

Facebook usage among Norwegian journalists during the workflow



Sophio Rusishvili

Master's thesis

In

Nordic Media

Department of Media and Communication

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

Spring 2015

© Author: Sophio Rusishvili

Date: May 30, 2015

Facebook usage among Norwegian journalists during the workflow

Sophio Rusishvili

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Print: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

Since the launching of Facebook in 2004 it became one of the most prevailing online social networking applications in most countries. Norway is no exception to this. SNSs are mingling the boundaries between the public and private life, leisure and work time. This study focuses on the ways Norwegian journalists apply Facebook during the workflow. The research, based on 12 interviews, discovered the main motives behind employing this social network on a regular workday. The results indicate that the participants employ Facebook in a wide range of manners. Accordingly, this research argues to what extent use of this SNS affects their media publications.

The most significant findings underscore how Facebook usage during the workflow affects the reliability and impartiality of the respondents' media outlets. The research uncovered that utilization of Facebook content without revision of the latter leads to negative effects on the respondents' publications. Additionally, findings shed light on in what way their engagement in Facebook discussions can impact on the impartiality of their media outlets. Also, the interviewees' Facebook employment as an arena to reveal their own attitudes towards certain issues was highlighted. In addition, this thesis displayed which personality traits of the participants influence on Facebook utilization, and whether separation of private/public life on this SNS matters or not.

Preface

Starting writing a master's thesis is an inception of a turbulent everyday life. This is an intensive and time-consuming process which at the beginning seems to be eternal. This endeavor is challenging your ways of thinking and organizing even tiny details in your "out of school" life. Under the procession of this project no one decision has been made without having master thesis in my mind. This is the process of an emotional instability caused by "ups" and "downs" and "should" and "shouldn't-s". Immersing in the academic literature and the empirical data simultaneously traps you and it occasionally follows you in your dreams. And the question: was it worth for everything these? - The very sincere answer: Yes, indeed! Why? Because when I look at this paper I see sleepless myself with turned blue eyes and pale face; though most importantly, I see myself grown academically and satisfied. This is the biggest task I have ever attempted to handle with.

So, my special thanks go to:

- Charles Melvin Ess for continually being helpful and encouraging me; the best supervisor I could ever have! (Autumn 2014, Spring 2015)
- Those 12 participants who contributed to this study!
- Lasha Aladashvili for being special in every moment of my life!
- My family for their emotional and financial support, and for standing my endless complaints!
- My close friends, especially Tamta Shkubuliani, for having faith in me, and for trying to make me joyful!
- My fellow students for being available when needed!

Thank you so much for everything!

Sophio Rusishvili

May 30th 2015 Forskningsparken, Oslo

Table of Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1. Developing Research Questions	1
1.2. Hypotheses.....	2
1.3. Research Aim.....	3
1.4. Review of the Introduction Chapter	3
1. 5. What is Social Media?.....	4
1.5.1. What is Web 2.0?	4
1.5.2. Social Networking Sites (SNSs)	5
1.5.3. Tools of SNSs	6
1.5.4. SNSs- as Networked Publics	7
1.5.5. Researches on Use of SNSs	8
1.5.5.1. Use of SNSs in the Workplace.....	8
1.6. Facebook. What is Facebook?	9
1.6.1. Facebook – as a SNS.....	10
1.7. Summary of the Introduction Chapter	11
2. Theoretical Framework	12
2. 1. Media and communication Evolution	12
2. 2. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC).....	14
2.2.1. Anonymity and Identity in CMC	16
2.2.2. Internet Impact on Everyday Life	17
2.3. Cyberpsychology.....	18
2.3.1. The origin of the term- Cyberpsychology	18
2.3.2. Personality Traits and Cyberpsychology	19
2.3.3. Personality Traits- The Big Five	20

2.4. Defining Objectivity.....	21
2.4.1. Objectivity in Online Era.....	22
2.4.2. Changeable Objectivity	23
2.4.3. User Generated Content.....	24
2.4.4. Ethics. Journalistic Ethics	25
2.5. Summary of the Theory Chapter.....	26
3. Methodology.....	27
3.1. Selecting the Research Method.....	27
3.1.1. Qualitative In-depth Interviews	28
3.1.2. Pilot Interviews	29
3.1.3. Selecting Interviewees.....	30
3.2. Data Gathering Process	31
3.2.1. Approaching interviewees	31
3.2.2. Challenges and Reflections.....	33
3.3. Work Done after Gathering Data	34
3.3.1. Transcribing	34
3.3.2. Coding	35
3.3.3. Analyzing of the Collected Data.....	36
3.4. Validation of the Empirical Data	37
3.4.1. Reliability, Validity, Generalizability	37
3.4.2. Ethical considerations.....	38
3.5. Summary of the Methodology Chapter	39
4. Analysis	40
4.1. The Work-related Facebook Usage.....	40
4.1.1. Facebook as a Spreading Information Channel	41

4.1.2. Facebook- as a Research Tool	44
4.1.2.1. Facebook for Background Researching	44
4.1.2.2. Facebook as a Channel to Gain Information.....	45
4.1.3. Use of Content Broadcasted on Facebook.....	48
4.1.4. Patterns of Communication with Sources	52
4.1.4.1. Connecting/Contacting Sources	52
4.1.4.2. Facebook- as an Interviewing Platform.....	54
4.1.5. Summary of the First Section	56
4.2. Employing Facebook as a Private Person.....	57
4.3. Engagement in Facebook Discussions	59
4.3.1. Postings and Engagement in Facebook Discussions.....	63
4.4. Professional VS Private Life on Facebook.....	67
4.5. Summary of the Analysis Chapter	70
5. Discussions	72
5.1 Moving on Findings	72
5.1.1. Facebook Effects on Workflow	73
5.1.2. Reliability of Facebook Content	73
5.1.3. CMC-based Interactions	76
5.2. Personal Facebook Usage.....	79
5.3. Participation in Facebook Dialogues.....	83
5.3.1. Personal Postings on Facebook.....	86
5.4. Does Separation of Personal/Private Life on Facebook matter?	89
5.5. Summary of the Discussion Chapter	91
6. Conclusion	92
6.1. Generalization and Further Research	96

List of Literature:	97
Appendix: 1. Interview Guide.	105
Appendix: 2. Consent for participation in the study	107
Appendix: 3. Code book.....	108
Appendix- 4. Request for participation in research project.....	109

1. Introduction

Since the launching of Facebook in 2004 (McClard and Anderson, 2008, p.10) it became one of the most ubiquitous online social networking platforms in most countries. Norway is no exception to this. The majority of the Norwegian population takes advantage of this application, though this is not what this research is concerned with. Having and using a Facebook account is not only purposed to keep in touch with friends, to fight against boredom or to kill time; moreover, by some Facebook users this social network is employed as an arena to spread considerations, thoughts and communicate with some particular target groups. For instance, politicians, journalists and in general people involved in media industry utilize social networking sites (SNS) actively to widespread their voices and to reach to preferable audience for them.

From the researcher's point of view, it will be considerable to study how Norwegian journalists make use of Facebook during the work processes. Perhaps equally interesting, keeping the same demographic in mind is an examination of the potential influence of Facebook usage on the workflow and on the reliability and impartiality of their media productions.

1.1. Developing Research Questions

“The real secret of good scholarly writing lies not in coming up with the right answer, but rather in asking the right question. First of all, a good question will capture the reader's attention, no matter what the answer”(Nygaard, 2008, p. 79).

As Punch (1998) claims, the research questions (RQs) in an empirical study take the central place, whether they are pre-specified or whether they are uncovered during the study. He further assumes that they do five main things under the empirical work. First, RQs organize the study project and guarantees its coherence. Second, they border the study and specify its boundaries. Moreover, RQs keep the researcher concentrated under the project duration and they at the same time provide a framework for writing up the project. Last, RQs point to the empirical date that will be indispensable for the study (Punch, 1998, p. 34).

From the researcher's point of view formulation of the research questions was one of the most essential steps in designing this master's thesis. Coming up with the right questions was tedious, time consuming and hard work. In spite of these obstacles, in order to uncover the effects of Facebook usage on Norwegian journalists' workflow, the researcher has formulated two research questions, as follows:

RQ1: Does Norwegian journalists' Facebook usage during the workflow affect the reliability of their media publications?

RQ2: Does their open criticism on Facebook impact on the impartiality of the media productions they produce? If yes, in what way?

1.2. Hypotheses

“To say we have a hypothesis is to say we can predict (at least to some extent and with at least some confidence) what we will find in answer to a question” (Punch, 1998, p. 39).

As Punch (1998) stresses, the researcher makes this prediction before the research is carried out; more precisely- it is priori. RQs state what the researcher is attempting to discover with the project, while hypothesis predicts the answers on those RQs (p. 39).

Thus, based on the researcher's present observations, it has been surmised that Norwegian journalists employ SNSs (including Facebook) in a wide range of manners. From her point of view, such usage does affect the workflow since utilization of SNSs (can) distract concentration and the quality of their media products might decrease. On the one hand, being active Facebook user and, on the other hand, expressing own opinions by journalists can raise ethical issues and question the objectivity of their media publications. Since objectivity is considered as one of the core principles of journalism, open criticism on SNSs can make questionable the reliability and impartiality of the media products that journalists daily produce. Though, issues concerning objectivity in journalism will be thoroughly discussed in the following chapters of this study, apparently based on relevant literature.

1.3. Research Aim

The main goal of this qualitative research is discovering the ways Norwegian journalists take advantage of Facebook during the workflow. Furthermore, it will be equally valuable to uncover if and how the latter manage to produce media outlets in a reliable and unbiased way while being active users of Facebook. Additionally, uncovering the ways Norwegian journalists maintain impartiality while making use of open criticism on this platform will be one of the main focuses of this study.

The researcher posits that the results of this project will be utterly interesting and significant for those who are involved in the Norwegian media industry, since Facebook is a fairly new application, and as such the effects of Facebook on the workflow at the Norwegian media organizations have not yet been widely considered.

1.4. Review of the Introduction Chapter

In order to create a specific picture of the Facebook usage among Norwegian journalists, first and foremost, the general review of the important concepts and correspondingly their essence to this study will be presented. Thus, the introduction part will start by the explanation of origin of social media which is commonly referred to the term Web 2.0. On the one hand, the advent of SNSs and, on the other hand, their tools and functions will be discussed in detail. Lastly, the focus will rather be zoomed on one particular social platform- Facebook, illustrating and assessing its functions and incentives for using this social network. In doing so, relevant literature that establishes the basic meanings of these concepts will be utilized.

1. 5. What is Social Media?

To start with, today social media in its various forms encompasses a great deal of mediated activity. Hinton and Hjorth (2013) argue that social media spreads across platforms and creates different forms of presence (p. 1). Since smart phones are taking place in the mainstream everyday life, the demographics of its consumers are changing. While one decade ago social platforms were employed just by young people, today they can equally be applied by young and older people (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 1). Hinton & Hjorth (2013) claim that as SNSs are evolving, the term “social media” is also developing to combine the growing sphere of contemporary online media practice. In addition, Hinton & Hjorth (2013) reflect upon the differences between social media and SNSs. They discuss how the rise of devices, for instance, locative media services such as Google maps, Foursquare and Facebook Places are altering the fabric of social media. Furthermore, these scholars stress that social media is now transforming definitions of both “social” and “media” (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 2).

When it comes to effects that social media cause, they are usually referred to the ways people think, practice and experience social media itself. It has become an integrated part of everyday life and it is no longer only a form of socializing for teenagers. In turn, social media impacts on the ways people reflect and interact with family, friends, colleagues and etc. (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 2).

In order to fully understand the essence of social media, the concept of Web 2.0 will be discussed in the following paragraph as these two terms are usually referred to each other (Baym, 2011, p. 384).

1.5.1. What is Web 2.0?

By Baym (2011) Web 2.0 (as mentioned above, referred to the term-social media) is supposed to represent a new era of online communication and interaction in which users create the content and broadcast on a “dot.com” after all. “All of the platforms taken as examples of Web 2.0, none seems to generate as much attention as social networking sites (...)” (Baym, 2011, p. 384).

According to Hinton & Hjorth (2013), in early 1990s developed the Web into what people perceive as 'online' now. Before evolving the Web "the internet was made up of a series of computers, connected to each other through numerous diverse methods but sharing a common basic data transfer protocol called TCP/IP" (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 9). Those computers were able to store data with each other, but the ability to locate recourses became an increasingly big obstacle as the internet developed. Thus, creating the web provided an interface that allowed people to discover and consume internet easily and quickly.

Hinton & Hjorth (2013) additionally discuss the fact that no one was talking about the web 1.0 before the emergence of web 2.0. They state that web 2.0 encompass an idea of making it simple for everyone to publish content on internet. "This idea encapsulates the transition from web 1.0, which was all about reading or watching content (...)" (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 18); whilst web 2.0 enables users to produce and broadcast content on internet. Hinton & Hjorth (2013) also claim that under the model of web 1.0 if someone would be willing to publish content on the internet, this would need to create someone's own website; while under the model of web 2.0 all the technical impediments are avoided and the users have only to focus on producing of any given content. Hence the web 2.0 makes the process of distributing content vastly less complicated, this, in turn, leads to much more content being broadcasted online (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 19). "Once content could readily be created by just about any user, the technological prerequisites were met for the emergence of social networking sites" (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 19). Therefore, the main point and evolving of social networking sites will be taken up in the following paragraph.

1.5.2. Social Networking Sites (SNSs)

To begin with, the concept of a social network emerged in sociology in the 1950s, which was filling a middle ground between communities and individuals. The social network unveiled a new way of looking at social structures (Baym, 2011, p. 385). Today social media is widely pervading everyday media practices (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p.32). Due to rising of smart phones that enable consumers to move between social media (such as Twitter, Facebook and etc.) definition

of SNSs is changing. “As a series of cultural practices and artifacts that are both commercial and cultural, SNSs are becoming an integral part of identity, social and political management” (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 32). SNSs are at the interface between social media and people; they represent some of the most known brands on the internet. Hinton & Hjorth (2013) also state that for many users internet is synonymous with SNSs (p. 32). Hence it is vital to further assess the essence of SNSs and their tools.

1.5.3. Tools of SNSs

SNSs share number of common similarities such as list of connections, profiles, comments and private messaging. Users identify themselves to the social media site by use of profiles where the personal information is revealed. In the profiles consumers unveil their names, dates of birth, contact information and commonly profile pictures of them. As Hinton & Hjorth (2013) affirm, these kinds of information assist users to create social networks. boyd (2011) argues that profiles are not unique to SNSs, but they are central to them. Additionally, profiles are the places where users gather to share and talk. As boyd (2011) claims, conversations take place on profiles and individuals’ profiles reflect their engagement with the site (boyd, 2011, p. 43). A list of connections with other users of the same SNS is usually called as “friends”. The majority of users commonly include all who they consider a part of their social world. This might encompass past and current friends and/ or acquaintances and peripheral ties, or as boyd (2011) claims, users may include in their connection lists people that they barely know but consider compelled to include (boyd, 2011, p. 44).

Furthermore, the majority of SNSs provide different tools to support semi-public or public communication between users (boyd, 2011, p. 45). In other words, the features of SNSs such as private messaging, status updates and comments allow people to interact with each other on the network. The interactions between users may take place in instant private messages, or it can be shaped as a statement intended by the user to provoke responses on it (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 35). For instance, comments are visible to everyone who is included in that person’s communication list and has access to that user’s profile (boyd, 2011, p. 45). As boyd (2011)

states, in conjunction with the comments section Facebook has composed features that allow users to post content to friends on the site (p. 45).

Additionally, Hinton & Hjorth (2013) consider that many of SNSs are based around a theme, while others have no theme at all. For example, Twitter and Facebook do not have any organizing theme (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 35). There are a lot of SNSs that meet the functional definition of an SNS though they differ according to their size and shapes. Giving an example, “as of the third quarter of 2014, Facebook had 1.35 billion monthly active users” (Statista, n.d). Users of this SNS are enabled to add applications in order to shape their self-presentation, promote causes they consider important and play games with their connections. In addition, they are able to create photo albums, share videos and items from elsewhere on the Internet, and broadcast blog posts (Baym, 2011, p. 386). Evidently SNSs collect and generate data about their users and about how users interact with each other. As Hinton & Hjorth (2013) state, much of the data that SNSs collect remain private, though some of that data is publicly accessible, for the most part things that the SNS users decide to share publicly.

1.5.4. SNSs- as Networked Publics

As boyd (2011) affirms, SNSs are similar to many other genres of online communities and social media. SNSs have combination of features that allow users to compose, first of all, a semi-public or public profile within a delimited system; secondly, SNSs allow people to construct a list of other users with whom they share connections and relationships and “view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system” (boyd, 2011, 43). Moreover boyd (2011) claims that collectively profiles, Friend lists, and different communication channels set the stage for the ways in which SNSs can be perceived as social publics. Additionally, she argues that SNS are publics due to the ways in which they connect people en masse and due to the space they provide for information and interaction. Furthermore, boyd (2011) stresses that SNS are networked publics due to the ways in which networked technologies structure and shape them (p. 45).

More precisely, networked publics by boyd (2011) is defined as publics that are restricted by networked technologies. “In making sense of the practices that unfold on and through these sites, I have come to understand social network sites as a genre of “networked publics” (boyd, 2011, 39). She claims that networked publics serve many of the same functions as other types of publics. For instance, networked publics allow users to gather for cultural, social, and civil purposes; in addition, they help users to keep in touch with their close friends and family. Accordingly, the ways the users take advantage of SNSs will be reviewed in the following paragraph, based on the researches regarding use of SNSs.

1.5.5. Researches on Use of SNSs

Hinton & Hjorth (2013) stresses that research concerning how people use SNSs dates back from 1980s, when the scholars were engaging with questions about the nature of sociality that was usually referred to computer-mediated communication (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 35). In addition, these scholars look at the discipline of Internet studies and attempt to emphasize what people do online, what kind of structures are re-mediated and what kind of structures are new (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 36). Since the amount of people employing the Internet was growing in the mid-1990s, Internet researchers had more possibility to research online communities. Scholars started to discuss the continuity of offline behaviors and relationships of SNSs’ consumers over discontinuity, highlighting the importance of social context (Hinton & Hjorth, 2013, p. 37).

1.5.5.1. Use of SNSs in the Workplace

As Watson-Manheim (2011) states, there is considerable interest in the use of social media in organizations today; hence she explores the potential for use of SNSs for performing work activities in organizations. She looks at the use of SNSs in the workplace for communication between employees; communication which is directed towards the activities assisting the process of production and distribution of services and products (Watson-Manheim, 2011, p. 169).

