Article

Mediatised Participation: Citizen Journalism and the Decline in User-Generated Content in Online News Media

Simón Peña-Fernández *, Ainara Larrondo-Ureta and Irati Agirreazkuenaga

Department of Journalism, University of the Basque Country (UPV/EHU), 48940 Leioa, Basque Country, Spain; ainara.larrondo@ehu.eus (A.L.-U.); irati.agirreazkuenaga@ehu.eus (I.A.)
* Correspondence: simon.pena@ehu.eus

Abstract: The second generation of web tools shook the journalist profession approximately two decades ago with the proactive incorporation of audiences into the media. Citizen journalism and user-generated content arose as an object of interest due to the democratising value of participation attributed to them, with empowered citizens who could emulate the professional and institutional practises of journalists. However, difficulties soon came to the surface, and audience participation in news media began to be limited. Within this context, this article conducts a critical review of studies on audience participation in news media based on a systematic literature review. The results indicate that, in general, audiences showed low interest in the creation of informative content and that their participation has grown increasingly problematic. In addition, journalists are reticent as they defend their professional role above all else, while company strategies have prioritised making participation profitable. For this reason, the idea of citizen journalism that offers user-created content through the media appears to be a thing of the past, with many characteristics that could define it as a failed innovation. Therefore, the text concludes that audience participation in the media could be defined as mediatised participation.

1. Introduction

In the changing professional landscape of journalism, new social actors coexist with established, organisational and institutional actors that produce, share, and distribute news in an increasingly complex hybrid media system (Chadwick 2013; Belair-Gagnon et al. 2019).

Thus, the second generation of web tools (commonly known as web 2.0) shook the journalist profession approximately two decades ago with the proactive incorporation of audiences into journalism. Initial approaches (Bowman and Willis 2003; Gilmor 2004) were frequently formulated as veritable news utopias (Mosco 2004) that defended the democratising value of participation, with empowered citizens who could emulate the institutional and professional practises of journalists (Boccia-Artieri 2012) and who would create messages capable of competing with those created by the news media in their day-to-day lives (Rodriguez 2001; Atton 2001). Since then, citizen journalism and audience participation in the media has been a recurring subject of study (Domingo et al. 2008; Paulussen and Ugille 2008; Allan and Thorsen 2009; Borger et al. 2013; Peña-Fernández et al. 2019).

During these initial turn-of-the-century years, fascination with participatory journalism and the reversal of roles in the news model was partially due to economic and credibility issues affecting the media (Deuze et al. 2007). This was not merely a technological shift; rather, it was a new cultural phenomenon that redefined traditional news spaces in an area where the limits became more and more blurred (Lewis 2012). In a digital economy in which the distribution and consumption of goods and services are increasingly based on cooperative relations (Ramella and Manzo 2020), the future is opening towards interactive and connective news production, where users and media would coexist, collaborate, and also compete, in the shared task of building reality (Deuze 2009).

The initial enthusiastic approaches, which argued that these innovations would inevitably and automatically cause social change, were largely driven by idealism and technological determinism (Larrondo-Ureta et al. 2023). However, it must be remembered that all innovations, in order to be considered successful, require not only achieving a technical advance but also social appropriation of them, that is, that citizens use them naturally in their lives (Peña-Fernández et al. 2019).

Indeed, it was this social appropriation where audience participation and citizen journalism ran aground. While the idea of participation as a driving force of democracy understood that institutions were adaptable and that audiences could mobilise if given the opportunity (Deuze et al. 2007), almost from the very beginning, we could verify that the news media was ill-predisposed to cede control of the editorial process to audiences and that these audiences also displayed a limited desire to participate in the news-creation process (Hermida and Thurman 2008; Singer et al. 2011; Hermans et al. 2014).

In recent years, this initial optimism has been cut short. The most usual trend in studies on participation leans towards problematisation (Quandt 2018), the distrust it creates amongst media professionals, and the sales focuses of news companies.

Within this context, this article conducts a critical review of studies on audience participation in news media based on a systematic literature review. The objective is to define this audience incorporation and the limits found based on the analysis of the three main actors in the process: the audiences themselves; the professionals; and the news companies.

2. Materials and Methods

To draw up this article, we conducted a systematic literature review (Grant and Booth 2009; Codina 2020a) based on the concepts of "citizen journalism" and "participatory journalism", as well as other similar definitions (journalism 2.0, open-source journalism, etc.). As a time range, the period spanning from 2000 until 2022 was chosen. The search encompassed main academic databases (Web of Science, Scopus) and was completed with consultations in the Google Scholar, EBSCO, and ProQuest search engines.

After the systematic search, the results obtained both from quantitative data (number of references obtained) and from qualitative data (topics addressed in abstracts and keywords) were categorised, following the indications of the panoramic review technique or scoping review with PRISMA (Codina 2020b).

As Tricco et al. (2018) explain, scoping reviews are a type of knowledge synthesis that follows a systematic approach to map evidence on a topic and identify main concepts, theories, sources, and knowledge gaps. Likewise, these types of reviews are useful to evaluate the characteristics, variety, and volume of research on a topic and allow us to summarise findings from a diverse range of studies that may vary in methods or disciplines (Tricco et al. 2018).

Following the mentioned search criteria, the first sample was composed of 972 documents. After applying the criteria of adequacy to the topic, time range, type of text (article or book chapter) and language, the reviewed selection consisted of 437 documents. Finally, for the selection of the final sample, empirical studies and research with the greatest academic impact were prioritised. This text synthesises the contributions of 125 of these texts.

3. Results

3.1. Participation and Interaction

In the beginning, the attention drawn by participation in the media was closely linked to its conception as an intrinsically democratic tool. This concept was used in a highly diverse fashion, although Carpentier (2016); Carpentier et al. (2019) identifies two main trends into which these definitions can be grouped: one with a more inclusive nature and more sociological profile, where participation is understood as any of the methods of social interaction; and another that is more selective and nearer political studies, where participation is understood as a way of sharing power.

