mutually *dependent* on each other, claim Bolter and Grusin. This siamese feature of remediation mirrors our culture, they say: «*Our culture wants both to multiply its media and to erase all traces of mediation: ideally, it wants to erase its media in the very act of multiplying them*» (Ibid p 5), write Bolter and Grusin, before giving an example of this dual existence of hypermediacy and immediacy; the CNN web site:

The CNN site is hypermediated – arranging text, graphics and video in multiple panes and windows and joining them with numerous hyperlinks; yet the web site borrows its sense of immediacy from the televised CNN newscast. (Bolter and Grusin 1999, p. 99)

It is this very dual existence of hypermediacy and immediacy that constitute *remediation*. Bolter and Grusin show how this double logic of remediation has worked on the introduction of each new medium through out history. They even incorporate the very definition of a

---

<sup>1</sup> This is not a comparison Bolter and Grusin make.

medium in this process, when they simply define a medium as «*that which remediates*» (ibid, p. 65)

An example: Renaissance painters outlined their paintings on linear perspective in order to achieve as much immediacy as possible. Their goal were transparent immediacy: The more realistic a painting looked, the better the painting. But painters could never represent reality *exactly*: Hence the strive for transparent immediacy welcomed photography - a medium much better suited for exact representation of reality and therefore transparent immediacy. Upon the introduction of photography, much attention was drawn to the medium it self, hence breaking way for the logic of hypermediacy. But the hypermedia features of early photography did not disturb photography's potential to represent physical reality more immediate than paintings, so painters where doomed to seek immediacy in the *psychological* reality in stead: New schools of painting such as impressionism and expressionism can be seen as such attempts to seek immediacy through representations of emotions rather than objects. These schools of course played on hypermediacy upon introduction – the new techniques created disturbance among the audience, drawing attention to form rather then content.

And so the history of remediation goes on: Photography, like paintings, still had one obvious flaw: It could not represent movement. Hence the strive for transparent immediacy welcomed film. And this is how the logic of remediation works: A new medium arises in order to improve older media's ability to achieve transparent immediacy. But in order to achieve this higher level of immediacy, the new medium first must overcome an immediacy set back, so to speak, as the logic of hypermediacy takes control, making both users and producers fascinated with the new medium. Hence hypermediacy can be seen as an unwanted, but necessary feature of each new medium.

It's almost like the myth of Sisyphus: The history of media can be seen as a continuous strive to push consumer experience up the mountain of immediacy. But once nearly at the top, an even bigger mountain of immediacy is spotted and consumer experience falls back down in the valley of hypermediacy before the bigger mountain is challenged.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> This is not a allegory used by Bolter and Grusin

### 3.1 Remediation and World Wide Web

Bolter and Grusin show the logic of remediation at work in new media such as computer games, digital photography, digital art, television and the World Wide Web, claiming that:

New digital media are not external agents that come to disrupt an unsuspecting culture. They emerge from within cultural contexts, and they refashion other media, which are embedded in the same or similar contexts. (Ibid, p. 19)

Bolter and Grusin show how the World Wide Web started off as only remediating text and the old medium of the telegraph, through email communication, before graphical browsers made it possible to remediate other media. Soon software and plug in's were developed so that graphics, pictures, audio and moving images could be remediated in a web browser. And now, *«the ultimate ambition of the web designer seems to be to integrate and absorb all other media»*, write Bolter and Grusin (Ibid, p. 208). Unlike previous media, the World Wide Web not only has the capability to remediate *all other* media – it is its ultimate goal.

This specific feature of new media is recognized by Lev Manovich as not only an absorption on old media into new media. He sees it is a *transformation*: *«Media become new media»*, he writes, making the computer a media processor rather than a new medium itself (Manovich 2001, p. 25).

Remediation on the web can take a variety of different strategies, ranging from *radical* to *respectful* (Bolter and Grusin 1999, p 200). A respectful remediation absorbs another medium without altering the content. An example mentioned by Bolter and Grusin, is the Project Gutenberg<sup>3</sup>, which today is a website where more than 16.000 books are made available. The books are displayed exactly as in print, unaltered, hence respectfully remediating the book as a medium.