Watson- Manheim (2011) discovers that organizations have become more geographically distributed with increasing dependence on social media for collaboration and interaction. Employees are able to make use of wide variety of applications online to perform work activities. Due to this, the variety of applications has increased engagement of the communication environment. (Watson-Manheim, 2011, p. 170) As Watson- Manheim claims, the introduction of any kind of communication medium in an organization disrupts current communication practices (Watson-Manheim, 2011, p. 170). In addition, she states that electronic communication makes it easier to engage in interaction and collaboration with co-workers regardless of location; hence “workers increasingly communicate electronically to work with colleagues at distant locations, often without actually meeting colleagues face-to-face“(Watson-Manheim, 2011, p. 173).

For instance, Facebook is one of the most employed communication medium which is increasingly used in organizations. According to Shih (2011), SNSs not only provide mechanisms for communication, but they are also profitable contact management system. As she assumes, Facebook is analogous to customer relationship management for people, “it is increasingly how many of us manage relationships across our personal and professional lives” (Shih, 2011, p. 49). In this respect this research attempts to examine use of this SNS among Norwegian journalists during the workflow. Due to this, the main points and functions of Facebook will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

1.6. Facebook. What is Facebook?

To start with, Mark Zuckerberg is a founder of Facebook who founded this social network while he was studying psychology at Harvard University. As a keen computer programmer, he had already created several SNSs. In 2004 Zuckerberg launched “The Facebook” and within one month over half of undergraduate population in Harvard had a profile on this social platform. Afterwards Facebook was spread to all US universities. In August 2005 it became Facebook.com and from September 2006 anyone having email address could join Facebook for free (Phillips, 2007, July 25). According to one of the latest surveys conducted in September 2014, the *Pew Research Center* states that “Facebook remains by far the most popular social media site”. While

the growth of Facebook has slowed, the level of Facebook user engagement with this social network has increased” (Duggan, Ellison, Lampe, Lenhart & Madden, 2015, January 9). Moreover, as Shih (2011) affirms, the social web evolution is already well underway. Users are spending more than 20 billion minutes a day on this social network and over half of Facebook users log on Facebook at least once a day (Shih, 2011, p. 11).

As Lusted (2011) argues, for millions of people social networking became as a daily routine. They come from school, work and log on their Facebook, Twitter, and Myspace accounts. In this way users of SNSs can communicate with hundreds of friends simultaneously. Facebook consumers read their friends status updates or postings on the Facebook “wall”. Moreover, this social network allows its users synchronous and asynchronous communication by online chatting or by the function of sending a message. Facebook provides an easy way for consumers to have their own space on the Internet. Users of this social application may set up a profile page with their (detailed) personal information and photos (Lusted, 2011, p. 7). Additionally, Facebook allows its consumers to compose a profile where they can uncover their occupation, religious, political considerations, favorite musicians, movies and etc. (Hughes, Rowe, Batey & Lee, 2012, p. 2).

As Lusted (2011) affirms, SNSs such as Facebook have impacted social relationships and daily life in a profound way. She further states that this impact has raised many vital questions such as whether SNSs provide positive ways for users to keep in touch with each other, or these kind of social platforms are encouraging consumers to be isolated and avoid face-to-face (FTF) communications (Lusted, 2011, p. 7). Though, the answers on these questions will not be sought since this project is not examining above mentioned issues. Rather the focus will be made on the functions and incentives for utilization of this social application.

1.6.1. Facebook – as a SNS

Social applications such as Facebook are web-based services that give users the opportunity to compose a public (semi-public) profile within a particular social network in order to share information with other users (Power and Kirwan, 2014, p. 27). According to Power & Kirwan (2014), many demographics use Facebook for different purposes, though they claim that there are

two principal motives: social connectivity for female users seems to be the vital incentive, while males' Facebook employment is referred to boredom (p. 26).

On the other hand, Nadkarni and Hofmann (2012) suggest a model which uncovers two main needs in the utilization of this social platform. The first one refers to the need to belong, whereas the second motive applies to the need for self-presentation. According to them, demographic and cultural factors contribute to the need to belong, while neuroticism, narcissism, shyness, self-esteem, and self-worth contribute to the need for self-presentation (Nadkarni & Hofmann, 2012). All these topics concerning motives behind employing SNSs will be thoroughly discussed in terms of Cyber-psychology and personality traits in the theory chapter of this thesis.

1.7. Summary of the Introduction Chapter

In the introduction chapter the significant concepts and their relevance to this study were taken up. Since the present project intends to discover the work-related Facebook usage among Norwegian journalists and accordingly possible effects of this employment on their daily routines appropriate literature was presented. Logically, the following chapter of this study dedicates to the theoretical framework, reviewing applicable theories and approaches. Subsequently, manifested theories will support the findings of this empirical work.

2. Theoretical Framework

As it was already explained, this chapter devotes to the theoretical framework. In doing so, relevant theories and approaches will be presented and discussed in detail. Apparently, applying different scholarly works aims supporting the results of this project.

First and foremost, computer-mediated communication (CMC) will be introduced. Since this approach evidently assesses how individuals use technologies and, on the other hand, possible effects of this usage, CMC will be utilized as a basement to explain potential Facebook effects on Norwegian journalists' workflow. Though, before CMC approach will be considered, the stages of media and communication evolution will be taken up.

Secondly, the focus will be made on Cyberpsychology which is a novel field in psychology and explores all aspects of human behavior, and impact of computers on individuals. Since this approach discovers the incentives for employing SNSs, Cyberpsychology will be applied to create a specific picture of motives behind applying Facebook during the workflow among the participants of this research.

Furthermore, since the second RQ of this study intends to discover issues concerning open criticism and expressing personal considerations on Facebook by Norwegian journalists, it is evidently vital to define the concept and essence of objectivity in journalism. Hence the journalistic ethics and challenges to the latter will also be reviewed.

2. 1. Media and communication Evolution

To start with, computer mediated communication resembles face-to-face interaction in significant respects (Jensen, 2011). The very idea of communication has been informed over the time by accessible media. Jensen (2011) argues that communication only came to be considered as a general category of human activity due to the rise of electronic media from the second part of 19th

century (connected to the emergence of the Telegraph) (p. 45). He additionally defines the three different degrees of media caused by communication and media evolution.

As Jensen (2011) stresses, the Media of the first degree are biologically based, socially formed recourses that enable humans to articulate a perception of reality, and to engage in communication regarding reality with others. Jensen (2011) claims that the central example is speech, while additional examples encompass painting, dance, song, and in general creative arts (p. 45). Moreover, media of the second degree are connected to the media of technical reproduction that make it possible to widely distribute artworks and other representations. Hence the media of this degree combine newspapers, printed books, television and radio (Jensen, 2011, p. 45). Furthermore, Media of the third degree are connected to the digital forms of interaction and communication. On this stage the two previous degrees are unified on a single platform called computer, which is a meta-medium. The personal computers and smart phones are the examples how the printed and digital media are combined, though as Jensen (2011) claims, these interfaces will presumably change in future developments of the Internet (p. 45).

According to Jensen (2011), the media are institutions that facilitate the reorganization of society across time and space. The old media is being remediated by new media such as “television adopted aesthetics of overlapping windows from the graphic computer interface” (Jensen, 2011, p. 45). As Jensen (2011) affirms, the Internet constitutes a unique configuration of communicative and informational recourses, which is (as he describes) the digital marriage of a massive information archive with high-speed interactions, applicable and accessible anytime and anywhere. Apart from this, the Internet allows its users to communicate not only with each other and with social institutions and communities, but with the system itself (Jensen, 2011, p. 53). By Jensen (2011), media are vehicles of information, and accordingly they are channels of communication.

In short, in this section the media and communication evolution stages were reviewed. Conformably computer-mediated communication, which is a “product” of the media evolution, will be taken up in the following section.

2. 2. Computer-Mediated Communication (CMC)

Since one of the research questions seeks to discover possible media effects on the reliability of the participants' media productions, the CMC approach will be employed to explain and predict the impact of the Facebook usage on Norwegian journalists' workflow.

To start with, some of the most significant turning points in human civilization are connected to technological evolution that has advanced people's capacity to transport and store information and knowledge. Present communication technologies that count on the processing power of computers challenge accepted notions of media and its employment. As Nock (2004) states, millions of people create totally new social situations and communicational behaviors by applying Internet. Hence "Computer mediated communication (CMC) is becoming an integral part of our lives at work and at home" (Kock, 2004, p. 327). In other words, CMC plays an essential role in everyday life.

As Consalvo (2011) stresses, the impact of Internet on society is fundamental. The ways how people seek information, how they transact daily business and interact with each other, how all of those activities are controlled and regulated- "all are being changed by the choice people make regarding to the code, hardware, and governance surrounding the Internet "(Consalvo, 2011, p. 111).

CMCs combine all forms of interactions transmitted between two or more people via computer networks. In a very broad sense, CMC systems encompass e-mail, instant messaging and text chat, group support, virtual workspaces, online games, web blogs, online conferencing and etc. CMC systems are able to support interactions that are: synchronous, asynchronous, anonymous, identified, sequential or parallel, recorded or not recorded communications etc. "They can reach around the world and be used by those in the same room. They differ in the degree to which they convey social presence "(Holton, 2008, p. 12).

As scholars argue, CMC is not neutral; it can cause many changes in the way people interact with each another; moreover it can also influence communication patterns and social networks (Fulk & Collins-Jarvis, 2001; in Holton, 2008). More precisely, this kind of communication leads to

social effects and is unlike face-to-face communication (FTF) (Rice & Gattiker, 2001; in Holton, 2008).

Fulk, Schmitz and Schwarz (1992) argue that individuals employ CMC systems in the different ways. According to them, every single individual has a rich history of interactions that partially structure perceptions of the surrounding and events (p. 16). “This history also affects how individuals engage in actions, anticipate consequences of actions and provide templates for future actions” (Fulk et al., 1992, p. 16). As Fulk et al. (1992) state, personal interaction patterns are vital aspects of the individual’s historical context; moreover, social influences impact on the meanings that individuals attach to symbols, attitudes and behaviors, as well as interpretations of the events (P. 16). As every individual has distinctive interaction histories with others, every individual has also different experiences with CMC. Individuals might have slightly positive experiences with computer-based technical development; on the other side, they might have distinctively positive interactions with group members employing CMC (Fulk et al., 1992, p. 16).

As Kollock and Smith (1996) admit, CMC systems are supposed to have powerful effects on social relationships. “Many claim that this new form of social interaction encourages wider participation, greater candor, and an emphasis on merit over status” (1996, p. 109). In addition, these authors affirm that one of the main questions in social sciences is connected to the problem of cooperation. They wonder how it is feasible to achieve cooperative relations in the face of temptations to behave egoistical (Kollock & Smith, 1996, p. 109). As Kollock & Smith (1996) consider, the problem of the cooperation is the fact that there is often a tension between collective and individual rationality. They argue that in many situations some particular behavior can be justifiable and reasonable for an individual, but this can cause poorer outcome for all. According to Kollock & Smith (1996), these kinds of situations are defined as *social dilemmas*.

Thus the essence of CMC was presented. In the following sections issues regarding anonymity and identity in CMCs will be reviewed due to their relevance to this study, and due to their importance in the recent researches studying how people engage in the CMC-based interactions.

2.2.1. Anonymity and Identity in CMC

According to Holton (2008), anonymity is a well-studied characteristic of CMC. While the entire anonymity is not a typical feature of organizational CMC utilizing, interaction without visual contact with other interacting parties or “visual anonymity”, often is (Holton, 2008, p. 12). As Holton (2008) claims, anonymity is a vital driver of deindividuation; hence anonymous individuals experience decreased state of self-awareness in which they are/feel uncomfortable and unidentified. “Deindividuation is said to reduce the restraints one normally places on one’s behavior to inhibit unsanctioned behavior” (Holton, 2008, p. 13). The concept of deindividualization is defined as a loss of identity and loosening of social norms and constraints associated with immersing in a group. CMC encompasses some of the conditions that are indispensable for deindividualization- anonymity reduced self-regulation and reduced self-awareness (Spears and Lea, 1992, p. 38).

Moreover, the recent researches on online and offline communities focus on the importance of identity in the virtual worlds. As Lori Kendall (2011) affirms, any given community does not exist without some sense of community identities among the users of the latter. Though, the scholars in terms of community identity have assessed identity in different ways. One among them concerns the superior ability of virtual community participants to mask their identity. Lori Kendall (2011) in his work refers to Donath (1999) who states that “Knowing the identity of those with whom you communicate is essential for understanding and evaluating an interaction”. In addition, Kendall stresses that as opposed to FTF interactions, the identity can be masked or presented in deliberately deceptive way in virtual worlds (p.318). At the end, he affirms that interaction limitations of online forums can make it hard to be sure of the identities of all members. Despite of this, as the latter argues, most people manage to present compatible identities in virtual worlds (Kendall, 2011, p. 319). Though, on the other hand, Paollilo and Zelenkauskaitė (2013) stress that “chat participants have various options in representing their identities. Because chat systems seldom require authentication and users can choose any name for themselves, users can easily conceal their off-line identities” (p.110).

In addition, as Paollilo & Zelenkauskaitė (2013) claim, the mechanics of conducting a conversation in chat differs from FTF interactions. At first, they underscore the turn-taking aspect

in CMCs which takes place without the benefits of participants knowing what other participants are doing at a particular moment. “Because reading and typing occur simultaneously and messages are posted immediately as they are sent, an interlocutor may introduce new threads before a previous one is finished” (Paollilo & Zelenkauskaitė, 2013, 119). Moreover, Rintel, Mullholand and Pittam (2001) underline the meaning of greetings in chats; however, they state that the meaning of the opening greeting in chats can lead to contrasting outcomes, which can either assist to establish new relations or destroy them even before the interaction takes place (Paollilo & Zelenkauskaitė, 2013, 119). According to these factors, CMC-based interactions are different contrary to socially rich FTF communications. In this respect in the following section Internet impact on everyday life will be taken up.

2.2.2. Internet Impact on Everyday Life

Recently the researchers, designers and suppliers have been obsessed to identify and classify the range of social impacts of communication technologies. Many attempts have been made to identify costs and benefits of the new technologies in order to distinguish efficiency and productivity effects from social effects, and to evaluate the impacts on individuals, groups, organizations and society (Lea, 1992, p. 1).

As Maria Bakardjieva (2011) affirms, Internet in everyday life is a recently emergent of Internet research which has not yet been widely explored. According to her, the researchers are concerned with studying how people make use of Internet in everyday life. In an important review of approaches to examining the social effects of communication technologies, Brynin and Kraut (2006) distinguish four levels at which such effects are conceived by researchers. At the first level communication technologies are perceived as tools allowing users to conduct similar activities in new ways. The second level of social impacts of technologies describes the cases in which the utilization of technologies causes qualitative changes in everyday life. “Here, people employ the technology to accomplish new goals, that is, new functions emerge that have no equivalents in the preceding state of affairs” (Bakardjieva, 2011, p. 68). The third level of social effects seeks the ways in which new forms of behavior caused by use of technology leads to

changes in users' general well-being; more precisely- psychological health, educational achievements, life opportunities etc. At the last level the scholars are concerned with "consequences that extent beyond the specific activities enabled by technologies and affect the organization of society at large. (p.68). As Maria Bakarjieva (2011) states, the findings of the researches on the first two levels have been plausible, while researches on effects of technologies on the general well-being of users and social organization at large have had obstacles; hence they have not been extensively approved (Bakardjieva, 2011, p. 68).

To sum up, applying CMC in this study will be fertile since this approach can support the results of this project; more precisely, issues concerning anonymity and identity in CMC-based interactions will have great importance in discussing of the findings of this research. Thus, applying this approach will facilitate discovering the effects of Facebook usage on Norwegian journalists' workflow and, more importantly, effects of CMCs on their media publications. Meanwhile in the following section focus will rather be made on how human behavior is affected by use of computers and technological devises. Thus, Cyber-psychology will be presented.

2.3. Cyberpsychology

Cyber-psychology is a novel field within psychology which has not been explored widely, though as an object of the research it examines how individuals interact with others by using technology and how users' behavior and psychological condition is affected in this process (Power & Kirwan, 2014, p. 3). In this project the researcher applies Cyberpsychology in order to uncover personality traits and motives behind using Facebook among the participants of this research.

2.3.1. The origin of the term- Cyberpsychology

The prefix "cyber" comes from the word "cybernetics" (a study regarding the operation of control and communication systems) and it has derived from the Greek work for steersman. This concept is connected to Norbert Wiener (1948/1961). In his book called "Cybernetics" the latter

discusses basic ideas of feedback loops and the hierarchical structure of machines (Norman, 2008, p. 7).

Another part of the word Cyberpsychology- “psychology” refers to the study of cognitive processes and human behavior. Norman (2008) claims: “when we put the two parts together to create the term cyberpsychology, we engender a unique synergistic combination. Why? Because we, as humans, are inherently involved in control and communication” (Norman, 2008, p. 7). Norman states that when control and communications are mediated by machines, new forces and factors enter in that enhance; hence these factors broaden the intentions and purposes of the individual human mind and the collective purposes of communities of minds (Norman, 2008, p. 7).

Furthermore, Cyberpsychology encompasses all factors of human behavior and thoughts. It is a study concerning the impact of computers and technology on the psychology of individuals and groups. Cyberpsychology assesses humans’ lives and the activities of computers (Norman, 2008, p. 7). Hence personality factors and traits connected to cyberpsychology will be subsequently taken up in the following section.

2.3.2. Personality Traits and Cyberpsychology

Every individual when he/she thinks about other individuals and individual differences, he/she thinks in terms of personality. The term personality is defined as the consecutive and distinctive feelings, thoughts and behaviors of individuals (Norman, 2008, p. 238). As Norman suggests, personality is consistent in the sense that it is durable over the time. On the other hand, personality is distinctive as it differentiates one person from another one. “We explore the factors of human personality and their relationship to performance and other measures at human-computer interface” (Norman, 2008, p. 239). Norman also affirms that one of the earliest lists of personality traits is connected to Cattell, though he retained way too many factors. In addition, Eysenck (1947) argued that only two orthogonal dimensions differentiate all the individuals: introversion-extroversion and neuroticism-emotional stability (Norman, 2008, p. 239). Norman (2008) argues that in order to simplify the situation and shorten the number of personality factors

to broaden dimensions, researchers involved in studies concerning personality composed five sufficient factors. These factors will be discussed in the following paragraph.