If we extend these two meanings, we understand that, in the broadest definition, participation is the equivalent of interaction, meaning all the ways in which the audience can interact with the media and its content, from content selection to participation in a survey or sharing information. The broadest definitions of citizen journalism (Goode 2009; García-De-Torres 2010) lean towards this definition. However, if we view participation as a balance in the shared exercise of power, it would be limited to productive interactivity (Rost 2006), meaning the audiences' capacity to create content and actively participate in the news-creation process in the media (Deuze 2006; Robinson and Wang 2018).

Unlike other forms of civic participation, the creation of this type of content would be understood as participation in the media and not participation through the media (Carpentier 2011; Ahva 2017), which would imply a purpose other than news creation. There would be a differentiation between the technology that allows users to control and personalise content and the platforms that allow citizens to create and distribute content in the public discourse or integrated structural participation (Peters and Witschge 2014).

In other words, participation could be understood as the most advanced way to interact with the media, where audiences take on roles usually reserved for journalists, while not all forms of interaction could be considered participation.

3.2. Audiences' Lack of Interest and Problematic Participation

Although more limited than today, studies on participation in the media have a long history (Mendiguren-Galdospin and Canga-Larequi 2017; Marzal-Felici et al. 2021). When audiences were empowered, this was the beginning of a new stage, when they began offering users channels by means of which to make their voices heard.

However, it soon became clear that one of the main obstacles to the development of citizen journalism was that, in general, audiences displayed very little interest in the creation of news content (Lowrey and Anderson 2005; Chung 2008; Karlsson et al. 2015). Those who showed interest were driven by the individual defence of certain ideas so that they would reach the public sphere or by dissatisfaction with traditional news media and the ideas that they defended (Larsson 2014).

Notwithstanding, in global terms, the silence of audiences in creating news content has been deafening (Milioni et al. 2012; Masip 2015). Even though the media generally offered little space to create news content (Meso-Ayerdi et al. 2014; Pantic 2018), even in spaces where they were given a place, very few of these contents ended up prospering or enjoying noteworthy coverage (Scott et al. 2015). Citizens were more interested in creating content related to popular culture or their daily lives than journalistic content of general interest (Jönsson and Örnebring 2011; Xiang 2019).

Along with a lack of motivation, there was also a lack of professional resources held by those who created this content. Concern over the weak content created by the users (Meso-Ayerdi 2013) includes their limited access to information sources (Reich 2008) and the absence of professional training (Kus et al. 2017). These issues can lead to them incorrectly reproducing professional routines, which calls into question their authority and credibility (Springer et al. 2015; Krajewski and Ekdale 2017). All this soon led to the understanding that citizen journalism was not going to replace the work of the media's news work but rather would occupy a secondary role (Neuberger and Nuernbergk 2010; Lacy et al. 2010; Franquet et al. 2011).

Having thus abandoned news-creation activity in the media, the main source of participation moved to news comment sections. However, experiences in this area were often not positive, either. On the one hand, existing studies show that participation in these spaces lacks deliberation (Ruiz et al. 2011; Rowe 2015; Castellano-Parra et al. 2020; Engelke 2020) and, as acknowledged by the users themselves, on many occasions, it does not meet ideals for democratic participation and is rather more linked to entertainment (Springer et al. 2015). This all leads to doubts regarding its public-sphere nature (Almgren and Olsson 2016; Manosevitch and Tenenboim 2017; Suárez-Villegas 2017).

Yet, perhaps the most dissuasive aspect and the one that has received the most attention in the recent literature is the audiences' problematic relation with the most negative ways of participation, which concerns both users (Eberwein 2019) and the media (Frischlich et al. 2019). The rules that had characterised audience participation before the Internet (identity, relevance, brevity, authority, entertainment, and civility) gave way to others, such as anonymity, confrontation, and ultra-brevity (Pastor-Pérez 2012), opening the door to uncivil discourse, hate speech (Erjavec and Kovačič 2012; Coe et al. 2014; Harlow 2015; Su et al. 2018), and all other kinds of excesses under the cloak of anonymity (Santana 2014).

Risks are not limited to a lack of civility but can also be found in media comment sections, with disinformation campaigns or attempts to influence public opinion (Braun and Eklund 2019). This has led the media to focus part of their work on controlling these comments (Wintterlin et al. 2020), given that the disrepute they generate has an impact on corporate credibility and how they drive political action (Ardèvol-Abreu et al. 2018).

As a result, many media outlets have reduced their participation sections or have entirely closed them, diverting audience participation to social media, which has become the most usual way to interact with news media content (Almgren and Olsson 2016).

However, not all aspects are negative. Citizen journalists have demonstrated initiative in tracking down their own stories, offering first-person testimonies or testimonies based on their own experiences (Reich 2008), and they help to enrich the public sphere by offering coverage of alternative issues, events, and points of view (Nah and Yamamoto 2019). In this regard, they have certainly helped to raise visibility for ordinary citizens in the media's eyes since they are not limited to the use of habitual sources (Neuberger and Nuernbergk 2010; De Keyser and Raeymaeckers 2012).

Moreover, citizen journalism has made valuable contributions to events of great social impact (Mano and Milton 2016; Konow-Lund and Olsson 2017), showing its ability to offer information in real time directly from the place where events are happening (Hänska-Ahy and Shapour 2013; Hung 2013; Barranquero-Carretero and Meda-González 2015; Moyo 2015; Mpofu 2016; Odabaş and Reynolds-Stenson 2018). For this reason, we might consider that audiences may perform "acts of journalism" (Holt and Karlsson 2014) in a complementary way to the work carried out by the news media.