A radical remediation on the other hand, would be web-cameras, according to Bolter and Grusin. Web-cameras remediate broadcast television and monitoring video, but with much poorer quality. The claim of improvement lies not on quality, but on economics: It's much cheaper to monitor an event with a web-camera than with broadcast television, thus making monitoring of events a more private and hence much more varied act. Buildings, traffic and

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.gutenberg.org/>

even goldfishes<sup>4</sup> are being monitored through web cameras. Interactive features are also often added to the monitoring – a feature introduced by the Web.

Lack of quality is a feature common in most media remediated on the web. Television, video and even still photography, are commonly watched with lower resolution than in their original medium. Text is more difficult to read on screen than print, and so on. This makes the media experience less immediate, hence making hypermediacy the most common logic of remediation on the web.

But the strive to achieve transparent immediacy are at work online. As bandwidth increases, screen resolution improves and new software and browser plug ins are developed, quality improves, making the user experience more and more immediate. Still there is the apparent hypermediated effect of the web as an interface with many windows and frames, but as media-integrating software such as Macromedia Flash<sup>5</sup> get more and more common in use, use of different windows could be minimized, making the user experience even more transparent.

### **3.2 Remediation and the language of new media**

The theory of remediation undoubtedly provides a theoretical framework by which the development of online journalism can and should be understood in reliance to journalism in old media. But is this sufficient? Are there other features to new media which can not be understood by this evolutionistic approach?

Lev Manovich agree that new media objects (such as pieces of online journalism) must be understood in reliance to old media. But this perspective is not sufficient, he argues:

Comparing new media to print, photography, or television will never tell us the whole story. For although from one point of view new media is indeed another type of media, from another it is simply a particular type of computer data. [...] New media may look like media, but this is only the surface. (Manovich 2001, p 48)

Hence it is necessary to turn to computer science in order to understand the full logic of new media, argues Manovich, He then examines the concepts of «interface» and «database» as categories for new media theory.

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://www.kokosgoldfish.com/goldfishcam.html>

<sup>5</sup> Macromedia Flash is a software that allows a seamless integration of all media: text, pictures, video, audio, graphics and animations without craving much bandwidth.

### 3.2.1 Interface

Manovitch suggest that the dichotomy of *content* and *form* should be replaced by *content* and *interface* in new media (Ibid, p. 66). He defines web pages, CD-ROM titles, computer games, etc, as *cultural interfaces*, which is «*the way in which computers present and allow us to interact with cultural data.*» (Ibid, p. 70). He then investigates why these cultural interfaces look the way they do. «*In my view, the language of cultural interfaces is largely made up from other, already familiar cultural forms*», he writes (Ibid, p. 71)

This sounds quite similar to the theory of remediation, but where Bolter and Grusin see new media as the end station of a pure media evolution, Manovich applies a cultural dimension to the understanding of new media. Cultural forms such as cinema and the printed word are refashioned (or remediated) in the cultural interface of new media. And among these earlier cultural forms, text play the most important role in computer culture, argues Manovich:

On the one hand, it [text] is one media type among others. But, on the other hand, it is a metalanguage of computer media, a code in which all other media are represented: coordinates of 3-D objects, pixel values of digital images, the formatting of a page in HTML. (Ibid, p 74)

Not only does text have this defining role in the core of computer culture, it has also functioned as the prime model in constructing cultural interfaces of new media:

In 1984, Apple introduced a graphical user interface that presented information in overlapping windows stacked behind one another – essentially, a set of book pages. [...] a traditional page was redefined as a virtual page. [...] By the mid-1990s, Web pages included a variety of media types – but they were still essentially traditional pages. Different media elements – graphics, photographs, digital video, sound and 3-D worlds – were embedded within rectangular surfaces containing text. To this extent, a typical Web page was conceptually similar to a newspaper page, which is also dominated by text, with photographs, drawings, tables, and graphs embedded in between, along with other links to other pages of the newspaper. (Ibid, p. 74f)

Viewed in this light, the critique of online journalism as being to occupied with text must be revised. Such a critique takes for granted that text is *not* an essential property of new media interfaces – which according to Manovich would be a misunderstanding.