2.3.3. Personality Traits- The Big Five

Power and Kirwan (2014) discuss five personality traits in terms of using SNSs: extraversion, neuroticism, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness to experience. These traits called as “Big Five” apply to the ways how users think, feel and behave; moreover, these scholars claim that these traits can be utilized sum up, determine and access an individual’s conduct (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 27).

First trait- extraversion refers to equally both to be socially active and to have ability to experience positive emotions. (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 28) “In addition to liking people and being sociable, Costa and McCrae (1992) argue that extraverts are assertive, talkative, active and cheerful in disposition”. According to Nadkarni and Hofmann (2012), users who are high on extraversion employ Facebook as a platform for alternative social activities.

Neuroticism- is the second personality trait which describes the “tendency to experience psychological distress, with high scorers tending to display heightened sensitivity to perceived threats “(Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29). The authors claim that high scorers can have irrational imagination to have less capability to control their own impulses and overcome more poorly than other individuals with stress. As Nadkarmi and Hofmann (2012) state, individuals who are high on neuroticism define “Wall” as their favorite component of Facebook; as opposed to the latter, user with low on neuroticism are more likely to prefer photos on this SNS.

Agreeableness- is the third trait which refers to a person’s tendency to be perceived as sympathetic, trusting and cooperative. “According to Costa and McCrae (1992) the agreeable person is fundamentally altruistic; they are eager to help others, and believe others will be equally helpful in return” (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29). Additionally, Costa and McCrae (1992) state that agreeable individuals seem to have favorable influence on social interactions (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29).

Conscientiousness- is the next dependability trait which applies to being responsible, cheerful, planful and organized (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29). These types of individuals are outstanding in terms of their discipline; they are concentrated to achievement of aims; hence they are dutiful.

Openness to experience- is the last trait which describes the tendency: “being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent, and artistically sensitive” (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 30). Werli (2008) states that individuals with high scores on openness to experiences have more willing to try, use, and adopt new technologies (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p.30).

Thus, by Power & Kirwan (2014) those five traits were used in order to assess the cardinal motives behind employing Facebook. They claim that keeping in touch with other users and overcome boredom seems to be more emerged incentives to take advantage of this application.

To summarize, in this second section of the theory chapter the psychological factors and motives behind using SNSs were presented. Since this empirical work aims to discover the ways of employing this social network among the participants, the researcher argues that cyberpsychology creates a clear frame to assess which personality traits and factors motivate the interviewees to apply Facebook during the workflow. Meanwhile the focus will be made on objectivity in journalism since the second RQ seeks to discover how the participants express themselves on Facebook, and whether their activeness on this platform impacts on the impartiality of their media publications. Thus, on the one hand, the concept and essence of objectivity and, on the other hand, to what extent objectivity is being challenged by new technologies will be further discussed.

2.4. Defining Objectivity

As it was already explained, the second RQ of this study attempts to uncover if and how Facebook usage among the participants affects the objectivity of their media outlets. In this respect it is significant to explain what objectivity is and why it matters in journalism.

To begin, objectivity is the reporting of reality, of facts as nearly as they can be obtained without the injection of prejudice and personal opinion (Maras, 2013, p. 7). As Maras (2013) affirms,

according to Everette E. Dennis, objectivity in journalism can be linked to three cardinal aims. The first point aims separating facts from opinion; the second one is connected to presenting an emotionally detached view of the news, while the last aim is about striving for fairness and balance (Maras, 2013, p. 8). Furthermore, according to Maras (2013), the term “objectivity” is multi-faceted since the latter is constantly referred to a cluster of terms such as accuracy, neutrality, fairness, honesty, impartiality etc. Reporting of the news without bias or slant is one of the core principles for maintaining objectivity. “It is important to note, however, that objectivity does not just operate at the level of values, but also procedures” (Maras, 2013, p.9). Though, objectivity in online era is being challenged due to the recent technological innovations and emergence of user-generated content. Apparently, these issues will be taken up in the following paragraphs.

2.4.1. Objectivity in Online Era

To begin with, the collaborative nature of mobile and web applications allows new possibilities for participation in the process of producing and consuming news, and transparency in conjunction of the exercise of values and judgments (Maras, 2013, p. 175). “As Jackie Harrison points out, technological change brings opportunities and expansion, allowing one to ‘bypass or improve upon mainstream reporting processes’” (Maras, 2013, p. 176). Additionally, some of the mainstream broadcast media consider technology totally in terms of competition of what they currently do. Maras (2013) underscores that on the level of work, technology can cause greater and/or lesser journalistic autonomy.

According to Maras (2013), new media, satellite and cable news have altered peoples’ sense of current affairs and news. Nowadays the news production and consumption have been transformed by digital technologies. This transformation makes possible constant updating in various media forms and platforms; though, in turn, the speed of reporting causes inaccuracies and shallow reporting (Maras, 2013, p. 177). “As Brent Cunningham notes, ‘the nonstop news cycle leaves reports less time to dig, and encourages reliance on official sources who can provide the information quickly and succinctly... This lack of time makes a simpleminded and lazy version of objectivity all the more tempting’” (Maras, 2013, p.177).

In addition, the emergence of low cost publishing media platforms that makes it possible to discuss, report on current affairs and broadcast news has led to the rise of citizen journalism and blogging. These platforms are multimedia in nature, encompassing, video, audio and text. However, these circumstances and technological possibilities are changing the ways journalists create media outlets and the ways how society receives them. Thus, understanding of media has been changed (Maras, 2013, p.189). Maras states that in on-line journalism sometimes the concept of objectivity is underestimated, whilst the subjectivity (expressing own opinions) is celebrated (Maras, 2013, p.189) “While objectivity can be called a basic norm of professional journalism, journalistic blogging instead seems to follow a combination of three main norms, mainly transparency, accuracy and advocacy” (Maras, 2013, p.189).

Moreover, Maras (2013) asks the question about whether objectivity is changing in the era of 24/7 news and on-line journalism. Herewith he composes threefold answer on this question. According to the first answer, newly emerged citizen and on-line journalism may not in itself reveal a challenge to objectivity; “that new technologies of reporting and platforms for publishing can (and are being) incorporated into established news models, which are themselves adapting to a 24-hour news cycle” (Maras, 2013, p.191). The second thesis of Maras is connected to “monitory democracy”. He claims that citizen and on-line journalism provide new channels for “monitory democracy”, whereby enormous of monitory institutions are in the business of publicly scrutinizing power (Maras, 2013, p.192). The third approach is referred to blogging and citizen media that are challenging and changing the very informational foundation of objectivity as a method for knowing and reflecting reality (Maras, 2013, p.192). Due to this, the ways how objectivity is changing in on-line era will be further explained in the following sections.

2.4.2. Changeable Objectivity

According to Maras (2013), objectivity is changing in the era of citizen journalism and 24-hour news. These changes are causing the restatements of the concept- objectivity. He hereby claims that citizen journalism and widely emerged news blogs are prompting a reevaluation of

objectivity as a method for handling information and as a theory of truth in the changeable environment of consumption of media (Maras, 2013, p.199).

2.4.3. User Generated Content

To start with, User-generated content (UGC) refers to media content composed or produced by non-professionals (rather than by paid professionals) and predominantly broadcasted on the Internet. By emergence of Web 2.0 technologies the potential to interact with and impact on a mass audience was accessible for an ordinary consumer. Examples of Web 2.0-based Websites that enable the consumers to create and produce UGC encompass YouTube, Facebook, Wikipedia, Flickr, Blogger, personal Web pages etc. (Daugherty, Eastin & Bright, 2008, p. 16).

Since Web 2.0 refers to a new generation of web interfaces that allows users to compose, read and share content over the web, UGC such as YouTube and Facebook are challenging the traditional media (Balasubramaniam, 2009, p.28). As Balasubramaniam (2009) states, the traditional media is losing their supremacy and their role as gatekeepers of spread content. The term user-generated content does not have a standardized definition; though UGC should cover the following three requirements: it should be publicly available via employing internet; UGC should contain a certain level of creativity, probably the most vital point; and the content should be created by nonprofessionals (Balasubramaniam, 2009, p.28).

Balasubramaniam (2009) also affirms that majority of UGC outputs are created without expectation of any kind of profit. UGC can take different forms, but it is challenging to assort them since they encompass not only one type of media, but several. For instance, on SNS-Facebook users are able to share videos, create groups with information on a particular topic and at the same time keep in touch with people. “Nevertheless, for Steve Rosenbaum from AlwayOn [6], a source of information for technology savvy consumers, we can split the world of user-generated content in seven groups according to their main use” (Balasubramaniam, 2009, p.29).

To start with, in the first group are replaced the media platforms (such as YouTube) where consumers are able to freely upload and share their own videos. Secondly, SNSs (such as

Facebook and LinkedIn) have the chat function and make possible for participants to contact with new people. Moreover, social platforms such as Flickr targets mostly family and friends and enables users to upload private pictures. In addition, the platforms such as Ebay glowingly use UGC to make money. Furthermore, people can meet other people and share common interests via websites such as Meetup. At the end of this classification, there are two groups employing blogs as layout, the news and the voices, pointedly utilized to inform people. Blog news are challenging the web sites such as BBC and CNN since they can distribute more specific and quicker news than these web sites. “Voices are usually famous bloggers who have become famous personalities through the web in the recent years by providing their views on political, social or economic trends” (Balasubramaniam, 2009, p. 29).

Thus, UGC is restructuring the way consumers watch video and TV with enormous amount of video creators and consumers. Particularly, UGC sites are creating new social interactions and encourage users to be more creative and to be more willing to develop new business opportunities (Cha, Kwak, Rodriguez, Ahn & Moon, 2007). Since UGC is changing the journalistic work in 21st century, it is essential to have a short review concerning how significant the ethics and particularly journalistic ethics are in journalistic work.

2.4.4. Ethics. Journalistic Ethics

Journalistic ethics, more precisely, the norms for responsible journalism is derived from the beginning of modern journalism in Europe during the seventeenth century. “Ethics is the analysis, evaluation and promotion of what constitutes correct conduct and virtuous character in light of the best available principles” (Ward, 2009, p. 295). At the basic level, ethics asks how individuals should live well ethically in right relation to each other. Moreover, as Ward (2009) argues, ethical reasoning is about how people interpret, balance and modify their principles in conjunctions with new social conditions, new technology and, in general, in conjunction with new facts.

Ethics, solely journalistic ethics is a vital practical activity. In other words, journalistic ethics seeks reasons to questions of how to act. “Journalism ethics is a species of applied media ethics that investigates the “micro” problems of what individual journalists should do in particular

situations, and the “macro” problems of what news media should do, given their role in society“ (Ward, 2009, p. 296). Thus, the journalists have duties, norms and rights as human beings, besides, they work under the general principle to tell the truth and avoid harm, since as professionals they have social power to construct political agenda and impact on public opinion (Ward, 2009, p. 296).

2.5. Summary of the Theory Chapter

To sum up, in the theory chapter the relevant theories and approaches were presented and discussed. As already explained, the presented theoretical background will be employed to strengthen the findings of this empirical work. CMC and Cyberpsychology will be utilized to assess to what extent Facebook employment among the participants affects their daily routines and the reliability of their media publications; while UGC, objectivity in journalism and journalistic ethics will support the results concerning how the participants’ use of this social platform impacts on the impartiality of their journalistic works. It goes without saying that the following chapter will present, on the one hand, the stages that the data collection process has gone through and, on the other hand, how the collected data was processed.

3. Methodology

The methodology chapter of this empirical work follows a chronological set-up. The chapter is four-folded, where the first section reviews the work done prior to the data gathering, encompassing the reasoning of the method used and pilot interviews testing the selected method. The second part of the chapter describes the data gathering process, assessing the challenges during this process. The third section will present the processing of the data after it was conducted, reviewing the process of transcribing, coding, and the stages of the analyzing gained material. The last fourth part of this chapter will discuss the reliability, validity and generalizability of this empirical work. At the end of this chapter a paragraph assessing the ethical considerations that the researcher has gone through under this project will be provided.

3.1. Selecting the Research Method

Remembering, the RQs of this study attempt to discover how Norwegian journalists use Facebook during the workflow and, most importantly, how this usage affects their daily routines and media outlets. Accordingly, the most appropriate research method for discovering answers on the RQs – qualitative in-depth interviews was selected. The research interview is an interpersonal situation, a conversation between two partners about a theme of mutual interest. In the interview, knowledge is created “inter” the points of view of the interviewer and the interviewee (Kvale and Brinkmann, 2009, p. 123).

Basically, qualitative in-depth interviews are much more like conversations than formal events with pre-specified response categories. The researcher uncovers several general topics to discover the participants’ considerations, but otherwise takes care of how the participants structure the answers. The viewpoint of the participant on any given phenomenon of interest should discover the participant’s view, not the researchers.

Interviews as a qualitative research method have certain strengths; such as large amount of data can be gathered quickly. Though, interviews have weaknesses and limitations. Since interviews

involve personal interactions, cooperation has a great importance. As Marshall and Rossman (1999) state, respondents may be unwilling to share all the information that the researcher attempts to uncover, or the participants may not be aware of recurring patterns in their lives. The interviewer should not ask questions that evoke long narratives from participants either because of a lack of experience or familiarity with local language, or because of lack of skills (Marshall & Rossman, 1999, p. 110.) In addition, an interviewer might have superb skills and be skillful at questioning, personal communications, and gentle probing for elaboration.

3.1.1. Qualitative In-depth Interviews

This empirical work targeted Norwegian journalists between the age group 25-45. Focus was made on mainly news reporters and journalists working on political, social and human rights issues. The researcher was concerned with the professional journalists working for the biggest media organizations in Norway. Aim of this research was also to carry out interviews with reporters working for printed media, broadcasting companies and working for online visions of media organizations.

Before contacting the respondents, obviously a semi-structured interview-guide was composed; see Appendix #1, p. 105. The interview-guide was the researcher's main tool to uncover the interviewees' answers. More precisely, questionnaire for the participants was composed in advance to cover all main topics; particularly, designed to discover how and why the respondents employ Facebook during the workflow and whether this usage affects production process of their outlets. "Semi-structured life world interviews seek to obtain descriptions of the life world of the interviewee with respect to interpreting the meaning of the described phenomena" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 124).

In order to produce a good sample, employing snowball method was intended to gain as valuable information as possible. "The method yields a study sample through referrals made among people who share or know of others who possess some characteristics that are of research interest" (Biernacki and Wardorf, 1981, p.141).

Furthermore, taking advantage of this method would make easier and more sufficient the data gathering process. More precisely, the interviewed journalists would be asked to give contact information of their fellow colleagues' perceived by them as active users of Facebook. Though, before contacting interviews, pilot interviews were carried out to test the selected method.

3.1.2. Pilot Interviews

“One should always start out with a pilot interview in order to test the research design” (Schröder et al., 2003, p.163).

Pilot interviews were conducted with three people. One of them was 26 aged male, working as a journalists for commercial broadcasting company. His work experience in this field counts more than seven years. The second one was also 26 aged female, periodically working with reportages from France, the place of her current residence; her profession is journalism as well. The last one was 25 aged female, not professionally active currently, though graduated as a journalist. These people were selected for the pilot interviews since they share the same profession with the actual respondents, and since they are pretty active users of social applications, especially-Facebook. In addition, the latter share the similar language (Georgian) and culture with the researcher of this study. Pilot interviews were conducted on Facebook due to the long physical distances between the interviewees and the researcher.

Pilot interviews were carried out in January, before contacting the potential respondents of this empirical study. Testing the selected method for this study was efficient and valuable. The feedback gotten from these three people helped the researcher to restructure some of the interview questions to make them clearer and simple to understand the meaning of the questions. In addition, some other additional interview questions that would also be relevant for this study were emerged; such as how Norwegian journalists separate their professional and private lives on Facebook.

Conducting pilot interviews was vital since the actual interviews would also be conducted in English, which is the native language neither of the researcher nor of the interviewed journalists.

Moreover, by making use of pilot interviews the approximate duration of each interview could also be assumed.

3.1.3. Selecting Interviewees

“That is to say, the interview is not at tool but an encounter, an event amongst other events in the lives of people. Each encounter involves negotiations, calculations, interpretations” (Schostak, 2006, p.15)

Contacting the potential interviewees was one of the most difficult and challenging stages of this project. After the interview-guide and the information letter of this study were composed, the request for participation in this study was sent via e-mail to many of Norwegian journalists. The respondents from the beginning were selected randomly by use of their recent publications spread via online versions of their media companies and via social platforms, mostly via Facebook. Potential respondents were selected in the middle of January. In this process the main focus was made on online versions of *NRK* (Public Broadcasting Company), *TV2* (Commercial broadcasting company), *Aftenposten*, *VG*, *Dagbladet* and *Dagsavisen*. The latter are the biggest media companies in Norway. In addition they stand out by the number of viewers and subscriptions of their online versions (medianorge, n.d.). Though, it was also aimed to attempt to interview journalists working as freelancers.

All the potential respondents were contacted by the researcher. The e-mail notification of the researcher contained the brief introduction about the researcher and the project. The information letter of this study, which also included a form for informed consent for participation, was attached in every e-mail request; see Appendix # 2, p. 107. Moreover, in the e-mail notifications all the potential respondents were told about their anonymity in the final publication of this empirical work. Furthermore, they were informed about the approximate duration of the interview. The most challenging issues during the data gathering process will be taken up in the following sections.

3.2. Data Gathering Process

This section will thoroughly discuss the data gathering process. Firstly, focus will be made on actual locations of each interview. In addition, the obstacles and difficulties under the data gathering process will be assessed. At the end, the challenges and reflections in the interviewing process will also be reviewed.

3.2.1. Approaching interviewees

The data gathering process was intended to take approximately two weeks, though it turned out to be more difficult to contact Norwegian journalists than the researcher supposed. Thus, in fact the empirical data was gathered over seven weeks. The work started from 23rd of January and finished on 14th of March. The researcher interviewed twelve Norwegian Journalists working for different Norwegian media organizations, as it was planned in advance. 5 female and 7 male journalists were interviewed. Two out of these interviews were carried out by the phone due to the lack of time that these male respondents had.

In addition, one interview was carried out via e-mail since the respondent did not have time to meet the researcher. That was the last interview. The questionnaire was sent to this female journalist and the filled out questionnaire by her was sent back to the researcher after couple of days. The follow-up questions that emerged after analyzing her responses were again sent via e-mail back to her. “Computer-assisted interviewing can be conducted through e-mail correspondence, implying an asynchronous interaction in time, with the interviewer writing a question and then waiting for a reply (...)” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009 p.149). According to Kvale & Brinkmann (2009), superiority with conducting interviews via e-mail is that they are self-transcribed and the text is ready for analysis from the minute it has been written.