3.3. Distrust of Journalists and Defence of Organisational Culture

Since the beginning, journalists have viewed citizen journalism with scepticism (Singer et al. 2011) and considered it something peripheral, which in no case was comparable to their own work (Vos and Ferrucci 2018). Contributing to this mistrust was that some of these users considered that their work was opposite to that of news media, which posed a relationship in terms of confrontation (Quandt 2018).

As time passed, some of these positions have softened, and many journalists recognise the interest in user-generated content for their daily work (Suárez-Villegas 2017). Although, in general, they still do not consider this work to be journalism, they have been abandoning adversarial positions and have begun to better value the contributions made by users (Chua and Duffy 2019).

For newsroom professionals, the essence of journalism work has not changed. Journalists have a strong professional identity, which is based on belonging to self-regulating organisations whose common objective is the production of primary information (Andersson and Wiik 2013; Örnebring 2013; Vos and Ferrucci 2018). They also perceive that their main commitment is to public service (Deuze 2005), which implies, among many other professional traits, respecting plurality, verifying information, being truthful or separating facts and opinions (Suárez-Villegas 2017). And although the deliberation strategy looked attractive because we understand that the media are spaces for public discussion, professionals perceive the time devoted to interacting with audiences as a deviation from the main activity they must carry out (Lawrence et al. 2018).

Although citizen journalism and user-generated content did not question the professional identity of the journalists (Heise et al. 2014), their emergence has reinforced it (Carlsson and Nilsson 2016).

This shared position of defending organisational culture has left little room for citizen journalism or creative participation. Neither did it contribute to improving the perception of audience contributions that the tools provided to them were, in addition to other uses, a source of harassment and hectoring against journalists (Erjavec and Kovačič 2013; Gardiner 2018).

Journalists think that user-generated content needs to be reviewed by professionals to avoid bias or manipulation (Örnebring 2013). In fact, the most usual resource is to use them as representatives of the "common people," with no regard for their specialisation, knowledge, or experience (Hermans et al. 2014). Citizens are also interested in raising new topics, although there tends to be a limited number of participants, which creates fragility (Wiard and Simonson 2019).

In contrast with citizen journalists, the majority of whom have no training in this field (Kus et al. 2017), journalists defend their profession tooth and nail, which requires, in addition to professional background, a set of skills and an institutional structure (Quandt 2018).

Journalists adduce that one of the reasons limiting audience participation is that their workload prevents them from achieving truly valuable collaborations on user-generated content. Reviewing comments is also a low priority, although they openly acknowledge that they follow social media more (Pérez-Díaz et al. 2020). Some authors have identified this lack of reciprocity from journalists as precisely one of the reasons that audiences are demotivated (Lewis et al. 2014). Even though all journalists consider dialogue enriching (Suárez-Villegas 2017), the media has conditioned how these contents are produced, their context, and even the topics (Holt and Karlsson 2011).

Journalists also do not particularly appreciate the value of users' contributions in controlling the editorial content of the media. Driven by the defence of their autonomy and their social role (Pérez-Díaz et al. 2020), mistake correction buttons or user contributions to creating and revising news pieces are two of the lowest-rated options by professionals (Ramon et al. 2020), although significantly greater with young journalists.

3.4. Making Participation Profitable

For news companies, adding participation has led to new tension between the two classic newsroom discourses, meaning between the journalists' professional ideal and the company's corporate efficacy and the profitability of the business model (Andersson and Wiik 2013).

Within the context of this classic duality between quality and profitability, media managers have perceived user-generated content as a way to increase the number of visits to capture their attention for longer and garner greater loyalty to the publication and, in some cases, also reduce production costs (Vujnovic et al. 2010; Manosevitch and Tenenboim 2017). As Franck (2019) summarises, media exchange information and entertainment for attention, which is, in turn, monetised via advertising. Managers also understand that opening up the door to participation can lead to reinforcement of the organisation's cultural capital (Hellmueller and Li 2015).

As such, since the beginning, a large portion of the draw of participation for news companies was their cost-saving aspect, given that audiences willing to create content for free were added (Domingo et al. 2008). Generalising participation spaces (there were plenty of them but very limited in nature and potential) had much more to do with economic reasons than the original spirit of promoting spaces for deliberation to broaden democratic freedoms (Singer et al. 2011; Masip and Suau 2014). As such, comment sections, surveys, forums and, in general, all spaces where audiences could share their content rapidly spread (Hermida and Thurman 2008), although, like with other innovations in the sector, the professional and corporate imperative was to occupy space in the new media, without excess concern for how this objective was achieved.

The difficulty in managing user-generated content (Domingo 2011), partially in its most negative aspect, far from providing cheap labour, made clear that audience participation required a much greater amount of technical and human resources to help filter content (Lawrence et al. 2018). Participation spaces needed to be redefined, moderation needed to be increased, new tools needed to be implemented (including machine learning), and they began attempting to identify users through platform logins.

In summary, the difficulties involved in managing participation and controlling user-generated content and the resistance to sharing editorial responsibility have led the media to gradually limit their spaces for participation (Masip et al. 2019). At the same time, the unstoppable emergence of social networks naturally transferred user-generated content and audience participation to them, while the media have preferred to opt for content distribution (Westlund 2013; Hille and Bakker 2013; Peña-Fernández et al. 2016; Larrondo-Ureta et al. 2023).

This was most certainly one of the main transformations in how news media conceived audience participation. Several longitudinal studies on how media professionals perceive the contribution that their audiences might make indicate that they have gone from perceiving them as potential content co-creators to mainly considering them as re-distributors of information (Krumsvik 2018). This shift in focus on relations between players in the news process has led to a reduced number of media participation spaces and an increase in practises to draw audience attention and how to make this attention profitable (Myllylahti 2020).