Today, cinema is taking over as the prime cultural form defining the cultural interface of new media, argue Manovich. Computer users and designers of today favor cinematic language over the language of print, simply because they have grown up in a media environment

dominated by television. The mobile camera and computer games are examples of the cinematic influence on the cultural interfaces of new media, according to Manovich. To stick with text as the main feature of online journalism in the future, would therefore be a mistake.

### 3.2.2 Database

*Selecting* and *compositing* are two basic operations in all new media, according to Manovich. These operations mirror the database structure, where choosing values from numerous predefined menus and presenting the result is the core activity.

The operation of selecting is fundamental in new media because of its ability to connect to content:

The World Wide Web [...] encourages the creation of texts that consist entirely of pointers to other texts that are already on the web. One does not have to add any original writing, it is enough to select from what already exist. Put differently, now anybody can become a creator by simply providing a new menu, that is, by making a new selection from the total corpus available. (Ibid, p 127)

Reflecting on the role of the DJ, Manovich recognises the operation of selection as a creative process, hence minimizing the classical perception of originality in content being the only source of originality and therefore creativity.

The operation of selecting is not new to new media, argue Manovich. But it is an operation made more important by new media technology. «*What before involved scissors and glue now involves simply clicking on 'cut' and 'paste'*» (Ibid, p 130)

Selecting is not enough in order to create new media objects, according to Manovich. The selection of content must also be composed together in order to constitute a seamless totality. Hence compositing is the second fundamental operation of new media.

Manovich compares the two operations of selection and composition to postmodernism:

Together, these two operations simultaneously reflect and enable the postmodern practice of pastiche and quotation. They work in tandem: One operation is used to select elements and styles from the “database of culture”; another is used to assemble them into new objects, Thus, along with selection, compositing is the key operation of postmodern, or computer-based, authorship: (Ibid, p 141f)

Reflecting the deconstructionist's disbelief in holism, the new media compositing techniques of the postmodernist 1980s emphasized boundaries between the selected elements, making each element well defined. Modern, computer-based, compositing techniques however tend to blend elements together and erase boundaries between them – for example when using software such as Macromedia Flash.

This development mirrors the two different logics of remediation: hypermediacy and immediacy. The logic of hypermediacy will typically emphasize boundaries between elements, hence drawing attention to the process of mediation. The logic of immediacy will seek to erase the boundaries, making the composed object seem as whole and unmediated as possible.

Related to online journalism, it is clear that Manovich's description of how the database structure defines new media - making selecting and compositing key operations - alters the view of online journalism. Online journalism is often described as cut and paste journalism – a description often accompanied by an underlying understanding of this as being poor journalism. Instead – following Manovich's chain of thought - cut and paste journalism should be seen as creative construction of news encouraged by new media.

### **3.3 Remediation and social theory**

Both Manovich and Bolter & Grusin belong to a tradition of technological determinism dating back to the days of Marshal McLuhan in the 1960s. This tradition is rightfully being criticized for forgetting the human factor. It seems as though Manovich, Bolter & Grusin consider the evolution of media as an automated process driven forward by the strive for transparent immediacy. It is almost as if they forget the ones operating media: People. People act upon motives. People run businesses. People are not overruled by the kind of technological determinism preached by Bolter and Grusin.

The CNN example cited from Bolter and Grusin above rises an interesting question which Bolter and Grusin never ask, let alone answer: *Why* do the CNN web site «*borrow its sense of immediacy*» from its parent organization; the TV station CNN? The theory of remediation fails to answer this question, because media are not remediated into new media only because of their imperfection when it comes to achieving transparent immediacy. The media evolution

is controlled by media operators and players; new technology developers; and consumer demands and habits.

Consumer habits can for instance compromise media evolution as theorized by Bolter and Grusin. Take the example of the tape recorder/cassette player: Why hasn't it ceased to exist? Other audio players and recorders have by far improved the quality of sound representation, hence reaching a higher level of transparent immediacy. And the possibility for the tape recorder/cassette player to remediate it self to a different kind of immediacy has proved non existence. According to the deterministic logic established by the theory of remediation, there should no longer be use for the cassette player/tape recorder. It should vanish from all homes, and defiantly from all drawing boards, assembly lines and marketing campaigns of consumer electronics companies. But it hasn't.