The rest nine interviews were conducted face-to-face either at their editorial offices or at the cafes in the city center of Oslo. The meeting spots were always chosen by the interviewees that would be more convenient for their time and location. Average duration of each interview with those 11 journalists either met face-to-face or talked on the phone was 20 minutes. Since the last interview

was conducted by use of e-mail it is not possible to calculate how much time it took for the respondent to answer on the interview questions.

The respondents' age varied from 25 to 45, as it was aimed in advance. The average age was 34. Besides, the average duration of work experience was 10 years. Two of the interviewees had the longest work experience counting 20 years, while the shortest work experience for one female respondent counted 1.5 years.

All interviews were conducted in English. However, the quotes from the respondents that will be introduced later in the analysis chapter will be unchanged by the researcher. Interviews were typed from the audio recording. Before starting recording the voice all the respondents were asked if they felt comfortable with that. Additionally, each of them was asked to sign a form for informed consent, revealing the date of the interview. Moreover, each of them was again informed about the purpose of the study, and they had possibility to read through the information letter of this project again. At the end of each interview participants were suggested to add anything they might be willing to say that the interview questions did not cover.

Furthermore, before shaking thanks and thanking the respondents by the researcher, the latter constantly asked them if their work place could be uncovered in the final publication of this study. All of them agreed on that.

Since approaching potential respondents for this research was time-consuming, the respondents were asked about any suggestions regarding contacting other journalists to participate in this study. Many of the participants were willing to contribute to the data gathering process. They would suggest some of their colleagues perceived as active users of social platforms during the workflow. In this way the researcher would gain either name of the potential participants or, in lucky case, their contact info. As it was already mentioned, utilizing snowball method was intended by the researcher in advance.

Some of the respondents were curious about how they were selected. Since the participants were anonymous, they did not have possibility to ask the researchers who the other respondents were; though some of them asked if there were contacted or interviewed some other people from their work places. This kind of factual information could be revealed.

At the end, all the participants were informed when they would receive the link of the final publication of this research. All of them expressed the sincere interest (as the researcher assumes) towards the results of this empirical work.

3.2.2. Challenges and Reflections

Apart from the difficulties approaching the interviewed participants, the duration of the interviews was problematic too. From the researcher's point of view, some of these participants had willing to finish the interview quickly. The reason for this can be the lack of time that journalists daily have. Apart from the time for recording of interviews, additional time for bureaucratic procedures was needed in case of meeting the respondents at their editorial offices. In such case the interview would be recorded at the cafeterias located at their work places. In order to enter there, a "pass card" from a particular media organization was needed. It would take additional several minutes.

On the other hand, getting the expected answer on a particular question was hard in the couple of cases. Some of the participants would answer quite shortly on the researcher's questions, where longer answers were expected. "People who are in position to have the knowledge you want may not always want to share that information openly" (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 67). In one occasion, while interviewing a male respondent on the phone, in the middle of conversation he said that if the interview would take longer than expected he would not have chance to answer on all questions. Circumstances like this were pretty stressful for the researcher since during the interview process there are constantly emerging follow-up questions that can be essential for the analyzing process. Due to the limited time, in some cases the most important follow-up questions were asked.

Furthermore, the language of the interview was obstacle in itself. As already explained, English was not the native language of the participants. Despite of the fact that majority of them mastered the interview language in all cases it was perceptible that the respondents were struggling with expressing themselves in the foreign language. Accordingly, this impediment would require more time for them to form their opinions; although (as the researcher assumes) all of them were trying with all their strength to structure their considerations about the study topic. Some of the

interviewees would instinctively say a word in Norwegian, stopping the conversation and looking for the equivalent word in English. In most cases this small kinds of obstacles would go smooth since the researcher spoke Norwegian language at a good level. Hence the meanings of the Norwegian words were mostly understood.

3.3. Work Done after Gathering Data

After gaining the empirical material, the researcher went through several stages before starting the analyzing process of the collected data. This section will review the process of transcribing of those 11 interviews (the one carried out via e-mail was obviously transcribed in itself). After transcribing, the code book was composed.

3.3.1. Transcribing

“(…) the transcriptions are translations from an oral language to a written language, where the constructions on the way involve a series of judgments and decisions” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 178).

The process of transcribing was done either on the same day the interview was carried out, or later. The quality of the majority of the recordings was pretty good. Though in some cases, when the interview was conducted at the café, some other additional voices were recorded too. Since cafeterias and cafes are noisy places at some point, seldom but still some parts of the conversations were covered by additional noises. Due to these kinds of small obstacles, the researcher had to listen several times extremely carefully to the problematic parts of the interviews to transcribe them correctly.

In the process of transcribing every single detail was transcribed. In most cases the participants would start saying a sentence, then interrupting and structuring the new sentence. Those were written down as well. If the interviewees would answer on an interview question with a question

to clarify the meaning of the question, those were transcribed too. Besides, any additional expressions such as “hmm” and laugh were included in the transcribed papers.

In some cases if the participants would start speaking about other people, revealing any kind of personal information about them; these parts were excluded from the transcribing process to protect the other peoples’ anonymity who even did not participate in this study. Moreover, all the participants’ names will be given a code for reference in the analysis chapter of this study. For instance, 30M13, where 30 reflects the actual age of the respondent, M-the gender of the latter and 13 pinpoints that the interviewee was number 13th among the interviewed male participants. “In order to protect the subjects’ privacy, fictitious names and sometimes changes in subjects’ characteristics are used in the published result. This requires altering the form of the information without making major changes of meaning.”(Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009 p. 272)

All the transcribed interviews were kept in the separated Microsoft Word documents, containing the practical information for the next- analyzing stage. These were- age, gender, work place, duration of work experience and the duration of the recorded conversation.

On this stage, the interviewer had a general picture of what material was gained from the participants. The similarities and differences in terms of using Facebook during the work day between the interviewees were emerged. Apart from this, similarities between the age groups were detected at some level. “You have to go for balance in your choice of interviewees to represent all the divisions within the arena of study “(Rubin & Rubin, 1995, p. 69).

3.3.2. Coding

“Coding is the starting activity in this sort of qualitative analysis, and the foundation for what comes later. For analysis directed at discovering regularities in the data, coding is central” (Punch, 1998, p. 204).

Thus, as Punch (1998) states, coding is the specific stage which starts the analysis of qualitative data. Accordingly, codes are labels, names or tags; therefore coding is the process of putting names, labels, tags against pieces of the empirical data. These pieces might be individual words, or small or large chunks of the data (Punch, 1998, p. 204).

Prior to the analyzing process, a code-book was composed by the researcher. Codes were based either on the interview guide questions, or on the relevant issues emerged during conducting the interviews. As it has already explained, after transcribing all the interviews, the researcher had a clear overview of what were the main points and aspects of the gained empirical data. The stage of coding was fruitful and equally vital since sorting out participants' responses was easily feasible. Thus, apart from age, gender and duration of work experience, 10 codes were created; see Appendix #3, p.108.

All the interviews were coded according to the code-book. For instance, the participants' responses compatible to code: 4.1 were grouped in one document. In the same way were the other responses sorted out. After finishing the coding stage, the collected data was ready for analyzing process.

3.3.3. Analyzing of the Collected Data

Qualitative research focuses on the examination of social life in natural settings. Due to the richness and complexity of qualitative research there are various ways of assessing and analyzing social life. As Punch (1998) states, variety and diversity in approaches on how to do qualitative study underlines the point that there is no single right way to do qualitative data analysis. The possible way to do qualitative data analysis is depended on the purpose of the project, though it is vital that the method of analysis is integrated from the beginning with the rest parts of the study (Punch, 1998, p. 200).

The process of analyzing in this research had three stages. All these stages were fruitful and valuable in discovering the main incentives and motives behind making use of Facebook during the workflow among the journalists. The analysis started with following the structure of the code-book that was composed in advanced. On this stage the main tendencies were emerged. At the second stage the focus was made on similarities and differences in terms of utilization Facebook between age and gender. The final stage of the analyzing process was one of structure. The wide picture of what were main aspects of the collected data was detected; though the pieces might be organized in a logical way. In this process looking at the analyzed data started with wide-angle

lens before zooming in. Apparently, all the topics emerged during the analyzing process will be discussed in detail in the analysis chapter of this study.

3.4. Validation of the Empirical Data

This section of the methodology chapter reviews issues concerning reliability and validity of this project. Obviously the generalization of the results of this qualitative research will be assessed likewise. In addition, the final paragraph of this chapter will be dedicated to the ethical issues and considerations.

3.4.1. Reliability, Validity, Generalizability

To start with, qualitative interviews are admitted to be subjective since in the process of analysis the main research tool is the researcher, and the latter has to interpret findings and discover main aspects of results revealed by participants. “The interpretation of the meaning of interview texts goes beyond a structuring of the manifest meanings of what is said to deeper and more critical interpretations of the text” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 207)

Kvale & Brinkmann (2009) argue that issues of reliability and validity raise epistemological questions regarding the objectivity of collected empirical data and the nature of interview research. “Objectivity as freedom from bias refers to reliable knowledge, checked and controlled, undestroyed by personal bias and prejudice” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 242).

While carrying out this interview-based research, the researcher attempted to achieve objectivity about her subjectivity, prescribed as reflexive objectivity (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 242). Precisely, the interviewer attempted to be free from bias on every stage of this project. Assessing and presenting empirical data in an impartial way required constant checking and revising every single detail, especially employing follow-up questions during the interview process. Evidently, on the stage of analysis the researcher was trying to withdraw her prejudices and explore the responses in an impartial manner as far as possible.

When it comes to validation of interview research, it is application of the truth and correctness in ordinary language (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 264). In order to achieve validity, constant checking, controlling, and theoretical interpreting of the findings were employed.

At the end, “If the findings of an interview study are judged to be reasonably reliable and valid, the question remains whether the results are primarily of local interest or whether they may be transferable to other subjects and situations” (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 260). Due to the limitations of the study, interviewing a large number of respondents was not feasible. Besides, the aim of the research was not an attempt to produce statistical generalization of results since as Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) state, research based on interviews is not applicable to the whole population in general. In turn, this projects claims to achieve analytical generalization which involves an adduce judgment about the extent to which the results and findings of this study can be employed as a guide to what might occur in another situation (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 262). Though, issues concerning generalization of the findings of this empirical work will be further discussed in the conclusion chapter.

3.4.2. Ethical considerations

The publication of a research report raises moral questions about what kinds of effects a report leads to (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 272).

The study has been notified to the Data Protection Official for Research, Norwegian Social Science Data Services. Besides, all personal data was treated confidentially. No one apart from the researcher had access to the collected data. The transcribed material did not contain any kind of directly identifiable information about the participants. Only coded names were utilized in the process of transcribing and analyzing of the empirical material. Thus, the participants are not recognizable in the final publication at any level. All data was transferred to the researcher’s private computer which was password locked and accessible to no one else.

The collected data (written notes and audio recordings) for this project is intended to be deleted after one year since this thesis will be publicly accessible. Apparently the collected data will not be utilized for further usage.

As previously uncovered, the work places of the participants could be included in the final publication of this empirical study. According to Kvale and Brinkmann (2009), “(...) care should be taken before the interview situation to have a clear understand with the interviewees about the later use and possible publication of their interviews, preferably with a written agreement” (p. 272). All of the participants were asked to sign the form for informed consent. All the interviewees met face-to-face signed this form (See: Fig # 2, p. 104). Although two respondents did not sign the form for informed consent. These interviews were carried out by phone. One of them suggested revealing his actual name in the publication, though since this study seeks to protect the anonymity of all the participants, obviously his name will not be uncovered. Apart from this, the signed informed consent was not received from the last participant. This interview was conducted via e-mail.

3.5. Summary of the Methodology Chapter

In short, in the methodology chapter the ways how the data was gathered and afterwards processed were described in detail. On the one hand, issues regarding validation of this empirical work and, on the other hand, ethical considerations at all the stages the researcher has gone through to protect the anonymity of the participants has been assessed. Obviously the following chapter will be dedicated to the analysis of the collected data.

4. Analysis

The analysis chapter of this empirical work will present the responses of the 12 interviewed journalists regarding their use of Facebook during the workflow. This chapter will have four main sections. In addition, these sections will be divided into sub-sections in order to discuss in detail these journalists' Facebook employment. Apparently presenting of the analysis stage will assist the researcher to uncover the meaningfulness and the importance of the findings in the discussion chapter.

To begin with, the first and biggest section will discover the work-related Facebook usage among the respondents, and will dig into the different motives behind applying this social network for the work-related purposes. The second section will assess the utilization of Facebook as private persons during the work processes by the participants. Furthermore, the third section will uncover the level of interviewees' activeness on this platform, and, apart from this, the focus will be made on their engagements in discussions with their Facebook connections. After all, the last fourth section will review whether the participants separate professional and private life on Facebook or not.

4.1. The Work-related Facebook Usage

As already explained, the first section of the analysis will be dedicated to the reasons and motives behind using Facebook during the work processes by the participants. The process of analysis was intensive and it has underlined different incentives for employing this SNS among the respondents. Differences and similarities between the participants' responses were detected at some level. Evidently these issues will be uncovered step by step in the following sections. In short, this section will present the main incentives for employing Facebook by the participants- Facebook as a channel to spread information, Facebook as a place to capture potential news stories and Facebook as a research tool. Moreover, Facebook as a background researching arena, a source of information and a place to contact sources were emerged as the cardinal reasons for applying this platform during the workflow. Even more, some of the interviewees claim this SNS

to be a convenient spot for carrying out interviews with sources. Thus, all these issues will be presented in the following paragraphs of this section.

4.1.1. Facebook as a Spreading Information Channel

One of the main reasons the participants use Facebook during the workflow is connected to spreading their publications in social media, and encouraging people to read and share stories written either by themselves or their co-workers. 4 of the interviewed journalists admit that they do this either always or quite often to promote and highlight the circulation of the stories. Though 2 of the respondents claim that despite of the possibility that Facebook offers to them in terms of wide-spreading their publications, they very seldom share media outlets on this social network. In addition, 6 participants state that in order to share a story/news on their Facebook Walls, a story should concern something special and unusual. In short, these interviewees distinguish the stories that can be published on their private Facebook accounts.

At first, it will be more logical to look at the responses of the participants who share stories on their Facebook Walls either often or constantly. For instance, 44F3 (working as a freelancer) says that she uses her professional Facebook account to share all her articles that do not go online. Likewise the latter, 45M3 (working for *VG*) and 45F2 (freelancer) also often employ Facebook to promote their publications.

Furthermore, 28F4 (working for *Dagsavisen*) uncovers several reasons for frequently publishing stories/news on this social network- "*Dagavisen* has Facebook page, but the online version of the actual newspaper does not have as many readers as *Aftenposten* and *Dagbladet*; so, there is not many people going directly into www.dagsavisen.no to read a story, but if they get it on their Facebook Feed, then they will click on it and read it". Additionally, 28F4 says that she posts her own publications since she wants people to know what she has been doing. As she argues, she also publishes stories written by her colleagues and in this way she employs Facebook actively to promote media outlets. Although, 28F4 uncovers that if she has worked with an ordinary story, she will not post this on her Facebook account; though, if she is very proud of the story she has written, she will definitely broadcast it on this network. "I realize that when I meet people that I

have not seen for a while, they say: ooh, you wrote that story and that story, and it is always the story that I posted on Facebook.” Moreover, 28F4 notes that she should broadcast even more articles on this SNS, since Facebook is the place where people keep eyes on what she is doing and, as she argues, it has a personal gain for her.

Contrary to these participants’ approaches towards sharing the stories on Facebook often or constantly, 37M6 (working for *NRK* as a news journalist) claims that he very rarely publishes publications on this social platform. The reason for doing this is that he looks at his Facebook profile as rather private; hence he argues that he is more private person on this social network. “I am musician, so, on Facebook I don’t want to mix my personal life with my professional life; if that makes any sense.” (Laughs...). Though, the latter also affirms that if he feels happy about the article he wrote probably he will be willing to publish it on Facebook. “If I work for weeks for something maybe I will share, but I mostly work with news”. As he considers, there is nothing special with news concerning a murder or a traffic accident to broadcast these kind of news on Facebook.

On the other hand, 28M5 (working for *TV2*) states that he does not always share stories on Facebook. “I do not use Facebook to share daily news that everyone knows about, because then my Facebook page would be full. So, I only share special stories”. He argues that if the story is a result of a long project and it has particular importance or it might be innovative in some way, then he will use Facebook to widespread this story. Contrary to the latter, 32M4 (working as a political journalist also for *TV2*) mentions that one of the reasons he does not employ Facebook to spread stories is that *TV2* has rather better Facebook account with over 300 000 followers. Hence whenever he has worked with a story either on TV or online on the web, this story will be shared on the official Facebook account of *TV2*. “So, I am not afraid to miss opportunities that I am not spreading the stories, because they will post it. I guess, there is a potential to use Facebook more, but I have not done it”. Like the previous respondent, 25F1 (working for *Aftenposten* as a political journalist) unveils that she almost never employs Facebook to share stories. “I think, I maybe have done it once or twice, and if I do this it is something extraordinary, something that I feel to share... I feel it has a value”. She notes that sharing ordinary stories would be too much for her.

As opposed to the participants who either always share their publication or they do this rarely, 27M7 uncovers that he distinguishes publications that he posts on Facebook. He classifies the articles since (as he assumes) there are many uninteresting stories. Moreover, 27M7 specifies that he commonly shares stories concerning human rights and other controversial articles as these issues receive more discussions and they become more noticed by the readers. “If a politician apologies for something- that is interesting to share”. On the other side, he argues that if a story concerns that yesterday somebody met somebody, that it a typical news and unimportant to publish. Herewith he reveals another additional incentive for sharing publications- “It also depends on the language... if I am really happy about the article and if the text of the article flows well, I tend to want to show it”. Likewise the latter, 32F5 (working for *NRK* as a political journalist) affirms that she rarely shares her own articles“. I have to be really proud of it, to share my own stuff”. Though, she states that she broadcasts the links of *NRK* if she considers them worth to read for her Facebook friends.