The strategy of diverting participation towards social media has the advantage that it is a complementary channel for traffic and income that does not question the legitimacy of the journalist profession (Vos and Ferrucci 2018). Thus, the news media can maintain their role as a primary source of news, newsrooms maintain editorial control over the content they create, and audiences later help to raise visibility for this news, re-distributing it and interacting with it once published, which contributes to strengthening a business model that guarantees the social role of the media (Krumsvik 2018). But at the same time, this practice also delves into the antagonism between media corporations and Internet platforms to the extent that it contributes to the overproduction of content and greater relevance of the platforms' intermediation work. This has undermined the traditional business and production model of journalism and the logic of concentration and control of production (Siapera 2013).

It is at this point that we find one of the subtle paradoxes of audience influence on news media content. Although the possibility of directly creating news in the media has flagged, the capacity to share the news and guide professional journalist routines towards more commercial, profit-oriented perspectives, has increased (Belair-Gagnon and Holton 2018).

Banking on social media, therefore, is not harmless, as it fully involves the news media in the fight for audience attention (Myllylahti 2020). Web analytics companies do not consider journalist criteria but rather indirectly promote standards and values oriented towards obtaining profits by introducing the visibility or success rates of newsrooms amongst users in said newsrooms' routine values (Belair-Gagnon and Holton 2018). In the last instance, this all flames the debate on how this attention economy jeopardises the public sphere and the very operation of democracy (Hindman 2018).

4. Conclusions and Discussion

The emergence of online news media, especially beginning with Web 2.0, empowered audiences as voices in parallel to the news media to create their own content through easy-to-use, low-cost tools. In some cases, this developed news utopias where people spoke of "journalism without journalists".

The promises of citizen journalism and audience participation in creating news in the media soon came up against three important limitations that stunted their development. On the one hand, the audience's lack of interest in creating news content in a sustained manner, despite the ability they have shown to make relevant and valuable contributions

to events of great social impact (disasters, mass events, etc.). Likewise, the media have had difficulties in managing their audiences' oftentimes problematic participation. The redefinition of the traditional norms with which audiences had contributed until then in the media, in particular, anonymity or the volume of participation, has increased the risk of incivility and the spread of information disorders.

In addition, corporate zeal, journalists' defence of their organisational culture, and a corporate approach based on securing audience loyalty and economic profitability (closely related to plummeting advertising income and the downfall of structures that the media had on similar channels) were far from the original idea of fomenting a deliberative culture and distributing power in democratic societies.

Even though there is no doubt that citizen journalism and participation have redeemed the central role of audiences in the news process (Picone et al. 2015) and have also sparked a greater degree of participation and interactivity (Jönsson and Örnebring 2011), they do not participate in the channels created in the media (Suau et al. 2019). Neither have journalists been able to create routines and spaces for interaction with audiences in the media themselves, while companies have focused on seeking out new ways to sell their products without giving up editorial control (Usher 2014).

Due to all the aforementioned, the idea of citizen journalism offering user-generated content through the media outlets themselves now appears to be a thing of the past (Quandt 2018) and bears many of the features defining failed innovation, given that citizen journalism currently occurs on the periphery of traditional news media (Wall 2019).

However, giving up on co-creation spaces does not mean that audiences have lost their capacity to influence the content that the media create. Paradoxically, through social media, where their role as news re-distributors has granted audiences a gatekeeping role after publication (Hermida 2020), their influence has directly conditioned the content that the media create based on their success on social media. Users are advocates who redefine the hierarchy of news that was previously selected by journalists, deciding which news is worth sharing and which is not (Masip 2015).

Redirecting participation towards social media seeks to maximise media audience, impact, and revenue. Citizen journalism, or the co-creation of news content, has been diluted in favour of SEO techniques or the quasi-exclusive conception of participation, as opinions conducted on channels that prioritise audience loyalty and provide access to new audiences through channels have never before been considered incidental consumption of information (Boczkowski et al. 2018). In the classic dispute between newsroom and corporate values, audience participation appears to shift the scale towards the latter (Andersson and Wiik 2013).

As such, the result of empowering audiences who are active in the media is largely mediatised participation, leaning towards greater audience interaction with media content. The struggle to draw their interest in a highly competitive setting constitutes a new method of participation (indirect and "ex-post", although as influential) that once again places the old controversy between public interest and the interest of the public at the heart of the debate. For this reason, it is important that news companies continue to establish collaboration channels amongst all players who participate in the process (Eldridge 2018) so they can continue innovating (Westlund et al. 2021).

This study bears certain limitations. Since it exclusively considers how citizens participate in the media, it does not address how this citizen journalism has moved to social media (Ritonga and Syahputra 2019) or community or alternative media that have arisen in parallel with traditional media, oftentimes much smaller in size and focused on defending specific interests (Harcup 2011; Meadows 2013).

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

Ahva, Laura. 2017. How Is Participation Practiced by "In-Betweeners" of Journalism? *Journalism Practice* 11: 142–59. [CrossRef]

Allan, Stuart, and Einar Thorsen. 2009. *Citizen Journalism: Global Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.

Almgren, Susanne M., and Tobias Olsson. 2016. Commenting, sharing and tweeting news: Measuring online news participation. *Nordicom Review* 37: 67–81. [CrossRef]

Andersson, Ulrika, and Jenny Wiik. 2013. Journalism Meets Management. *Journalism Practice* 7: 705–19. [CrossRef]

Ardèvol-Abreu, Alberto, Catherine M. Hooker, and Homero Gil de Zúñiga. 2018. Online news creation, trust in the media, and political participation: Direct and moderating effects over time. *Journalism* 19: 611–31. [CrossRef]

Atton, Chris. 2001. *Alternative Media*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Barranquero-Carretero, Alejandro, and Miriam Meda-González. 2015. Community and alternative media in the citizeńs protest cycle since the 15M-movement. *Athenea Digital* 15: 139–70. [CrossRef]

Belair-Gagnon, Valerie, and Avery E. Holton. 2018. Boundary Work, Interloper Media, and Analytics In Newsrooms. *Digital Journalism* 6: 492–508. [CrossRef]

Belair-Gagnon, Valerie, Avery E. Holton, and Oscar Westlund. 2019. Space for the liminal. *Media and Communication* 7: 1–7. [CrossRef]

Boccia-Artieri, Giovanni. 2012. Productive Publics and Transmedia Participation. *Journal of Audience & Reception Studies* 9: 448–68.