Why is the cassette player/tape recorder still around? The most immediate answer seems to be because of consumer habits. People have become used to them, attached to them. And consumer habits are not easily turned. In fact, consumer habits imply an emotional and even irrational dimension to the evolution of media. And consumer habits are not the only factor compromising the deterministic feature of the theory of remediation.

Consider the culture of work places and personnel resources in media companies. Since new media often derive from old media companies – especially today – such factors play an important role when content is transformed and shaped in new media. Take for instance the CNN example once again: Why *do* the CNN web site borrow its sense of immediacy from the TV station CNN? Is it coincidental? Is it because of the web designers' lack of creativity? Is it a deliberate business strategy?

The most probable answer is perhaps this: They borrow the TV station's sense of immediacy simply because that's what they know. That's what they're used to. The staff of CNN online might have worked at the TV station earlier, they might be used to certain ways of dealing with things. They are part of a CNN culture. Hence they establish a sense of immediacy (not deliberate) the only way they know how to.

Besides, it is the only logical way for CNN to establish immediacy. CNN is a strong brand with a strong position among media consumers. By borrowing immediacy from the TV station, consumers automatically transfer what they associate with the TV station to the online

edition of CNN. Hence borrowing immediacy means borrowing journalistic integrity and trustworthiness.

To understand the impact of *the human factor* on the development of online journalism, it is necessary to turn to social theory and the view of news production as acts of social construction. There is a long tradition in social science to view news production as construction rather than selection, thereby drawing attention to the role of the journalist, the interaction among journalists, among journalists and their sources, journalists and the organisation within which they work and journalists and the market which their news organisation is part of.

Michael Schudson outlines three different approaches to the sociology of news production: The political economy of news; the social organization of newswork; and culturological approaches (Schudson 1992). Since the production of online journalism for a broader part is conducted from within already established news institutions, the organization of the online newswork and how it might differ from organization of newswork in other media within the same institution is of great importance when trying to understand how online journalism is produced.

How does the role of the journalist change in online newsrooms compared to traditional media newsrooms - how is it *remediated* into online newsrooms? How do practices and routines in the online newsroom affect the news production? And how do the background and interests of online journalists affect the news production?

To answer these questions, it is necessary to establish a theoretical understanding of both the role of the journalist and practices and routines within which online journalism is produced. Rune Ottosen uses Erving Goffman's understanding of *the role* as a fruitful startingpoint to understand the development of the role of the journalist in Norwegian press history (Ottosen 2004). A *role*, according to Goffman as understood by Ottosen, develops through time as part of the actions performed by a person in line with the normative demands directed towards the level of status that person has (Ibid, p. 16). In other words: A role is *both* a position within a social institution defined by a pattern of duties and rights developed through time, *and* something which is influenced by expectations brought on by the society outside the social institution in question.

This means that the role of the journalist in an online newsroom is a dynamic feature depending on three different modelling elements:

1. Duties and rights established by other journalists through time in traditional media.
2. Actions performed by the journalists seen in reliance to the duties and rights already established.
3. The public's expectations to the journalist.

All these fields must be studied in order to understand the development of the role of the online journalist, and thereby online journalism itself.

To study actions performed by the journalist in reliance to the duties and rights established by the profession, the classical sociological dichotomy of *structure* and *agency* must be included in the theoretical approach. Anthony Giddens' theory of structuration is useful in that respect. Giddens gives priority to neither structure nor agency, but states that the structure of a social institution is constantly reproduced and changed by the actions performed by the members of that institution, because the structure exists not as a separate entity but as part of the agency, and vice versa (Kaspersen 2001)

In an online newsroom, the structure consists of rules, routines, values, duties and rights established both by the profession of journalism through time, and by the organisation itself and its members. But, according to Giddens, the structure is not an underlying principle upon which action is performed. The structure is manifested through the actions of the journalists when they produce news, at the same time as the actions are limited by the very same structure. Hence the structure provides both opportunities and limitations for actions. This duality of structuration is what Giddens labels *social practice* (Ibid, p. 52).