Furthermore, 38M2 (working as a political journalist for *VG*) claims that he does not always post his publications on his Facebook profile. “But when I have something that I believe people I know might be interested in the topic, I post them to get more readers”. He admits that he employs both his private Facebook account and the official Facebook profile of the newspaper to promote these kinds of stories. He uncovers that he is one of the editors of the official Facebook page of *VG* where he, together with his co-workers, publishes stories actively to increase the number of the readers. Moreover, as he states, the editors of the official Facebook page of *VG* tag all the people mentioned in the articles; by doing this, they attempt to direct some of the news towards the certain groups of the readers who might be interested in these stories. “For instance, if it a celebrity or a sportsman we are writing about, or if it is a hard news of foreign affair, we try to direct to the groups to get more people to read the articles”.

To summarize, this section has presented the ways how and why the participants make use of Facebook to spread media outlets written either by themselves or their colleagues. As it has been shown, some of them state that they broadcast their publications seldom, while the others do this more frequently. Employing Facebook as a channel to spread information for the respondents seems to have different reasons. Mostly shared publications by the interviewees turned out to be connected to more unusual, special stories/issues. Whilst for some of them Facebook works as a

platform to promote their own work and receive more readers both for them and for the media companies they work for. Hence the first motive behind employing Facebook by the participants was discovered. Which personality traits of these participants affect Facebook usage will be taken up in the discussion chapter in terms of Cyberpsychology. Meanwhile, in the following section the next incentive for Facebook employment for the work-related purposes will be detected; precisely, the ways how Norwegian journalists utilize Facebook as a research tool will be uncovered.

4.1.2. Facebook- as a Research Tool

The analysis process discovered that another main reason as to why the participants apply Facebook during the work day is connected to utilization of this SNS as a research tool. Different incentives for employing Facebook as a research tool were defined. It seems that for all of the participants Facebook works as one of the significant methods to gain updated information through online WebPages or official Facebook profiles of the different media organizations in Norway. Furthermore, this social network assists 4 of the participants to conduct background researching of the stories and/or individuals involved in the news stories. In addition, 5 of the respondents affirm that they periodically use Facebook to search for potential cases for stories. Thus, these are the main reasons the participants use Facebook as a research tool. Obviously these issues will be taken up in detail.

4.1.2.1. Facebook for Background Researching

“Facebook is one of the main tools in journalistic work” (28M5); “I also use Facebook to check the person, to whom he is connected, who his friends are; kind of spy work”. (45F2)

As the participant 28M5 states, when he and his colleagues make use of Facebook they want to check something that is on Facebook itself. Additionally, he affirms that Facebook can be used to check bio, education and work experience of some certain individuals. “Facebook can be useful

to detect social relations”. More precisely, Facebook allows this participant to find out if some certain persons mentioned in the news have common Facebook friends with him and his colleagues.

Likewise 28M5, 25F1 says that she employs Facebook mostly as a research platform. “Usually I use it for background researching; researching peoples’ profiles, checking if I can find any links to special groups, special interests, and stuff like that”.

Additionally, as 32M1 uncovers he together with his colleagues employs Facebook to research specific individuals or groups of people engaging in political issues or organizations that are active on this SNS. He also claims that many political campaigns are run on Facebook and therefore this social network is not only a research tool for investigating. According to 32M1, Facebook should be used for straightforward communication with sources, which, as he assumes, is a normal journalistic work. Evidently issues regarding Facebook as a communicative platform between the journalists and potential sources will be taken up in the following chapter. Moreover, to what extent employing Facebook for background researching affects the reliability of the participants’ media publications in terms of identity and anonymity in CMCs will be discussed. As it was shown in the theory chapter, individuals in online communities are able to easily conceal their identities; due to this, the researcher argues that these factors negatively impact on the participants’ publications. Though, before this topic will be further considered, other reasons for using Facebook during the workflow of the participants will be introduced.

4.1.2.2. Facebook as a Channel to Gain Information

Another incentive for employing this SNS is connected to receiving updated information through the online versions of the different media organizations in Norway.

To start with, 27M7 claims that sometimes it is valuable to gain different information from other media organizations, since interesting stories tend to spread around. “I pick up the stories that my Facebook friends share on their Facebook Wall”. He also says that he follows couple of media companies, though he does not do this for the workflow. “Most of the time I feel it is tedious”

(27M7). In addition, 28F4 admits that she applies Facebook actively since a lot of newspapers are posting stories online and if one scrolls down the Facebook News Feed one will receive info about what is currently happening. “I am working with political issues... a lot of politicians post things like, let’s say, there is a story going on and maybe someone comments on it and you see what they are meaning”. As she further adds, periodically a Facebook post can become a huge story as often people publish things that they have not thought through.

Likewise the previous, 32M4 argues that he also applies Facebook as a channel of getting news. “The things I am working with, I am not posting many of them on Facebook, but I am using it as a channel to see what other politicians are saying, doing; I mean opinions about the issues”. Furthermore, 44F3 also states that she receives copious information she is interested in through Facebook. More precisely, Facebook works for her as a news channel through which she gets many significant tips for her work. “I follow closely women and work-related researches and I get a lot of them in my News Feed; and commentary articles also, I get them from newspapers all the time”. She claims that she does not read commentary articles usually but sometimes she employs them when she needs a case for a story. As she assumes, this method works quite successfully for her.

Contrary to 44F3, the participant 45F2 makes use of Facebook constantly to find a case for a story. “I always need to have a case for articles”. As she says, she can post questions on her Facebook Wall, such as- “do you know anyone having heart attack?”. She additionally reveals that one can come up to any kind of work-related idea on this SNS. Though, she also stresses that she employs Facebook actively for researching individuals, the social relations of those individuals to detect to whom they are friends with on Facebook and etc. “Kind of spy work” (45F2).

The participant 38M2 uncovers following- “some of my friends will write something on Facebook that can be interesting to me as a topic and that can be an idea for further research”. On the other side, he states that he does not use Facebook as a research tool, but for coming up with an idea for a potential research. As he claims, this social network is not a good source and there are better sources than that. “I will never write something based on Facebook”. Although, as 38M2 claims, he can utilize information spread on Facebook by some certain politicians and make use of his kind of content for his own publications. Evidently issues concerning how the

participants employ content published on Facebook will be assessed later in the following sections of this chapter.

Furthermore, 45M3 affirms that his Facebook usage is actively connected to receiving information through various articles spread in social media and particularly on Facebook. “Facebook points me to interesting articles, whether it is silly stuff or just debates going on, also fun stuff or big news stories and good stories of international press”. As he assumes, Facebook assists him to get into points of articles, such as publications about Russia, Ukraine or for instance- Iraq-Syria. He notes that some of his Facebook friends are quite knowledgeable about this field (international relations). Therefore, he finds it interesting and valuable to follow researchers, scientists, older journalists, foreign journalists since they publish many significant things. Following these kinds of persons mentioned above assists him to find interesting links of the stories to read. “That is, I think, fascinating; there are more and more news sources on Facebook. When I started employing Facebook, it was more friends and fun, now it’s more into the work”.

At the end, the participant 32F5 admits that she rarely employs Facebook to gain information regarding different topics. Though she says that- “Often I ask connections (who are not real friends of mine) about work related questions. I also have sources as Facebook friends to whom I communicate via Facebook. It seems like the non-formal setting.”

Thus, in this sub-section the analysis concerning how the participants utilize Facebook to gain information discovered different issues. The process of analysis showed that all the interviewed journalists employ this SNS at certain levels to gain valuable information (as they assume) through either different media organizations or through other individuals who are knowledgeable in different fields. In addition, Facebook seems to be a significant arena for the participants to find relevant cases for the stories they work with. Hence utilization of Facebook content among the participants will be taken up in the following sub-section.

4.1.3. Use of Content Broadcasted on Facebook

One of the main goals of this empirical work was discovering the ways how the interviewed journalists use content broadcasted on Facebook for their own publications. The analysis process defined two main approaches among the respondents towards utilization of content spread via this social network. 7 respondents state that they continuously revise content published on Facebook. 2 participants (32M1 and 32M4) underscore that Facebook does not have that safe privacy not to be hacked; due to this, they constantly double check the content published on this SNS. Though, the participant 32M1 considers content spread by politicians through their Facebook home pages as reliable; while the respondent 25F1 argues that Facebook is Wikipedia in a way where anyone is able to publish anything. Although, 5 respondents (32M1, 28F4, 32F5, 27M7 and 38M2) consider that if content is posted by any given politician or public figure, than this kind of information can be utilized as a source of information. Evidently all these approaches will be herewith exposed.

To begin with, the participant 28M5 claims following- “I never use content revealed on Facebook without double-checking. If it is a link of a credible course, such as a post from PDF, then I would go to that and would not double check it” (28M5). Though, he states that if someone wrote something in a Facebook post that popped up in his Facebook News Feed, he would not definitely use it without double checking.

In addition, 32M1 argues that most of what is published on Facebook, apart from the homepage of any given politician, is published as informal information. According to him, this means that the content published on Facebook is private information, broadcasted in an unofficial way by the authors of the content. 32M1 further affirms that if content is not published by official Facebook pages of politicians, it needs second confirmation, more precisely- double checking. “Also, you never know who is actually publishing the information; so, the fact that the information exists on Facebook does not mean it is true and factual; any Facebook account can very easily be hacked, taken over by other people then the one who is actually running it”. He stresses that Facebook can be one among the other research tools. Thus, one can gain information on this social network, but this does not necessarily mean that one will employ it. As he claims, this approach is one of the main differences between post-soviet countries’ journalism and Norwegian journalism which

strictly follows ethical guidelines. “We have fairly high standard of double checking and quality checking of the information found on Facebook.”

On the other side, 28F4 argues that if someone has written something on Facebook that can be relevant to her publication, she will always call that person and ask about more elaboration and information. “But if they don’t reply, I will have no problem just to quote the Facebook post. Actually, in today’s newspaper I am quoting some people from Facebook. They are not politicians, they are doctors”. Additionally, she uncovers that before she worked for the online version of *Aftenposten* where the speed of working was a lot faster. “You have to write a story and it has to go online”. She states that she used more social media as sources of information for quoting directly than she uses now. The reason for this is that now she has the full day to work with her piece; hence she has possibility to try to contact sources several times during a workday. 28F4 also notes that the main difference between working for online and for printed version of a newspaper is the way the journalists employ content spread in social media. According to her, when one works for online version of a paper, one does not have much time to keep in touch with sources and she/he is forced to utilize content published on Facebook; whilst working for printed version of a newspaper allows reporters to revise information thoroughly.

Furthermore, 32F5 stresses that when she utilizes Facebook content, most often these contents are relevant links from other media organizations. She says that she can include in her publications content downloaded from Facebook and most likely it can be an outrageous quote from a politician. As opposed to the latter, for 25F1 Facebook as a platform to gain content is more connected to finding factual information about the events. She affirms that Facebook can be fruitful for revising places, dates and times for planned events since on this SNS one can have most updated information about arrangements. Though, when it comes to revising content broadcasted on Facebook, she states following- “let’s say, if they write: “we are the biggest youth organization in Norway”; I would double check it, because it is like Wikipedia in a way, you don’t know who is verifying the information; but if it says that this event starts at 7 pm, I would not think revising this info”.

Furthermore, on the question whether he applies Facebook content as a source of information, 38M2 answers -” Yes, maybe once a week I find something on Facebook, and then I find interesting and relevant to what I am working with. But not very often, I must admit”. When it

comes to including this kind of information in his publications, he states that he does this very seldom since his Facebook friends rarely write something that is interesting for him in terms of the issues he works with.

As opposed to the other participants, for 27M7 employing content broadcasted on Facebook is depended on the “Face Value”. More precisely, he distinguishes the sources of information and states that face value is based on one’s perceived relationships with other media organizations. “Probably sometimes you don’t have chance to double check the content and you have to go to other media which might have picked up that case from the original source which you are not double checking. So, it has to be on the face value most of the time.” Moreover, he states that he has used content spread on social media only once, though he stresses that in this situation he would not double check since Facebook is hard to hack to get into account, unless one has password’s password. In addition, 27M7 assumes that people tend to be more honest on Facebook than in real life. He additionally admits that if the content is broadcasted by an important public figure, then he would not double check the content- “because he decided to publish it and make a post”. By this he means that these kinds of posts can be used as quotes.

Contrary to the previous participants, possible use of Facebook content among the rest of the respondents seems to be different. The way how they use information published on this SNS ends up with revising and double-checking the gained information. At first, 45M3 argues that since he does not write news stories but columns and editorials, he does not quote directly from Facebook. He reveals that he has written a publication which was based on Facebook debates only once. Otherwise, he uses this social application neither to gain information nor as a source of information for his articles.

The rest 7 participants admit that they always revise information gained from Facebook. “I always double check; always, of course. Well, I like checking things” (45F2). Likewise 45F2, 37M6 states the same concerning utilization of the content broadcasted on Facebook: “I am always calling up or sending a text message; say, it is a politician saying something either on Twitter or on Facebook. I will always call and ask “did you write this?”. He additionally claims that since he works with radio mostly, he cannot quote directly from Facebook- “I cannot refer to Facebook messages on Radio, saying “that person says that”, I cannot do that with sounds; I always double check”.

Similarly to the latter participant, for 44F3 use Facebook content ends up with revising the content. According to her, she has never utilized information from Facebook without double checking. “I contact the person first, unless it is a sort of the Facebook debate and then I can quote the debate such as; I would never quote a person without having spoken to the person”. Although, she argues that she could write about sexual harassment on Facebook and then quote from this social platform, but without revealing the name of the source; “I would quote anonymously. I would always double check it if I use it as my information”. On the other side, the participant 32M4 affirms that his Facebook usage is more connected to monitoring opinions and keeping an eye on what is happening on this SNS. “If a politician claims something on Facebook, I would regard this as an information from many other sources, so, you have to check it”. He considers Facebook statements and blogs as information that he could gain elsewhere; hence one cannot uncritically make use of Facebook content.

To summarize, this section reviewed the ways how the interviewed journalists employ content spread on Facebook. Two main approaches towards this issue have been detected. 5 participants utilize content broadcasted on Facebook if the revealed content belongs to either public figures or politicians. The remaining interviewees claim that they constantly revise information since Facebook can be easily hacked and content published there can be posted by someone else than the person who seems to be the author of the content. Remembering, the first RQ of this study seeks answers on whether the Facebook usage among these participants affects the reliability of their publications. Since 5 respondents utilize Facebook contents (published by some certain public figures) without double checking for their publications, their use of Facebook contents will be taken up in the discussion chapter in terms of objectivity in journalism and UGC. Herewith the researcher claims that use of any kind of information without further revision may impact negatively on the reliability of these participants’ media outlets. Though, before that, the following sub-section will discuss Facebook as a communication medium between the participants and their sources. The analysis of the collected data will attempt to uncover whether the participants apply Facebook messaging/chatting function to contact and/or to gain information/comments from the potential sources. In addition, the ways the interviewees find more convenient to contact their sources will be analyzed.

4.1.4. Patterns of Communication with Sources

Another main goal of this empirical research was discovering the methods the participants commonly apply to approach their sources. Digging into respondents' responses uncovered the varying approaches on this issue. Accordingly, in the following sub-sections at first the preferable communication mediums between these journalists and their respondents will be assessed. On the other hand, the focus will be zoomed on Facebook- as a platform for interviewing sources.

4.1.4.1. Connecting/Contacting Sources

Facebook is a prevailing social network which allows its users to freely and easily communicate with others. In this respect this research was attempting to discover whether Facebook is widely approved medium for communication with sources among the participants or not. The responses on this issue were varying between the interviewees. Two of the participants (28M5 and 32M4) state that their preferable contacting medium is calling; 45M3 finds email notifications more formal way of communication with sources, and rarely Facebook messenger function. 25F1 and 37M6 give preference to calling and then email notifications; for 27M7 Facebook is easier way to interact with potential sources, though, if something has to be done immediately he prefers to call; while 44F3, 45F2, 28F4, 38M2 and 32F5 employ combination of Facebook chat and calling in terms of approaching their sources.

“I almost never use Facebook messages, because you have to protect the source” (37M6).

The participant 37M6 claims that he prefers either to call or to send e-mail notifications to the potential sources. As opposed to the latter, 32M1 argues that he employs Facebook to contact sources periodically; though he admits that this does not happen frequently since many people he is in contact with daily are not friends of him on this SNS. “So, we will not be able to contact via Facebook; Say, politicians who do not have Facebook pages, or they don't have time to sign on Facebook to chat, they do their interviews while they are on cars”. As he assumes, the absence of many respondents on this social application is the reason as to why he does not utilize Facebook

commonly to approach respondents. Additionally, the participant 45F2 has the similar consideration about this subject matter-“it depends, some people aren’t that much active on Facebook”.

In addition, for 44F3 Facebook seems to be one of the possible ways to contact potential sources. Although, she claims that she prefers to call and meet people to talk, though- “if I need a short quote for some topic, I have occasionally contacted people on chat, but normally it would be: “hi, I am this... and I am doing that, I know, you know a lot about the topic, can we talk?”. 44F3 affirms that first contact with a respondent might be achieved on Facebook in order to receive the phone number and keep in touch with the person. Furthermore, 28F4’s consideration about Facebook usage as a communication arena with sources coincides with 44F3’ attitude on this issue. “I can ask: can I come by? (...) but I don’t conduct interviews on Facebook.” As she argues, in the communication process with sources she employs Facebook to present her background and the ideas of the topic of the common interest.

In addition, the participant 38M2 states that he occasionally takes advantage of Facebook to communicate with sources depending on the stories he is working with. “Let’s say, you are reporting on a big drama or somebody is missing, then you would use Facebook to contact that person’s friends, for instance”. On the other hand, 27M7 affirms that utilization of Facebook to keep in touch with respondents depends on whom he is contacting with. “If I know someone well and have good relationship with it is better to do that on Facebook, because it is easier.” Though, he admits that if it is something that has to be done immediately, then it is better to call. Additionally, he affirms that contacting sources on Facebook is more unofficial approach, but if he wants to ask for an interview- “it is just easier to click on the message chat and you can just send them message there and do that through chat, then call by phone or use another mediums”. Like the latter interviewee, 32F5 also admits that she often employs Facebook to communicate with sources. “I feel like I have to be a lot “on” not to miss out what is trending and what concerns people”.

As opposed to the latter respondents, 45M3 asserts that when it comes to contacting people/respondents to arrange meetings, sending an e-mail notification is paramount. “I find it little more sort of binding and little more formal way; the contact is stronger via e-mail”. Apart from this, the reason he prefers to interact via e-mail is that e-mail notifications are more

organized in terms of having calendars and outlook. Conversely, the participant 28M5 on the question whether he uses Facebook to contact respondents answers shortly- “I call”. Likewise the latter, the participant 25F1 admits that she gives preference to calling when it comes to contacting sources, since this way is faster. ”I would usually start calling then I would maybe text or send notification via Facebook, email”. Besides, she says that calling is more convenient way to approach sources since one can never see how frequently people are online on Facebook.