Boczkowski, Pablo J., Eugenia Mitchelstein, and Mora Matassi. 2018. "News comes across when I'm in a moment of leisure": Understanding the practices of incidental news consumption on social media. *New Media & Society* 20: 3523–39. [CrossRef]

Borger, Merel, Anita Van-Hoof, Irene Costera-Meijer, and José Sanders. 2013. Constructing participatory journalism as a scholarly object: A genealogical analysis. *Digital Journalism* 1: 117–34. [CrossRef]

Bowman, Shayne, and Chris Willis. 2003. *We, Media. How Audiences Are Shaping the Future of News and Information*. Reston: The Media Center at the American Press Institute.

Braun, Joshua A., and Jessica L. Eklund. 2019. Fake News, Real Money: Ad Tech Platforms, Profit-Driven Hoaxes, and the Business of Journalism. *Digital Journalism* 7: 1–21. [CrossRef]

Carlsson, Eric, and Bo Nilsson. 2016. Technologies of participation: Community news and social media in Northern Sweden. *Journalism* 17: 1113–28. [CrossRef]

Carpentier, Nico. 2011. *Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-Democratic Struggle*. Bristol: Intellect.

Carpentier, Nico. 2016. Beyond the ladder of participation: An analytical toolkit for the critical analysis of participatory media processes. *Javnost—The Public* 23: 70–88. [CrossRef]

Carpentier, Nico, Ana Duarte Melo, and Fábio Ribeiro. 2019. Rescuing participation: A critique on the dark participation concept. *Comunicação e Sociedade* 36: 17–35. [CrossRef]

Castellano-Parra, Orge, Koldobika Meso-Ayerdi, and Simón Peña-Fernández. 2020. Behind the Comments Section: The Ethics of Digital Native News Discussions. *Media and Communication* 8: 86–97. [CrossRef]

Chadwick, Aandrew. 2013. *Hybrid Media System: Politics and Power*. New York: Oxford Studies in Digital Politics. [CrossRef]

Chua, Sherwin, and Andrew Duffy. 2019. Friend, foe or frenemy? Traditional journalism actors' changing attitudes towards peripheral players and their innovations. *Media and Communication* 7: 112–22. [CrossRef]

Chung, Deborah S. 2008. Interactive features of online newspapers: Identifying patterns and predicting use of engaged readers. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 13: 658–79. [CrossRef]

Codina, Lluís. 2020a. Cómo hacer revisiones bibliográficas tradicionales o sistemáticas utilizando bases de datos académicas. *Revista ORL* 11: 139–53. [CrossRef]

Codina, Lluís. 2020b. Revisiones bibliográficas sistematizadas en Ciencias Humanas y Sociales. 1: Fundamentos. *Methodos, Anuario de Métodos de Investigación en Comunicación Social* 1: 50–60. [CrossRef]

Coe, Kevin, Kate Kenski, and Stephen A. Rains. 2014. Online and uncivil? Patterns and determinants of incivility in newspaper website comments. *Journal of Communication* 64: 658–79. [CrossRef]

De Keyser, Jeroen, and Karin Raeymaeckers. 2012. The printed rise of the common man: How Web 2.0 has changed the representation of ordinary people in newspapers. *Journalism Studies* 13: 825–35. [CrossRef]

Deuze, Mark. 2005. What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism* 6: 442–64. [CrossRef]

Deuze, Mark. 2006. Collaboration, participation and the media. *New Media & Society* 8: 691–98.

Deuze, Mark. 2009. Media Industries, Work and Life. *European Journal of Communication* 24: 467–80. [CrossRef]

Deuze, Mark, Axel Bruns, and Christoph Neuberger. 2007. Preparing for an age of participatory news. *Journalism Practice* 1: 322–38. [CrossRef]

Domingo, David. 2011. Managing Audience Participation: Practices, Workflows and Strategies. In *Participatory Journalism: Guarding Open Gates at Online Newspapers*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 76–95. [CrossRef]

Domingo, David, Thorsten Quandt, Ari Heinonen, Steve Paulussen, Jane B. Singer, and Marina Vujnovic. 2008. Participatory journalism practices in the media and beyond: An international comparative study of initiatives in online newspapers. *Journalism Practice* 2: 326–42. [CrossRef]

Eberwein, Tobias. 2019. "Trolls" or "warriors of faith"? Differentiating dysfunctional forms of media criticism in online comments. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society* 18: 131–43. [CrossRef]

Eldridge, Scott. 2018. *Online Journalism from the Periphery: Interloper Media and the Journalistic Field*. London and Boca Raton: Routledge & CRC Press.

Engelke, Katherine M. 2020. Enriching the Conversation: Audience Perspectives on the Deliberative Nature and Potential of User Comments for News Media. *Digital Journalism* 8: 447–66. [CrossRef]

Erjavec, Karmen, and Melita Poler Kovačič. 2012. "You don't under-stand, this is a new war!" Analysis of hate speech in news web sites' comments. *Mass Communication and Society* 15: 899–920. [CrossRef]

Erjavec, Karmen, and Melita Poler Kovačič. 2013. Abuse of online participatory Journalism in Slovenia: Offensive comments under News Items. *Medijska Istrazivanja* 19: 55–73.

Franck, Georg. 2019. The economy of attention. *Journal of Sociology* 55: 8–19. [CrossRef]

Franquet, Rosa, María Isabel Villa, and Ignacio Bergillos. 2011. Audience participation in online news websites: A comparative analysis. *Observatorio (OBS*)* 5: 223–42.