The local structure of an online newsroom is in other words totally dependent on how the journalists of that newsroom act. Hence it would be wrong to say that the structure of for instance the online edition of CNN is inherited from the parent organisation through the process of remediation. New technology and different staff require and establish new production routines, thus changing the structure and reshaping rules and values, duties and rights – which in its turn might establish new routines for action and therefore a different understanding of what news production is.

Studying this constant process of structuration is in other words important to understand the development of online journalism. It provides a human touch to the theory of remediation.

## **Conclusion**

I have in this paper outlined the theory of remediation and related it to online journalism, supplemented it with some concepts borrowed from Lev Manovitch's language of new media, and showed how social theory also must be applied in order to create a suitable theoretical framework when conducting research on the development of online journalism.

Traditionally scholars limit their theoretical framework to social theory when approaching newsrooms. When studying online newsrooms, such a limitation often results in failure to understand and incorporate new media aspects suited to explain and conceptualize social actions and structures. It is my claim that the theory of remediation - as I have outlined and modified it - makes in essence three such aspects visible:

1. The theory of remediation provides a rationale for why producers of online journalism are reluctant to implement new media technology. Such reluctance promotes immediacy and thereby lets the online news producers inherit journalistic integrity and trustworthiness from traditional media players. Reluctance to implement new media technology is in other words a sensible business strategy for online newspapers.
2. It is a common critique of online journalism producers that they produce too much text and too little multimedia content. This critique is based on a misunderstanding of what the essential properties of new media are. The basic feature of new media interfaces has until now not been multimedia, but text.
3. The notion of online journalism being cut and paste journalism is based on a misunderstanding that this is poor journalism produced only because of time pressure and scarce resources. But cut and paste journalism could be viewed as a creative way of constructing news, mirroring the basic operations in all new media: selecting and compositing. In other words: Cut and paste journalism might be the future of online journalism, not a temporary set back due to economic limitations and time pressure.

These aspects show that a theoretical approach based on a balanced evolutionistic new media theory, provides a study of online journalism with a fruitful framework well suited to produce both hypothesis preceding a study and explanatory tools in a post study analysis.

## Reference List

- Boczkowski, Pablo J (2004): *Digitizing the News: Innovation in Online Newspapers*.  
Cambridge, MA, USA: The MIT Press
- Bolter, J. David and Richard Grusin (1999): *Remediation Understanding New Media*.  
Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Deuze, M. (2001). *Understanding the Impact of the Internet: On New Media Professionalism, Mindsets and Buzzwords*. Ejournalist 1[1],  
<http://www.ejournalism.au.com/ejournalist/deuze.pdf>
- Domingo, David (2004): *Comparing Professional Routines and Values in Online Newsrooms: a Reflection From a Case Study*. Paper for the Media Production Analysis Working Group, IAMCR Conference, Porto Alegre.
- Engebretsen, Martin (2001): *Nyheten Som Hypertekst: Tekstuelle Aspekter Ved Møtet Mellom En Gammel Sjanger Og Ny Teknologi*. Kristiansand: IJ-forlaget.
- Harper, Christopher (1998): *And That's the Way It Will Be: News and Information in a Digital World*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kaspersen, Lars Bo (2001): *Anthony Giddens Introduksjon Til En Samfunnskritiker*.  
København: Hans Reitzels Forlag.
- Manovich, Lev (2001): *The Language of New Media*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Matheson, D (2004): *Weblogs and the epistemology of the news: some trends in online journalism* New Media & Society 6.4, pages 443-68.
- Ottosen, Rune (2004): *I Journalistikkens Grenseland - Journalistrollen Mellom Marked Og Idealer*. Kristiansand: IJ-forlaget.

Pavlik, John (1999): *Journalism and New Media*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Schroeder, Roland (2004): *Online Review*, Journalism Studies 5, 4, pages 563-70.

Schudson, Michael (1992): *The Sociology of News Production Revisited* Ed. James Curran and Michael Gurevitch. London: Edward Arnold, pages 141-59.

Scott, Ben (2005): *A Contemporary History of Digital Journalism* Television and New Media 6, 1, pages 89-123.