Furthermore, the respondent 32M4 emphasizes the privacy function of Facebook. He affirms that two years ago his Facebook usage was much more frequent comparing to his present usage of this SNS. “Now I have not actually installed the new message function on Facebook, because I don’t like the privacy function; I don’t think it is safe enough”. He further states that this SNS does not provide the level of security that he would like to have. As he argues, he could contact a politician through this social application and ask for an interview about a certain topic, but at any rate he prioritizes either calling or texting.

Hence in this sub-section the analysis was focused on the ways the interviewed participants give preference in terms of communication with their potential sources. Three main communication mediums were defined- calling, texting and sending a message on Facebook. Calling sources turned out to be the paramount contacting channel for the participants since, as they claim, it is faster. Though, some of the interviewees admit that Facebook is a convenient communication platform. Due to this, it will be fruitful to look at whether participants employ this social application as an arena to carry out interviews with their sources. Thus, this topic will be assessed in the following sub-section.

4.1.4.2. Facebook- as an Interviewing Platform

The last sub-section of this section will dissect whether the respondents of this qualitative research apply Facebook to conduct interviews or not. Digging into the collected data underscored varying responses on this subject matter also. 2 of the participants (27M7 and 32M1) admit that they do employ Facebook to either carry out interviews or receive short comments from the respondents about some certain topics. Whereas 8 of them assert that they do not apply this SNS in term of interviewing sources. At the end, 44F3 unveils that she has utilized this social

network to conduct an interview only once; while 28F4 states that she can ask any given source to send her a short comment via e-mail. Hence in this sub-section the participants' use of Facebook as an interviewing platform either frequently or rarely will be taken up.

To start with, 27M7 uncovers that he sometimes carries out interviews by use of Facebook since it is easier. "I can see when they are logged on, and most of the time, I think, they are more open to answer on a request via Facebook than they would do that via phone". Besides, he argues that when one sends a message via Facebook chat receivers tend to not be annoyed. On the other side, it is hard to ignore the message sender since the one who sends a message on Facebook is able to detect when the message was read by the receiver. Additionally, he states another argument for employing Facebook as a communication/interviewing arena being convenient. According to 27M7, people tend to check their Facebook accounts while they are sitting at the meeting- "I have done interview on Facebook which was only available way". Moreover, he considers Facebook chat service as a lot faster in the communication process with sources than communication via email, since the latter takes longer time and is asynchronous.

Contrary to the latter participant, 32M1 claims that he very seldom conducts interviews via Facebook since, as he argues, Facebook does not have the same level of security one could use it constantly. From his point of view, e-mails or mobile phone conversations are more secure than Facebook chat service. Although, he admits that if this SNS is the only possible way for carrying out an interview, then he allows himself to use Facebook as an interviewing platform. "Let's say, you are interviewing very open source, say researcher, who is sitting at the conference abroad... he is busy and he cannot pick up his phone while you need a comment on a story you are doing... then I don't see any problems in doing this via Facebook". He additionally argues that he can quote the person he is interviewing via chat since he knows the person he is typing to.

Furthermore, 44F3 recalls the only one interview that she has carried out through Facebook chat function. As it was already mentioned, she utilizes this SNS to find interview objects, though she usually does not interview sources on Facebook. As she claims, the last story she wrote for *Aftenposten* was based on Facebook debate. "First of all, I found out that this was a hot topic, and then I could also find people to interview in that debate. I also found one of the experts through Facebook. I contacted and interviewed him on the messenger chat". (The topic of the debate will not be revealed, since the researcher attempts to protect anonymity of this

respondent). Additionally, from her point of view, Facebook is helpful when it comes to finding sources. She also affirms that due to her age she is friend with many people on this SNS; hence she repeatedly asks questions regarding potential sources on her Facebook Wall.

Contrary to these participants, 37M6 uncovers that he has never used content that someone told him via Facebook chat. For him this network works only as a communication channel with sources. " I write a message, presenting myself and ask them if I can call them, or if they can call me back. I give my number". Likewise 37M6, the participant 28F4 states that she has never gotten any comment via Facebook chat- "I would call them, or I would ask them to send me comment on e-mail". She further reveals that she mostly contacts advisors and politicians via this social network to ask for an interview and/or short comment.

Thus, the participants' responses concerning whether they employ Facebook as an interviewing channel or not were unsteady. Some of them criticize this SNS for having a low level of security; whilst the others consider the chat function of Facebook either casual way of gaining interview/comment from sources or as an outlet when the other possible way for carrying out an interview does not exist. Since the aim of this project is uncovering whether the participants' Facebook usage affect the reliability of the content of their publications, this issue will be taken up thoroughly in the discussion chapter. Moreover, in terms of CMC the researcher will argue how the quality of the content gained through Facebook chat can differ from the quality of the content gained through real-time interactions. The researcher will count on effects of CMCs and the discussion on this subject matter will refer to issues concerning anonymity and identity in virtual communities.

4.1.5. Summary of the First Section

To summarize, the first section of the analysis chapter was presenting the work-related Facebook usage among the participants. Since various motives behind applying Facebook during the workflow were emerged, that was the biggest section of this chapter. Furthermore, another goal of this empirical work was discovering whether the respondents make use of Facebook for private purposes during the work processes or not. Thus, the following section will attempt to

uncover the cardinal aspects of this subject matter detected in the analysis process of the empirical data.

4.2. Employing Facebook as a Private Person

The researcher was concerned with gaining data from the respondents regarding whether they employ Facebook for private purposes during the workflow or not. Remembering, this research attempts to assume in light of Cyberpsychology how utilization of this SNS affects the production process and daily routines of the interviewed journalists. Accordingly the current section will analyze the interviewees' responses on this subject matter. Though, this topic will be further assessed in the discussion chapter where the researcher will argue which personality traits of the respondents impact on their Facebook employment. In addition, whether frequency of logging on this SNS negatively affects their publications will also be discussed.

Immersing in the data concerning applying Facebook for private purposes while the participants are at work stressed diverse replies. Assessing the gained data in terms of age groups did not emphasize any similarities on this topic. Beginning with, all of the respondents admit that they take advantage of Facebook for private bearings in the work processes at some level; nevertheless their responses differ when it comes to frequency of logging on Facebook during on a regular day. Although, the 2 respondents (37M6 and 45M3) affirm that they utilize this social application mostly for the work-related purposes during the workflow.

To start with, 6 out of the 12 participants admit that they continually apply Facebook during a workday. On the question what she employs Facebook for in general, the participant 28F4 uncovers- "I use it for several things, first personally". Moreover, she discloses that her regular checking of Facebook is connected to both glancing what is going on her Facebook account, and typing to her friends. Likewise the latter, 27M7 claims that his Facebook usage for private purposes during a work day is constant. Though, he admits that he attempts not to log on this network while he is working on a publication- "Otherwise I get distracted. I try not to be there. If I do that, it turns the whole day to be gone". Similarly the latter, 32F5 confesses to be an active

user of this SNS. Additionally, she is curious about what is trending and what her connections share and like on Facebook. “I’m frightened to summarize how often I check my Facebook page on my iPhone, but I’m sure it’s at least 20 times a day”. Besides, she says that if she receives a private message through the chatting function of Facebook, she will reply if she has time for that.

Resembling the previous participant, 45F2 underlines frequency of her utilization of Facebook- “Ooh, 15 times a day, maybe. (Laughs...) I am constantly checking it. During the workflow I use it for private purposes as well, texting family members, friends. I can in the middle of writing an article, log on Facebook and on other social applications to check them”. Furthermore, the next participant 44F3 states that she checks her Facebook account a few times a day for private purposes. Though as she considers, private stuff does not occupy any time.

Contrary to the respondents reviewed above, 32M4 affirms that while he is working on his publication he does not employ Facebook for private purposes, but text messages. Although, logging on Facebook and keeping an eye on his Facebook News Feed is a morning procedure for him (as he stresses). “Well, I have a smart phone and I have a Facebook application; so, I check it many times a day”.

Furthermore, the rest 6 interviewees claim to be less active Facebook users for private bearing during the workflow. Some of the participants admit that they do occasionally employ Facebook for private purposes; though their utilization of this network is not as continual as the others. For instance, 38M2 states that he logs on this SNS once or twice on a regular day for private reasons- “to see what is going on there”. Similarly, 25F1 checks her account (as she claims) three-four times a day to response the people via Facebook chat- “For me Facebook is with my phone. My mobile is the most important work tool, but I also get private texts and I also use it for personal tasks. So, I think it is kind of the same”. In that way the analysis showed that these participants do not stand out in terms of applying Facebook for private reasons during the workflow.

In addition, the rest of the participants claim that their Facebook usage during the work processes is for the most part connected to the work-related purposes. 37M6 states that he does not apply Facebook for private reasons too much. As he argues, if he makes use of this SNS during the workflow it is mostly connected to his work. “I have always Facebook opened, if a political issues come up, I check what people are saying at the political party’s Facebook page or at the

politicians Facebook page. I am looking for reactions that people have or the political party itself is writing on their private Facebook page”. Additionally, 28M5 has the similar point of view about this topic- “I don’t use Facebook while I am working on news unless that is a story that happened on Facebook”. In other words, if a story derives from this SNS employing Facebook is acceptable for him during the workflow. At the end, the participant 45M3 admits that he is not very private person on Facebook; due to this, his Facebook usage is not too constant. “I publish all my things in a public way; I use it mainly to sort of promote my work. I don’t write about my private life, I don’t post pictures of my children there. It is like my public profile”. He further argues that as being a columnist at the newspaper, he has to be more public person than private on this social application.

Thus, the analysis underscored variable responses on this subject matter among the interviewees. Notwithstanding the participants avail Facebook for private purposes in the work processes at certain levels. Which personality traits of the participants influence Facebook usage during the workflow in terms of Cyberpsychology will be taken up in the following chapter. Since 6 out of the 12 respondents admit to be relatively active users of this SNS, the researcher will discuss whether Facebook utilization among the latter leads to both distraction of their concentration and time-wasting during the work processes. More precisely, from the researcher’s point of view, these circumstances can affect the respondents’ daily routines and lead to producing less reliable media publications. Though, before the discussion chapter, the last two sections of the analysis chapter will be presented.

4.3. Engagement in Facebook Discussions

The second RQ of this study seeks answers on whether the participants utilize Facebook to express their criticism towards certain issues and spread their considerations or not. Hence one of the main focuses of this empirical work was uncovering how the respondents engage in the discussions about some particular issues with their Facebook friends. The analysis chapter will present the interviewees’ responses on this subject matter. Later, in the discussion chapter their

use of Facebook in terms of spreading their considerations will be assessed in light of the supportive theories.

To begin with, the analysis process regarding this topic underlined little bit more differences between the age groups. At first, 3 out of the 12 journalists (28F4, 25F1 and 32F5) claim that they do not engage in the discussions with their Facebook friends at any level. These participants are relatively younger than the others. The remaining 9 respondents affirm that they occasionally take part in the dialogues to answer questions of their reader, and (as they argue) to clear up possible misunderstandings about their publications. Although, 4 among those 9 participants admit that they do engage in the discussions and they periodically express their attitudes about certain issues on this network.

To start with, 28F4 claims that she never draws in dialogues on her Facebook Wall. “I am restricting myself more than my colleagues, as I know. I am very careful with saying my personal opinions; the only thing that I can write is that if they say “good job”, I will write “thank you”. She further explains that when the readers start expressing their statements about a certain issue they mostly start arguing; the reason of this is the diversity of the people to whom she is friend with on this SNS. “Sometimes you can have very weird discussions on Facebook and I am asking myself: is this on my Facebook page?! But I don’t want to interrupt them or interfere, I just let them discuss”. As opposed to the rest of the participants, 28F4 underscores the importance of the function of “like” on Facebook. She states that restraining herself from liking some things on Facebook is difficult; despite of this she never likes things by which people can replace her in a political party. “I tell the person face-to-face or in chat if I like his post, but I am not going to like it officially”. Similarly to her, the participant 25F1 affirms that she has avoided engaging in Facebook discussions since as she assumes, it is difficult to balance herself as a private person and as a professional reporter. “There is a lot of information and it is not forbidden to like certain things and have certain opinions, but I mean, the more that kind of person you are more difficult it can be for yourself”. This participant emphasizes that she has to cover all kinds of stories and due to this she should be perceived as open and unbiased journalist by the readers. Herewith she says that she has also political background and many of her opinions are biased, though she attempts to stay as private as possible on Facebook.

In contrast to the latter, 32F5 discloses that she at times shares on Facebook satirical links from the news; as she admits, that is sometimes risky. “Often I would like to participate in discussions about topics I’m covering, since I know a lot about them and could add relevant arguments to the threads. I try to avoid it to not leave an impression of me having chosen side”. Though, she states that she does not post her personal opinions even if it is very tempting for her. The reason for doing this so is that she has many Facebook friends from the left and right side politicians; due to this, she has to be neutral.

Thus, these participants are younger than the others. As the analysis discovered, these respondents restrain themselves to take part in the dialogues with their connections on their Facebook Walls. On the other hand, 5 of the interviewed journalists admit they do engage in the discussions on Facebook; though as they claim, the engaging process is connected to clarifying misunderstandings/questions about the stories they produce. Although these interviewees do not express their opinions publicly on their Facebook Walls. Common feature between these respondents is that 4 out of 5 discuss the importance of the ethical guidelines in terms of engaging in Facebook discussions. Their opinions about this topic will be herewith considered.

To begin with, on the question whether he takes part in the discussions on Facebook or not the participant 28M5 responds- “Well, I answer questions about the stories, but I do not engage in the discussions on the prime minister or any political aspects of the story. I don’t express my personal opinions on my Facebook profile.” He explains that he and his colleagues are not allowed to express personal meanings and/or to pick up a side on an issue in social media, be political or not. Likewise the previous, 32M4 affirms that sometimes he engages in the discussions on this social network, though as he claims- “I try not to have any opinion, but if it comes to correcting impressions, I mean, if the people have misunderstood the fact in the case, then I would correct and say: this is how you should understand my story”. He further considers that if people comment on his story this is obvious that they misunderstood the story; due to this he attempts to clarify what was the statement of his publication, what was the fact and what was not. Similarly to 28M5, 32M4 also considers spreading private thoughts on social media unacceptable. Moreover, he recalls the ethical guidelines of his own work place, which defines that the reporters should not say or mean anything on social media that cannot be broadcasted on television.

Additionally, 32M1 admits that he very seldom engages in Facebook discussions. Participation in the discussions for him as well is connected to answering questions and clarifying the facts. He affirms that he does not employ Facebook to reveal his opinions. Likewise the previous participants, he mentions the ethical guidelines and rules concerning how the reporters should behave while being on social media. “Posting on Facebook, although its only 1200 friends, you might get in trouble, because Facebook is open publicly. So, it is very unwise to do that. And I don’t”.

37M6 also admits that he takes part in the discussions, though he never employs his private Facebook profile for doing that. “I comment as *NRK*. I don’t express my personal opinions on Facebook. I don’t post opinions either as a personal human being or as a journalist. I just answer comments as a member of *NRK* team on shared articles. If someone is commenting or wondering about something, I clarify”. He further explains that as being a journalist he should not have any opinions. Moreover, he affirms that sometimes he writes articles he does not agree with, but no matter he is not allowed to express private considerations. Once again, this participant mentions the ethical guidelines of *NRK* which restricts all the journalists from being biased and personal. “We don’t say or do things that are damaging”. Additionally, he admits that some dissident journalists in social media are expressing their opinions; though he still underscores the significance of the regulations regarding posting personal interpretations. Thus, he avoids publishing personal attitudes that can damage his work place.

As opposed to the previous respondents, 44F3 during the interview process about this subject matter did not mention ethical guidelines; though she reveals that discussions do not take place often on her professional Facebook profile. As she discloses, the debates are mostly taking place on the actual publications, for instance, on www.aftenposten.no and its Facebook page. “Sometimes I engage, sometimes I don’t; it depends on if I have time, but if people ask me questions directly, I try to answer them. These debates are going to all directions and sometimes there is no use to participate”. 44F3 uncovers that she at times shares her own publications on her private Facebook profile where people usually do not start discussions.

Thus, the analysis process concerning the participants’ engagement in the discussions with their Facebook friends discovered the ways they describe their participation in the dialogues with their connections. As it was highlighted in the respondents’ responses, they mostly take part in the

discussions to answer questions and/or clarify misunderstandings about their publications. In the discussion chapter the researcher will argue whether their participation in the dialogues impacts on the impartiality of their media outlets or not. Though before that, the remaining 4 interviewees' responses on this topic will be separately presented since these respondents periodically express their attitudes on Facebook. The analysis about this issue will be taken up in the following sub-section.

4.3.1. Postings and Engagement in Facebook Discussions

In this sub-section the last 4 participant's interpretations regarding their engagement in the discussions with their Facebook friends will be presented. The reason as to why the analysis on this subject matter was divided and taken up separately is that these respondents sometimes express their opinions on Facebook. One among the interviewed participants is a columnist; more precisely, he is an opinion journalist in a way. Accordingly he is allowed to express considerations in his publications. Despite the researcher was attempting to uncover if he also applies Facebook to unveil his attitudes. Most importantly, the last 3 interviewees affirm that they try not to make strong comments or express their opinions directly on this SNS.

To start with, a political commentator 45M3 claims that he sometimes engages in the discussions if something is fun, and if he has something more to say. Besides, his engagement in the dialogues is at times connected to misunderstandings. "Sometimes people will express opinions about what you have written and it is fine; I want sort of take what are their opinions about the topic I have written. If they are giving me opinions, I say: you read me wrong or there is nothing in the text that backs up for this". Moreover, he affirms that since he works for the big newspaper, it is common that people start discussion about his publications- "That is a part of the game". Furthermore, this participant uncovers that he does not add more info about the issues on his Facebook Wall. As he claims, he tries to include everything in the pieces he daily works with. Since he is an opinion journalist the question how he was maintaining impartiality while posting on Facebook was not applicable for him. Although, it was interesting to find out what his attitude was towards this issue. He stresses that there is a big difference between how the readers

comment on media outlets on the online version of the newspaper and how they engage in the discussions on Facebook. Additionally, he assumes that people tend to be more positive on Facebook since there is friendly atmosphere on this SNS; hence the readers try to be nicer.