Frischlich, Lena, Svenja Boberg, and Thorsten Quandt. 2019. Comment Sections as Targets of Dark Participation? Journalists' Evaluation and Moderation of Deviant User Comments. *Journalism Studies* 20: 2014–33. [CrossRef]

García-De-Torres, Eelvira. 2010. User generated content: A state of the situation. *Profesional de La Información* 19: 585–94. [CrossRef]

Gardiner, Becky. 2018. "It's a terrible way to go to work:" what 70 million readers' comments on the Guardian revealed about hostility to women and minorities online. *Feminist Media Studies* 18: 592–608. [CrossRef]

Gilmor, Dan. 2004. *We, the Media. Grassroots Journalism by the People, for the People*. Sebastopol: O'Reilly Media.

Goode, Luke. 2009. Social News, Citizen Journalism and Democracy. *New Media and Society* 11: 1287–305. [CrossRef]

Grant, Maria J., and Andrew Booth. 2009. A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal* 26: 91–108. [CrossRef]

Hänska-Ahy, Maximilian T., and Roxanna Shapour. 2013. Who's reporting the protests? Converging practices of citizen journalists and two BBC World Service newsrooms, from Iran's election protests to the Arab uprisings. *Journalism Studies* 14: 29–45. [CrossRef]

Harcup, Tony. 2011. Alternative journalism as active citizenship. *Journalism* 12: 15–31. [CrossRef]

Harlow, Summer. 2015. Story-chatterers stirring up hate: Racist discourse in reader comments on US newspaper websites. *Howard Journal of Communications* 26: 21–42. [CrossRef]

Heise, Nele, Wiebke Loosen, Julius Reimer, and Jan-Hinrik Schmidt. 2014. Including the Audience: Comparing the attitudes and expectations of journalists and users towards participation in German TV news journalism. *Journalism Studies* 15: 411–30. [CrossRef]

Hellmueller, Lea, and You Li. 2015. Contest over content: A longitudinal study of the CNN iReport effect on the journalistic field. *Journalism Practice* 9: 617–33. [CrossRef]

Hermans, Liesbeth, Gabi Schaap, and Jo Bardoel. 2014. Re-establishing the relationship with the public: Regional journalism and citizens' involvement in the news. *Journalism Studies* 15: 642–54. [CrossRef]

Hermida, Alfred. 2020. Post-Publication Gatekeeping: The Interplay of Publics, Platforms, Paraphernalia, and Practices in the Circulation of News. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 97: 469–91. [CrossRef]

Hermida, Alfred, and Neil Thurman. 2008. A clash of cultures, The integration of user-generated content within professional journalistic frameworks at British newspaper websites. *Journalism Practice* 2: 343–56. [CrossRef]

Hille, Sanne, and Piet Bakker. 2013. I like news. Searching for the 'Holy Grail' of social media: The use of Facebook by Dutch news media and their audiences. *European Journal of Communication* 28: 663–80. [CrossRef]

Hindman, Matthew. 2018. *The Internet Trap: How the Digital Economy Builds Monopolies and Undermines Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. [CrossRef]

Holt, Kristoffer, and Michael Karlsson. 2011. Edited participation comparing editorial influence on traditional and participatory online newspapers in Sweden. *Javnost* 18: 19–35. [CrossRef]

Holt, Kristoffer, and Michael Karlsson. 2014. 'Random acts of journalism?' How citizen journalists tell the news in Sweden. *New Media & Society* 17: 1795–810. [CrossRef]

Hung, Chin-Fu. 2013. Citizen journalism and cyberactivism in China's anti-PX plant in Xiamen, 2007–2009. *China: An International Journal* 11: 40–54. [CrossRef]

Jönsson, Anna Maria, and Henrik Örnebring. 2011. User-generated content and the news: Empowerment of citizens or interactive illusion? *Journalism Practice* 5: 127–44. [CrossRef]

Karlsson, Michael, Annika Bergström, Christer Clerwall, and Karin Fast. 2015. Participatory journalism—The (r)evolution that wasn't. Content and user behavior in Sweden 2007–2013. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 20: 295–311. [CrossRef]

Konow-Lund, Maria, and Eva-Karin Olsson. 2017. Social Media's Challenge to Journalistic Norms and Values during a Terror Attack. *Digital Journalism* 5: 1192–204. [CrossRef]

Krajewski, Joanna M. T., and Brian Ekdale. 2017. Constructing Cholera: CNN iReport, the Haitian cholera epidemic, and the limits of citizen journalism. *Journalism Practice* 11: 229–46. [CrossRef]

Krumsvik, Arne H. 2018. Redefining User Involvement in Digital News Media. *Journalism Practice* 12: 19–31. [CrossRef]

Kus, Michal, Tobias Eberwein, Colin Porlezza, and Sergio Splendore. 2017. Training or Improvisation? Citizen journalists and their educational backgrounds—A comparative view. *Journalism Practice* 11: 355–72. [CrossRef]

Lacy, Stephen, Margaret Duffy, Daniel Riffe, Esther Thorson, and Ken Fleming. 2010. Citizen journalism websites complement newspapers. *Newspaper Research Journal* 31: 34–46. [CrossRef]

Larrondo-Ureta, Ainara, Simón Peña-Fernández, and Helle Sjøvaag. 2023. Repositioning Journalism Within the Current Technological Context: Approaches from the Practice and Epistemology of the Profession. In *Blurring Boundaries of Journalism in Digital Media*. Berlin: Springer, pp. 25–38. [CrossRef]

Larsson, Sofia. 2014. Battling mainstream media, commentators and organized debaters: Experiences from citizens' online opinion writing in Sweden. *Nordicom Review* 35: 77–89. [CrossRef]

Lawrence, Regina G., Damian Radcliffe, and Thomas R. Schmidt. 2018. Practicing Engagement: Participatory journalism in the Web 2.0 era. *Journalism Practice* 12: 1220–40. [CrossRef]

Lewis, Seth C. 2012. The Tension Between Professional Control and Open Participation. Information. *Communication & Society* 15: 836–66. [CrossRef]

Lewis, Seth C., Avery E. Holton, and Mark Coddington. 2014. Reciprocal Journalism. *Journalism Practice* 8: 229–41. [CrossRef]

Lowrey, Wilson, and William Anderson. 2005. The Journalist behind the Curtain: Participatory Functions on the Internet and their Impact on Perceptions of the Work of Journalism. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 10: JCMC1035. [CrossRef]

Mano, Winston, and Viola C. Milton. 2016. Citizen Journalism and the Ebola Outbreak in Africa. In *Participatory Politics and Citizen Journalism in a Networked Africa*. Edited by Bruce Mutsvairo. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, pp. 244–61. [CrossRef]

Manosevitch, Idit, and Ori Tenenboim. 2017. The Multifaceted Role of User-Generated Content in News Websites: An analytical framework. *Digital Journalism* 5: 731–52. [CrossRef]

Marzal-Felici, Javier, María Soler-Campillo, and Carlos López-Olano. 2021. Participación ciudadana y medios de comunicación públicos. Resultados de focus groups a académicos, profesionales y expertos en dinamización social. *Quaderns del CAC* 46: 13–23.

Masip, Pere. 2015. Hegemonía periodística y audiencias (in)activas. *Anuario ThinkEPI* 9: 177–81. [CrossRef]

Masip, Pere, and Jaume Suau. 2014. Active audiences and participation models in Spanish media. *Hipertext.net* 12. [CrossRef]

Masip, Pere, Carlos Ruiz-Caballero, and Jaume Suau. 2019. Active audiences and social discussion on the digital public sphere. Review article. *Profesional de la Información* 28: e280204. [CrossRef]

Meadows, Michael. 2013. Putting the citizen back into journalism. *Journalism* 14: 43–60. [CrossRef]

Mendiguren-Galdospin, Terese, and Jesús Canga-Larequi. 2017. Primeras iniciativas participativas de los lectores en la prensa española. Análisis hemerográfico de los siglos XIX y XX. *Ámbitos: Revista Internacional de Comunicación* 38: 1–17.

Meso-Ayerdi, Koldobika. 2013. Periodismo y audiencias: Inquietudes sobre los contenidos generados por los usuarios. *Cuadernos.Info* 33: 63–73. [CrossRef]

Meso-Ayerdi, Koldobika, Ainara Larrondo-Ureta, Simón Peña-Fernández, and Diana Rivero-Santamarina. 2014. Audiencias activas en el ecosistema móvil. Análisis de las opciones de interacción de los usuarios en los cibermedios españoles a través de la web, los teléfonos móviles y las tabletas. *Hipertext.net* 12. [CrossRef]

Milioni, Dimitra L., Konstantinos Vadratsikas, and Venetia Papa. 2012. Their two cents worth': Exploring user agency in readers comments in online news media. *Observatorio* 6: 21–47. [CrossRef]

Mosco, Vincent. 2004. *The Digital Sublime: Myth, Power, and Cyberspace*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Moyo, Last. 2015. Digital age as ethical maze: Citizen journalism ethics during crises in Zimbabwe and South Africa. *African Journalism Studies* 36: 125–44. [CrossRef]

Mpofu, Shepherd. 2016. Participation, citizen journalism and the contestations of identity and national symbols: A case of Zimbabwe's national heroes and the Heroes' Acre. *African Journalism Studies* 37: 85–106. [CrossRef]

Myllylahti, Merja. 2020. Paying Attention to Attention: A Conceptual Framework for Studying News Reader Revenue Models Related to Platforms. *Digital Journalism* 8: 567–75. [CrossRef]

Nah, Seungahn, and Masahiro Yamamoto. 2019. Communication and citizenship revisited: Theorizing communication and citizen journalism practice as civic participation. *Communication Theory* 29: 24–45. [CrossRef]

Neuberger, Christoph, and Christian Nuernbergk. 2010. Competition, complementarity or integration? The relationship between professional and participatory media. *Journalism Practice* 4: 319–32. [CrossRef]

Odabaş, Meltem, and Heidi Reynolds-Stenson. 2018. Tweeting from Gezi Park: Social Media and Repression Backfire. *Social Currents* 5: 386–406. [CrossRef]

Örnebring, Henrik. 2013. Anything you can do, I can do better? Professional journalists on citizen journalism in six European countries. *International Communication Gazette* 75: 35–53. [CrossRef]

Pantic, Mirjana. 2018. Participatory spaces in online media: Half-opening the gates to users. *Newspaper Research Journal* 39: 389–97. [CrossRef]

Pastor-Pérez, Lluís. 2012. The new rules of audience participation in digital media. Analysis of seven European newspapers. *Estudios Sobre El Mensaje Periodistico* 18: 193–210. [CrossRef]

Paulussen, Steve, and Pieter Ugille. 2008. User Generated Content in the Newsroom: Professional and Organisational Constraints on Participatory Journalism. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture* 5: 24–41. [CrossRef]

Peña-Fernández, Simón, Iñaki Lazkano-Arrillaga, and Ainara Larrondo-Ureta. 2019. Medios de comunicación e innovación social. El auge de las audiencias activas en el ecosistema digital. *Andamios* 16: 351–72. [CrossRef]

Peña-Fernández, Simón, Iñaki Lazkano-Arrillaga, and Daniel García-González. 2016. European newspapers' digital transition: New products and new audiences. *Comunicar* 46: 27–36. [CrossRef]

Pérez-Díaz, Pedro Luis, Enrique Arroyas-Langa, and Rocío Zamora-Medina. 2020. La construcción de la agenda de los cibermedios. Estudio comparativo con las preferencias temáticas de lectores y usuarios de Twitter. *Revista Latina* 75: 225–44. [CrossRef]

Peters, Chris, and Tamara Witschge. 2014. From grand narratives of democracy to small expectations of participation. *Journalism Practice* 9: 19–34. [CrossRef]

Picone, Ike, Cédric Courtois, and Steve Paulussen. 2015. When news is everywhere: Understanding participation, cross-mediality and mobility in journalism from a radical user perspective. *Journalism Practice* 9: 35–49. [CrossRef]

Quandt, Thorsten. 2018. Dark Participation. *Media and Communication* 6: 36–48. [CrossRef]

Ramella, Francesco, and Cecilia Manzo. 2020. *The Economy of Collaboration. The New Digital Platforms of Production and Consumption*. London: Routledge.