In addition, 45M3 in the interviewing process was willing to express how the news reporters deal with impartiality while they are posting their attitudes on Facebook. As he considers, there is a big difference between how older and younger journalists employ social media. “Younger reporters that are sort of “digitals” don’t mess so much with this. They have the instinct feel how they use social media. For me it seems like that. That is a trouble for older journalist; they are biased and they get critics. Some of them post some stuff on Facebook ... that is a little weird”.

As opposed to the latter, the next participant 27M7 claims that he has never expressed his own thoughts in the publications he works with. Moreover, he affirms that sometimes he interviews people he strongly disagrees with but this factor cannot influence the ways he is working with his articles. As he considers- “The quality of the questions you asked in the article should be sufficient for your clarity that you are neutral. If you engage in the discussions, you end up with the situation that your credibility it getting lower”. On the other hand, when it comes to expressing his opinions on Facebook, he argues that he does not like journalists who employ this network to promote their attitudes; due to this he tries to avoid doing the same. Though he admits that- “but sometimes when the case if strong enough I tend to not to want to shut up”. On the question why he periodically expresses his considerations, he answers that there are some things that he needs to care about. Although as he says, he does not reveal his opinions about the stories he works with. Herewith he gives an example about a story that was published in one newspaper. The article was concerning a foreign man who killed his wife and accordingly he was put in the prison. His children were given temporary residence permit by *UDI* for being in Norway- “and my question was: why did not they get permanent residence? Why they need to fulfill the obligations for three years? That annoys me, that makes me angry in so many levels, because it is a way to handle people that I don’t appreciate and this is why I posted: this is why? Why?”. On the question how often he is posting this kind of feelings, he claims- “too much, but from the outside it will be seen as too little”. In addition, he admits that when he is getting annoyed, he writes something really angry, but before publishing it he asks himself whether this will open up unnecessary discussions and whether this will be problematic to the case later. “So, the things I

tend to write before I press the button “post” are quite a lot more than what actually gets online”. Though, he affirms that in the publications, whether he agrees or not, he might be impartial since in that process he is not a private person with personal opinions. In addition, he states that he tends to get his personal opinions as far away as possible.

The next participant 38M2 also affirms that he seldom engages in the discussions with his connections on Facebook. He argues that he attempts not to be very personal on this SNS since he is a journalist and he sometimes applies Facebook professionally. He further explains that some part of his Facebook friends are potential sources and this is why he tries not to be very direct and personal with strong opinions. “But indirectly people who follow me on Facebook will understand my opinion, because I, for instance, post mostly stories where I agree with the political subtexts of that story. So, indirectly people who follow me on Facebook will understand what my opinion is”. Hereby he gives an example regarding refugee children being in Norway and admits that he will not say straight that the government is terrible wrong and that these children should be allowed to stay in the country but as he considers, by posting about this issue his Facebook connections will guess what his view point is.

After revealing his approach regarding posting on Facebook, the question concerning how he maintains impartiality in his publications was evidently asked. He answers that this is very difficult and this is dilemma for him. Due to this he attempts to be indirect on this SNS. Besides, he claims that for a long time he did not have any Facebook friends apart from his actual friends and acquaintances. “A lot of politicians added me on Facebook and I didn’t want to accept them, because I wanted to be able to write what I wanted. I wanted to express my personal opinions, and I was afraid that maybe many of these politicians then would find out that I didn’t agree with them and then they would not trust me as a journalist”. He further affirms that couple of month ago when he accepted friend requests on Facebook from some politicians, then he accepted the rest of them. Due to this, currently he tries to be more careful and to be less personal on this social network.

Thus, as 38M2 responses underscore before adding politicians on Facebook, this platform was an arena to reveal his opinions about the issues at times. Although he argues that in spite of the fact that he no more publishes directly what his thoughts are, people can guess what his considerations about some certain issues are. “Maybe before I would post about refugee children

and say this is a shame, read my article about how these children are treated, but now I might only publish the article but not write anything about my opinion”. At the end, he stresses that recently he attempts to apply Facebook as more public profile, whist before he would sometimes use this social network to express his attitudes.

Likewise the previous participant, 45F2 states that she periodically engages in the discussions with her Facebook connections. “It depends on what kind of story it is. Some stories are more engaging and some stories are not, I can talk about the people on Facebook, I can do that. Depends on what kind of story, what kind of person and content it is, of course. You can take up considerations”. Although, she states that she will neither make strong comments nor express her opinions at the moment when she has something more to say. Herewith she gives an example. She affirms that couple of years ago she wrote an article about the wages of the Norwegian politicians. As she considers, it was a strong story and she did not comment on it then, but afterwards she started commenting on the content. “I felt I had to wait little bit before I would start commenting on their opinions”. In addition, she recalls one politician woman from one certain political party. 45F2 states that that politician was voting for higher salary for herself. “It is morally unacceptable for politicians”. 45F2 says that the politician she was interviewing was very hard to work with. “First, she was commenting and then she said no- you cannot publish this. So, it was a tough story. In a moment I did not publish that on Facebook and did not comment on her in specific, but now, today, I have been commenting and I have been telling people what she actually said”. At the end, she reveals that she does not work for that media organization anymore therefore she could comment on this story on Facebook.

To sup up, the analysis process on this subject matter underscored differences between the participants’ approaches regarding use of Facebook as an arena to engage in the discussions, and to spread their private considerations about the issues they work with. This topic will be evidently discussed in the following chapter in terms of objectivity in journalism and journalistic ethics. Since the second RQ attempts to discover whether Facebook usage among the interviewees impact on the impartiality of their media publications, these 4 participants’ responses on this subject matter will be thoroughly assessed. The researcher will argue how these respondents’ engagement in the dialogues with their Facebook connections and their indirectly or directly postings as private persons harm the impartiality of their media outlets. Before moving to the

discussion chapter, the last section of the analysis chapter will be presented. This time the focus will be made on whether the interviewed journalists separate their professional and private lives on Facebook or not.

4.4. Professional VS Private Life on Facebook

In this section of the analysis chapter focus will be made on whether the interviewed journalists separate their professional lives from their private lives on Facebook or not. The analysis on this subject matter discovered that 7 out of 12 the interviewees do not separate their lives on this SNS. As they argue, this platform is a mixture of private and work contents. Only one participant (44F3) admits that she has two Facebook profiles- one for the professional work and another one for the private purposes. In addition, 2 participants uncover (25F1 and 37M6) that their Facebook employment is more connected to private life, while another 2 (38M2 and 45M3) employ Facebook mostly for professional reasons. In addition, digging into their responses did underscore neither similarities nor differences between the age groups. Thus, in order to satisfactory present their approaches on this topic their responses will be chronologically illustrated.

To start with, many of the participants argue that separation of professional and private life on Facebook is very difficult since every Facebook user has only one news feed where professional publications and pictures from one's private life are broadcasted next to each other. 28F4 (having over 1,000 Facebook friends) claims that one should constantly think about how professional and private life can be balanced on Facebook. As she uncovers, she should have met a person personally at least once before accepting a friend request on Facebook. "I don't write how I am feeling but I have photos when I am drunk; but as long as there are people that I sort of know, it is ok. Now I have a lot of politicians as Facebook friends, but I see them almost every day and I see what they are doing, so the balance is restored". She further states that from the professional angle, Facebook is a very useful tool. The next participant-28M5 claims that what he posts on Facebook is not private, but public; hence one should discuss the degrees of how public it is and to whom the content is accessible. As he argues, the content he broadcasts on Facebook is at least

visible for all of his Facebook friends who can talk about the revealed content; due to this the published content is not private at any level. “I don’t think, in practice there is a need to separate private and public life on Facebook, because everything is public; but then you can separate whether you post something from your private life or post something from work”.

Furthermore, 32M4 affirms that private and work life limit each other for him. He says that he rarely posts personal and professional things on this platform, though he claims- “I am not quite happy with the way I am using Facebook right now, maybe I should have another Facebook account that can be more professional”. He reveals that there is a potential to apply Facebook more actively for the work-related purposes, but he has not done it yet.

On the question how she separates both the work-related and personal content on Facebook, 32F5 answers- “This is a tough one. My network wants us to share links to get traffic through Facebook. I only share stuff I really like. I rarely have my own status updates; it’s mostly for trying to get in touch with persons I need to personify a story”. She also talks about the dilemma she is facing while employing this social network. As she admits, she posts pictures of her two kids since she is a proud mom; accordingly she wants to show family and friends how the little ones are doing. On the other hand, she admits that she is friend of many politicians and sources on this SNS who are also able to see the content she broadcasts. Due to this when she occasionally meets the latter, they start talking about the private content she has published on Facebook. Moreover, as she argues the professional connections allow her to take a step into their personal lives. Thus, she considers this as being a dilemma for her.

Likewise the other participants, 45M3 affirms that it is very difficult to separate private and professional life on Facebook. He further claims that some of the profile journalists employ Facebook to publish private content to receive people’s attention. As he states, by doing this the readers have illusion that they know the journalists personally. In that way the readers become more interested in the stories the latter works with. “You are sort of the guide of the world of politics and international conflicts. In a way people are more interested about the things you are reporting on and they follow you in this world”.

Additionally, 27M7 says that he would like to give a long speech that he separates his work and personal life on Facebook, but he does not. “That’s problem; that is why am so careful about

posting. I also don't add as friends people that I don't like. There are some politicians that are in my opinion racists, phobic, everything putting together. Those I would not have on my Facebook, because I would not tolerate with them and I don't want them to see what my opinions sometimes are". Apart from this, he admits that his relationship status on Facebook is not open and his friend list is also closed. As he affirms, he at times hides some certain stories from some certain politicians since he does not want to show them to these politicians.

Likewise the previous interviewees, 45F2 argues that she mixes her personal and professional contents on Facebook. Though, she states that she employs this application more professionally and this is a reason as to why she is never very personal. "I have opinions, but I try to control them, because it is a bit of a mess".

"I would not like to mix my ski experiences with my articles on Facebook" (44F4). As it was explained, only this participant utilizes two Facebook profiles to separate the work-related and personal content on this SNS. As opposed to the latter, the other participants employ only one Facebook account where all kind of content is combined. Though, 38M2, 37M6 and 28F4 state that they have access to the official Facebook profiles of the media organizations they work for.

The next 4 participants claim that they for the greater part use Facebook either for professional or for personal life. As 37M6 admits, he looks at his own Facebook profile as more private platform. Despite of the fact that he continuously applies this network as a research tool, he has to be very happy about his own publication to share it on Facebook. "I am musician; so, on Facebook I don't want to mix my personal life with my professional life" (laughs...). Since he mostly works with news stories, he considers that there is nothing special with this kind of content to broadcast them on his Facebook account. Contrary to the latter, 38M2 claims that he has never been very private on Facebook. More precisely, as he says he has never published very personal pictures from his private life. Though, he affirms that before becoming friend with many professional connections, politicians, he used to employ Facebook as a place where he would express his own opinions about some certain issues. 45M3 also applies Facebook professionally; accordingly he is less private person on this network.

In addition, 25F1 affirms that she does not utilize Facebook professionally in terms of promoting her publications. Furthermore, she states that it is very difficult to separate professional and

personal life on this application since Facebook is transparent. “I want to be as a private person and I don’t want people to get too much expose to what I am doing, even though it might have been better for me. I am so modest now, (laughs)”. She further adds that journalists might be more aware what they are doing on Facebook. Precisely, as she says, it is up to a certain person whether she/he wants to make use of Facebook as a promoting channel for himself/herself or not.

To summarize, the ways the participants attempt to separate their personal and professional lives on Facebook differ at significant levels. The analysis showed that 7 respondents do not divide professional/private content on this SNS; whilst a few of them claim to be either more personal or more private on Facebook. The participants, who describe their employment of this platform as a mixture of every kind of content, uncover couple of the methods regarding how they attempt to balance personal/professional life on their Facebook profiles. Knowing personally all the connections that are on their Facebook friend list; trying to be less personal and avoiding posting very private pictures, and hiding some stories from some certain connections (mostly politicians)- were named as the cardinal methods they apply to maintain the balance between the private- and work-related content on Facebook. The issue whether separation of work-life and private-life on this SNS matters will be taken up in the discussion chapter. The blurred boundaries between the public/private content on Facebook will be given a great importance. In this respect the researcher will argue how Facebook employment can affect the relationships between the participants and their Facebook connections who are also their potential sources. Additionally, focus will be made on whether the readers’ possibility to take a step in these participants’ private lives can influence the ways the readers interpret their publications.

4.5. Summary of the Analysis Chapter

In short, the methodology chapter was four-folded. The division of this chapter was based both on the RQs and the issues emerged at the stage of the data collection process. The biggest section was devoted to the work-related Facebook usage among the participants. On this stage various motives behind employing this platform were emerged. The second section considered the interviewees’ Facebook utilization as private persons during the workflow; while the third section

presented the analysis regarding whether the respondents apply Facebook to engage in the discussions with their Facebook connections or not. In addition, this section demonstrated whether the interviewees use this network to broadcast their own considerations about some certain issues. Lastly, the fourth part of the analysis chapter showed how the participants attempt either to balance their work-life and personal-life or to separate them on Facebook.

Thus, the analysis chapter illustrated the empirical data gained from the participants. Similarities and differences between the age groups have been presented at some level; though, the similar tendencies across the age groups did not emerge at a greater part. Evidently the following chapter will devote to the researcher's discussions based on the supportive theories and approaches considered in the theory chapter. Moreover, the empirical data will be assessed in terms of RQs and hypotheses of the researcher.

5. Discussions

The discussion chapter of this qualitative study will present the cardinal findings of this empirical work. It will also assess the results in terms of the RQs and applicable theories. This chapter will be two-folded. The first section will argue how the interviewed journalists' Facebook employment affects the reliability of their publications. In doing so, the findings will be considered in light of UGC, CMC, and Cyberpsychology. In order to answer on the first RQ, the participants' personal- and work-related Facebook usage during the workflow will be discussed.

The second section of this chapter will argue how the respondents' engagement in Facebook discussions and expressing personal opinions impact on the impartiality of their publications. This topic will be discussed in terms of objectivity in journalism and journalistic ethics. In order to answer on the second RQ, the researcher's arguments will count on the interviewees' responses on this subject matter. In addition, how the latter separate their professional and private lives on this SNS will also be considered.

5.1 Moving on Findings

Remembering, Jensen (2011) considers three degrees of media, whereas the last degree is described in terms of digital forms of communication between individuals. By him, computers and smart phones are the evident examples how the printed and digital media are combined. In this respect SNS- Facebook equally presents the confluence of the digital and printed media. In addition, this SNS engages its users on this platform at significant levels in everyday life. Due to this, the researcher will claim how the participants' Facebook utilization leads to negative effects on their daily routines and their media publications.

The analysis chapter discovered that the participants apply Facebook during the workflow in a wide range of manners. Accordingly, the researcher's hypotheses were tested and they occurred to be reasonable. At first, the discussion part will look at the work-related Facebook employment among these journalists. On the other hand, the discussion part will focus on the participants'

Facebook usage for private purposes during the workflow. Hence the main goal of this section is arguing how use of Facebook during the workflow affects the reliability of the participants' publications.

5.1.1. Facebook Effects on Workflow

Among various reasons as to why the interviewees apply Facebook during the workflow were as follows: Facebook- as a channel to gain information and as an arena to spread media outlets. These topics will be discussed later in light of Cyberpsychology which uncovers the motives behind using this SNS.

This time the focus will rather be made on the analysis regarding how the participants utilize content published on Facebook. The greatest importance will be given to whether Facebook can be used as a source of information for media publications or not. In addition, background researching via Facebook will be thoroughly considered. The issues concerning Facebook as a connecting/contacting and interviewing platform will also be assessed.

5.1.2. Reliability of Facebook Content

“But if they don't reply, I will have no problem just to quote the Facebook post. Actually today, in today's newspaper, I am quoting some people from Facebook. They are not politicians, they are doctors”. (28F4) “If a politician will write something on Facebook, maybe I will refer the Facebook post in my article.”(38M2)

The analysis stage discovered that all participants apply Facebook as a research tool during the workflow at some level. The latter continuously look for information that can be either interesting for them or relevant for their publications. Though the ways they use content broadcasted on Facebook differ at certain levels. 7 interviewees admit that they double check all sorts of content published on Facebook; while 5 (32M1, 28F4, 32F5, 27M7 and 38M2) participants periodically employ Facebook content. As the latter claim, they only utilize content spread by some certain

politicians and public figures. Among these journalists content published by public persons are considered as being credible, official and trustworthy. Though, the researcher affirms that Facebook profiles can be run over by others who are able to spread content by the name of the actual owner of the Facebook account. Hence content broadcasted on this SNS must be treated as informal information since Facebook allows everyone to publish all kind of content easily.

To strengthen the researcher's argument on this issue UGC will be applied. Since Web 2.0 technologies allow any given user to spread information easily, UGC- such as Facebook is challenging the traditional media (Balasubramaniam, 2009, p.28). Maras (2013) states that digitalization makes possible continual updating in multiple media forms and platforms. "Though, in turn, the speed of reporting causes inaccuracies and shallow reporting" (Maras, 2013, p. 177). Additionally, Brent Cunningham notes that the nonstop news cycle leaves journalists less time to dig; due to this, they rely on official sources who can provide information succinctly and quickly. "This lack of time makes a simpleminded and lazy version of objectivity all the more tempting" (Maras, 2013, p.177). In this respect the researcher claims that utilization of any given content generated from Facebook is "lazy versions" of gaining information. Presumably relying on this kind of content can lead to producing of news/articles based on incorrect or misinterpreted information. Thus, the researcher states that in order to be any given Facebook content considered as credible, it must be revised and further checked. Since on the one hand, the journalists work under general principle to tell the truth and avoid harm, and on the other hand, as professionals they have social power to construct political agenda (Ward, 2009, p. 296). Possible usage of Facebook content that can be incorrect or unofficial logically raises the risk that the reliability of the journalists' publications decreases.

"Quotes are a vital ingredient of journalism, adding authority, drama and powerful or colloquial expression to an account" (Harcup, 2004, p. 103). Consequently revising the content broadcasted on Facebook is essential regardless the potential author of any spread content. In doing so, the journalists will be able to avoid harm and produce their publications based on materials checked and revised personally with the sources. Moreover, this topic raises ethical issues. In terms of Internet studies, Baym (2011) states that users of SNSs have little, if any, choice to opt out of how their data are utilized once they have published them on SNSs. In addition, the users of

SNSs are not informed about the uses to which the data/content they broadcast online may be put/further utilized (Baym, 2011, p. 400).