Ramon, Xavier, Marcel Mauri-Ríos, and Jesús Díaz-Campo. 2020. In-house media accountability instruments: Spanish journalists' and citizens' perceptions. *Revista de Comunicación* 19: 221–41. [CrossRef]

Reich, Zvi. 2008. How citizens create news stories. *Journalism Studies* 9: 739–58. [CrossRef]

Ritonga, Rajab, and Iswandi Syahputra. 2019. Citizen journalism and public participation in the Era of New Media in Indonesia: From street to tweet. *Media and Communication* 7: 79–90. [CrossRef]

Robinson, Sue, and Yidong Wang. 2018. Networked news participation: Future pathways. *Media and Communication* 6: 91–102. [CrossRef]

Rodriguez, Clemencia. 2001. *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizens' Media*. Cresskill: Hampton.

Rost, Alejandro. 2006. La interactividad en el Periódico Digital. Doctoral dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, Spain.

Rowe, Ian. 2015. Deliberation 2.0: Comparing the deliberative quality of online news user comments across platforms. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 59: 539–55. [CrossRef]

Ruiz, Carlos, David Domingo, Josep Lluís Micó, Javier Diaz-Noci, Koldobika Meso, and Pere Masip. 2011. Public sphere 2.0? The democratic qualities of citizen debates in online newspapers. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 16: 463–87. [CrossRef]

Santana, Arthur D. 2014. Virtuous or vitriolic: The effect of anonymity on civility in online newspaper readercomment boards. *Journalism Practice* 8: 18–33. [CrossRef]

Scott, Jonathan, David Millard, and Pauline Leonard. 2015. Citizen Participation in News: An analysis of the landscape of online journalism. *Digital Journalism* 3: 737–58. [CrossRef]

Siapera, Eugenia. 2013. Platform infomediation and journalism. *Culture Machine* 14: 28.

Singer, Jane B., David Domingo, Ari Heinonen, Alfred Hermida, Steve Paulussen, Thorsten Quandt, Zvi Reich, and Marina Vujnovic. 2011. *Participatory Journalism: Guarding Open Gates at Online Newspapers*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Springer, Nina, Ines Engelmann, and Christian Pfaffinger. 2015. User comments: Motives and inhibitors to write and read. *Information, Communication & Society* 18: 798–815. [CrossRef]

Su, Leona Yi-Fan, Michael A. Xenos, Kathleen M. Rose, Christopher Wirz, Dietram A. Scheufele, and Dominique Brossard. 2018. Uncivil and personal? Comparing patterns of incivility in comments on the Facebook pages of news outlets. *New Media & Society* 20: 3678–99. [CrossRef]

Suárez-Villegas, Juan Carlos. 2017. Citizen Journalism. Analysis of opinions of journalists from Spain, Italy and Belgium. *Convergencia* 24: 91–111. [CrossRef]

Suau, Jaume, Pere Masip, and Carlos Ruiz. 2019. Missing the Big Wave: Citizens' Discourses Against the Participatory Formats Adopted by News Media. *Journalism Practice* 13: 1316–32. [CrossRef]

Tricco, Andrea C., Erin Lillie, Wasifa Zarin, Kelly K O'Brien, Heather Colquhoun, Danielle Levac, David Moher, Micah D. J. Peters, Tanya Horsley, Laura Weeks, and et al. 2018. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 169: 467–73. [CrossRef] [PubMed]

Usher, Nikki. 2014. *Making News at the New York Times*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Vos, Tim P., and Patrick Ferrucci. 2018. Who am I? Perceptions of Digital Journalists' Professional Identity. In *The Routledge Handbook of Developments in Digital Journalism Studies*. Edited by Scott A. Eldridg and Bob Franklin. London: Routledge, pp. 40–52. [CrossRef]

Vujnovic, Marina, Jane B. Singer, Steve Paulussen, Ari Heinonen, Zvi Reich, Thorsten Quandt, Alfred Hermida, and David Domingo. 2010. Exploring the political-economic factors of participatory journalism: Views of online journalists in 10 countries. *Journalism Practice* 4: 285–96. [CrossRef]

Wall, Melissa. 2019. *Citizen Journalism: Practices, Propaganda, Pedagogy*. London: Routledge.

Westlund, Oscar. 2013. Mobile News. *Digital Journalism* 1: 6–26. [CrossRef]

Westlund, Oscar, Arne H. Krumsvik, and Seth C. Lewis. 2021. Competition, Change, and Coordination and Collaboration: Tracing News Executives' Perceptions About Participation in Media Innovation. *Journalism Studies* 22: 1–21. [CrossRef]

Wiard, Victor, and Mathieu Simonson. 2019. 'The city is ours, so let's talk about it': Constructing a citizen media initiative in Brussels. *Journalism* 20: 617–31. [CrossRef]

Wintterlin, Florian, Tim Schatto-Eckrodt, Lena Frischlich, Svenja Boberg, and Thorsten Quandt. 2020. How to Cope with Dark Participation: Moderation Practices in German Newsrooms. *Digital Journalism* 8: 904–24. [CrossRef]

Xiang, Yu. 2019. User-generated news: Netizen journalism in China in the age of short video. *Global Media and China* 4: 52–71. [CrossRef]