Furthermore, 4 (28M5,45F2,25F1 and 32M1) respondents mention that they at times make use of Facebook to revise bio, work experience, education and social- political relations of some certain individuals. In order to argue whether gaining any personal information via this SNS can cause negative effects on the participants' workflow Identity in CMCs will be applied. Baym (2011) stresses following- "Facebook requires real names, although their system for recognizing authenticity is flawed, resulting in multiple profiles bearing the names of celebrities, businesses, or websites (p. 390). On the other hand, Kendall (2011) states that interaction limitations of online forums can make it hard to be sure of the identities of all members (p. 319). While Paollilo and Zelenkauskaitė (2013) underscore that chat participants have different options in representing their identities. Since chat systems rarely require authentication, users are able to easily conceal their off-line identities (p.110). Thus, these scholars discuss the possible ways of how factual information can be spread incorrectly in SNSs and in other chat systems.

Based on these authors' attitudes towards Identity in CMCs, the researcher claims that personal information of any given person can be incorrectly presented on Facebook. Digging into this kind of content on this SNS can lead to time wasting which logically negatively affects participants' work processes. Due to the insecure nature of Facebook, avoiding researching some particular individuals' personal details (such as bio) can curtail probability that the journalists will waste time and will be mistaken at the end. As already explained, employing data/content from SNSs needs verification with the potential sources to protect the privacy of the authors of any given content. Verification of content guarantees avoiding raising ethical questions in terms of further usage of any content.

In short, this section considered how the respondents' employment of Facebook content can negatively impact on the reliability of their publications. The following section will rather focus on the use of Facebook as a communication medium between the participants and their sources. Negative effects of CMC will also be taken up.

5.1.3. CMC-based Interactions

The scholars claimed that CMC is not neutral and it can lead to many changes in the way people interact with each other. CMC can also affect the communication patterns and social networks since this kind of communication is unlike FTF communication. According to Bakardjieva (2011) the second level of social impacts of technologies describes how people employ the technology to accomplish new goals. This, in turn, derives new functions that have no equivalents in the preceding state of affairs (p. 68). As she affirms, social impacts of technologies cause qualitative changes in everyday life. She further adds that the recent researches have been plausible on this subject matter (Bakardjieva, 2011, p. 68).

The researcher claims that Facebook as a “descendent” of CMC does affect the ways the users of this SNS interact with each other. Mia Consalvo (2011) argues that the impact of internet on individuals is fundamental. The way how people seek information, how they organize daily work and communicate with each other is changed by the choice people make regarding use of Internet (Consalvo, 2011, p. 111). The participants of this study also differ in terms of employing Facebook for communication purposes. Hence this section will assess the ways they apply this SNS in the process of approaching their sources.

“It is easier to see on Facebook when politicians are online and text them” (28F4).

Thus, another incentive for employing Facebook among the respondents was communication with sources. Almost all participants affirm that the first contact with any given source can be achieved on Facebook. Despite of the fact that among the participants the preferable contacting medium with sources was calling, 7 (28F4, 37M7, 38M2, 44F3, 32F5, 32M1 and 25F1) of them underscore that Facebook can be a convenient place to contact their respondents. Thus, these respondents periodically contact their potential sources via Facebook; although they do not apply this SNS to carry out interviews. As opposed to the latter, 3 participants admit that they at times conduct interviews on Facebook. According to this, the researcher will argue how conducting interviews on this SNS can affect the reliability of the content of their media outlets.

For instance, 32M1 claims that Facebook does not have the high level of security hence mobile conversations and e-mails are more secure ways for conducting an interview; however he seldom

but still uses Facebook to carry out interviews. The reason for conducting interviews via this SNS is the physical absence of any given source. If a potential source is sitting at the conference and he is not able to answer on his questions via phone, 32M1 considers acceptable to conduct an interview via Facebook. The latter also affirms to be able to quote content gained through Facebook chat, since he knows personally the person he is in contact with via this network at certain moments. Though, the researcher argues that interviewing sources via Facebook chat is informal way of gaining content. Additionally, none of the journalists can totally be assured in the personality of any individual they are typing to on this SNS.

Furthermore, another incentive for applying Facebook to carry out interviews was described by 27M7 as being easier than the other mediums. 27M7 also argues that this social network is convenient when attempting to contact sources sitting at the meetings. The researcher claims that it is questionable how objective and informative attitudes they gain from the sources who are simultaneously occupied with other additional affairs; probably with more significant ones. This can also affect the quality of the media outlets that these journalists produce. In terms of CMCs Holton (2008) stresses “They can reach around the world and be used by those in the same room. They differ in the degree to which they convey social presence “(p. 12). Moreover, Fulk et al. (1992) argue that individuals are different in terms of their use of CMC systems. As they claim, some of the individuals stem from differing individual skills, personal preferences and communication task imperatives. Each individual has a history of communications/interactions that at some level structures their perceptions of surroundings and events (Fulk, et al. 1992, p.16). Fult et al. (1992) also consider that social influences impact on the meanings that individuals attach to symbols, attitudes and behaviors, as well as interpretations of the events (Fulk et al., 1992, p. 16). Since human beings differ at the level they structure their interpretations of events, attitudes etc., content generated on Facebook chat can be interpreted in different ways, conformably causing different outcomes.

Kollock & Smith (1996) consider that CMCs have powerful effects on social relationships. According to them, in many CMC situations some particular behavior can be justifiable and reasonable for an individual, but this can cause poorer outcome for all. These kinds of situations are defined as social dilemmas (p. 109). The researcher connects this approach to Brent Cunningham statement. As already explained, the latter considers how reporters rely on official

sources who provide the information succinctly and quickly in online era (Maras, 2013, p.177). Thus, gaining information via Facebook chat function is simpleminded and lazy method of gaining content which can impact on the accuracy of the media content. In this respect interviews based on Facebook chat system can assist producing of less reliable publications based on inaccuracies and insufficient information.

Furthermore, 44F3 admits that she has also carried out an interview on Facebook. “I could find people to interview in that debate because there were a lot of opinions. I found one of the experts through Facebook. I contacted and interviewed him via Facebook chat function”. The researcher over again affirms that the quality of the content gained through Facebook chat function differs from the content gained through FTF interaction. As Spears & Lea (1992) explain, FTF interactions are socially rich and personalized than communications conducted via some certain medium. Additionally, Lori Kendall (2011) underscores how the participants of virtual communities can mask their identities (p.318); while Donath (1999) states that “Knowing the identity of those with whom you communicate is essential for understanding and evaluating an interaction” (Kendall, 2011, p.318). Based on these arguments, the researcher’s statement is that interaction between an interviewer and an interviewee conducted on Facebook messenger is neither socially rich nor satisfactory personalized. Most importantly, an interviewer can never be totally assured in the identity of sources in virtual communities. This factor becomes more considerable when interviewing individuals on this SNS without ever having met them personally.

Furthermore, Bargh, Katelyn and McKenna (2004) consider that individuals’ behaviors in CMCs are more self-centered and less socially regulated than usual (p.578). They also underlined that real-time interactions, physical proximity and non-verbal expressions are vital to the process of relating to each other’s effectivity. Additionally, by providing an alternative way of communication in which relationships and communication play somewhat different rules- they have accordingly different outcomes (Bargh & McKenna, 2004, p. 578). Hence carrying out interviews via Facebook lacks personalization of sources. Identity of the latter can equally be questioned. Possibly the lack of time can lead to avoiding follow-up questions that are significant to produce content in a sufficient way. Due to this, these factors apparently negatively affect the reliability of the gained Facebook content.

To summarize, the researcher has argued how Facebook employment for the work-related purposes can affect the reliability of the participants' media outlets. In short, the risk to gain incorrect information is relatively high when journalists apply content derived from Facebook. Considering Facebook posts of any public persons as reliable can impact on the reliability and accuracy of the journalists' media outlets. In addition, employing Facebook as an arena for conducting interviews with sources was criticized. Since as CMC and scholars in this field discover, CMC is unlike FTF interaction which leads to different outcomes of social relationships. Moreover, how users of SNSs interpret attitudes, surroundings and events differ from real-time communication where non-verbal interaction and physical proximity play an important role. In the discussion process Identity in CMCs has given great importance. Since users of SNSs are able to use any name to mask their real-time identities, interviewing sources on Facebook by the participants was criticized. Taking into consideration these factors the probability that the journalists will produce less reliable media publications increases.

Moving on the issues regarding personal Facebook usage, the following section will consider which personality traits of the participants influence Facebook usage. Apparently how this usage affects on their work processes will also be assessed.

5.2. Personal Facebook Usage

SNSs are mingling the boundaries between the public and private life, leisure and work time. "Theoretically, it is up to the individual how much disclosure happens online, what platforms are used, what privacy settings are chosen, who is followed and befriended, what types of posts are sent, what can be automated, and how much time is spent on these activities" (Mrva-Montoya, Summer 2012).

In this section the respondents' Facebook usage for the private purposes during the workflow will be assessed. The analysis chapter showed that all the respondents use this SNS either constantly or relatively rarely on a regular work day. Presumably the researcher affirms that the participants'

Facebook utilization during the work processes affects their daily routines. Precisely, the researcher's main argument is that this SNS distracts concentration that leads to poorer outcomes in terms of producing reliable publications.

The analysis uncovered variable attitudes towards employing Facebook as a private person during the workflow. 6 participants make use of this social application constantly; whilst the others claim to be less active Facebook users. However all of them apply Facebook on a regular work day at some level. Before arguing whether this usage affects their work processes, the motives behind using Facebook among the participants will be further discussed.

In the theory chapter the big five personality traits in terms of using SNSs were presented. This section in light of Cyberpsychology will attempt to stress the reasons as to why the respondents use Facebook while they are at work. Remembering, Cyberpsychology is examining how people interact with each other employing technologies and how people's behavior can be influenced in this process. Additionally, it also studies how the psychological state can be affected by use of technologies. Power & Kirwan (2014) discuss Cyberpsychology (which is related to CMC) in terms of personality traits and motivations that influence Facebook usage. Hence this approach assisted the researcher to discover how and why the participants use Facebook during the workflow.

Digging into the gained data on this subject matter has detected diverse responses. Assessing the empirical data in terms of age groups did not emphasize any similarities on this topic. Despite of all the respondents admit that they use Facebook for private bearings during the workflow, nevertheless their responses differ when it comes to frequency of logging on this SNS. Additionally, 2 (38M2 and 45M3) respondents claim that they utilize this SNS mostly for the work-related purposes; while another 2 (25F1 and 37M6) seem to be rather private persons on Facebook. The discussion chapter by applying Cyberpsychology considers which personality traits of the participants play important role when employing Facebook. In addition, these traits will shed light on whether frequency of logging on this SNS can influence their daily routines or not.

Among 6 most active Facebook users keeping in touch with people, typing to friends, checking what is happening on their Facebook Walls, what their connections share and like were stressed

as the cardinal reasons to log on this SNS. The rest participants describe themselves as less active Facebook users for private bearings during the work processes; still keeping an eye on what is happening on their Facebook Walls couple of times a day motivates them to log on Facebook.

Among the most active Facebook users personality trait described as “openness to experience” was prevailing. The latter refers to: “being imaginative, cultured, curious, original, broad-minded, intelligent, and artistically sensitive” (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 30). As Werli (2008) posits, individuals with high scores on “openness to experiences” have more willing to try, use, and adopt new technologies (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p.30). In this respect this personality trait affects these 6 participants’ frequency of logging on Facebook.

Although some respondents (for instance 32M4) claim that they check this SNS only couple of times a day. Still they admit that they response people via Facebook message function. In addition, having a Facebook application with the cell-phone was mentioned by these participants. Since these respondents do not apply continuously Facebook during a regular work day, their Facebook utilization is related to the trait described as “*Conscientiousness*”. The latter applies to being responsible, cheerful, planful and organized (Power & Kirwan, 2014, p. 29). These types of persons are outstanding in terms of their discipline; they are concentrated to achievement of aims and they are dutiful.

Spreading information through Facebook and highlighting the circulation of the articles written either by themselves of their co-workers was named as of the ways participants use Facebook for. The analysis stage discovered that the interviewees have different approaches in terms sharing/spreading media publications. 38M2, 27M7, 32F5 and 37M6 admit that if a story is unusual and different from the ordinary news stories they might be willing to spread the latter to increase the number of the readers. While 28M5, 28F4, 45F2 and 45F3 either often or constantly share their publications to promote the circulation of the articles belonging to their media companies. These participants’ Facebook usage can be referred to the trait-“*Agreeableness*”. This personality trait uncovers an individual’s tendency to be perceived as sympathetic, trusting and cooperative. “According to Costa and McCrae (1992) the agreeable person is fundamentally altruistic; they are eager to help others, and believe others will be equally helpful in return” (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29). Moreover, Costa and McCrae state that agreeable persons seem to have favorable impact on social interactions (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 29).

The respondents (25F1 and 37M6) who claim that their Facebook usage is mostly connected to private purposes state that they do not mix their private life with their profession. According to them, since separation of private and personal life on this social network is difficult, they chose to be more private on this network. In terms of personality traits, the researcher argues that this tendency is related to the trait “*extraversion*”. The latter refers to equally both to be socially active and to have ability to experience positive emotions. (Power & Kirwan, 2014 p. 28) “In addition to liking people and being sociable, Costa and McCrae (1992) argue that extraverts are assertive, talkative, active and cheerful in disposition”. According to Nadkarni and Hofmann (2012), users who are high on extraversion use Facebook as a platform for alternative social activities. “I am a musician”, “I don’t want to mix my ski experiences with my articles”, “I want to be private”- these attitudes were mentioned among the respondents who claim to be rather private persons on this SNS.

Thus, the motives behind applying Facebook among the participants during the workflow either for work-related or private purposes in terms of personality traits were discussed. The researcher claims that these traits affect the participants’ Facebook usage. Moreover, personal motivations behind Facebook employment influence the frequency of logging on Facebook during a work day. As majority of the participants emphasize having Facebook application with their cell-phones they are able to use this SNS at any time. Herewith the researcher argues that using Facebook during the workflow for various incentives (discussed above) can distract concentration. Since Social media are pervasive, user-friendly, non-technical and focused on interaction and collaboration, these factors conformably affect users’ psychological state, behavior and professional productivity (in this case).

Moreover, the applications are platform independent in the way that they are equally available on computers, mobile phones and on every conceivable device (Power & Kirwan, 2014, p. 15). Additionally, social media are unlike FTF communication in the way that they are not focused on employing the software in isolation to perform some tasks; rather their focus is on interaction, collaboration and working in groups. “But when online they are part of a community of users and contributing to the nature of the experience of all the others” (Power & Kirwan, 2014, p. 15). Taking into consideration these circumstances, the researcher affirms that high frequency of logging on this SNS causes negative effects on the workflow. As Ariyur et al., (2008) claims, one

of the biggest concerns regarding SNS is that productivity will be affected negatively, because employees may spend too much time networking and posting entries on blogs and wikis. There is also a risk that employees will utilize it for more social purposes and not on work-related postings (Ariyur, 2008; ClearSwift, 2007b; MessageLabs, 2007a; Shirky, 2008, In Zyl, 2009, p. 913).

In addition, the researcher applies to a research based on the 329 completed surveys, containing multi-ethnic participants. The aim of this research was examination of publishing professionals' responses who were conducting structural editing of any given publication as an important part of their daily work routines. The results of this study indicate that despite the relative advantages of social media tools and their compatibility with many aspects of the editing profession, they are perceived as being time-consuming, distractive, and inappropriate for work and "these costs can outweigh the benefits of their use" (Mrva-Montoya, summer 2012). By applying this study, the researcher's claims that the participants' activeness on Facebook during the workflow distracts their concentration and leads to time wasting; this, in turn, might decrease the quality of their media outlets. Hence high frequency of applying Facebook does affect work processes and the respondents' psychological state at significant levels.

Summing up, the researcher has argued which aspects of Facebook utilization during the workflow affects the participants' daily journalistic work. The issues concerning the private- and work-related Facebook usage that can influence the reliability of the respondents' outlets have been discussed. In the following section the focus will be made on how the participants' posting and engagement in Facebook discussions affect impartiality of their outlets. In doing so, the researcher will attempt to present her arguments in order to answer on the second RQ.

5.3. Participation in Facebook Dialogues

"Ethical reasoning is about how people interpret, balance and modify their principles in light of new facts, technologies, and new social conditions" (Ward, 2009, p. 296).

The second RQ seeks answers on whether the participants' engagements in Facebook discussions and their open criticism affect the impartiality of their media publications or not. The analysis process on the respondents' levels of drawing in Facebook dialogues stressed little bit more difference between the age groups. 3 out of the 12 participants claim that they do not engage in discussions with their Facebook connections. These participants are relatively younger female respondents (25F1, 28F4, 32F5). On the other hand, their engagements in dialogues by another 5 (44F3, 28M5, 32M4, 32M1 and 37M6) interviewees were described as an attempt to answer their readers' questions. Additionally, they sometimes add relevant info and clear up possible misunderstandings around their publications. As opposed to the latter, the rest 4 (45F2, 38M2, 27M7 and 45M3) respondents periodically engage in Facebook discussions and express their personal opinions.

First, the discussion part will look at the responses of the younger participants who do not take part in Facebook dialogues. Not employing a "like" faction of Facebook (28F4); staying as private as possible (25F1), and having many left and right side politicians as Facebook friends (32F5) - were stressed by them as to why they avoid participation in discussions on this SNS. As 28F4 uncovers she can tell a person that she likes his-her post either via Facebook chat or face-to-face, but she never likes a certain post officially on Facebook. In contrast, 25F1 claims that it is not forbidden to like certain things; though since she covers different stories as a political reporter, she needs to be perceived as an unbiased journalist by the readers. On the other side, 32F5 admits that it is tempting to engage in Facebook dialogues as people tend to write many things she has more knowledge about. Although her activeness on Facebook encompasses mostly sharing links; at times satirical links, that is risky too (she assumes).

Thus, these participants neither take part in discussions nor express their opinions on this social network; though their motives behind being solely professional on this network differ. While 28F4 highlights the importance of the function-"like" on Facebook; 25F1 gives preference to the readers' perceptions towards her as unbiased journalist; in turn, 32F5 underlines having political figures as Facebook connections from both political wings. Though they have once thing in common- they restrain themselves from being subjective on Facebook. In this respect the impartiality of their publications cannot be questioned. The researcher affirms that these interviewees' Facebook usage does not include expressing personal opinions at any level.

Moreover, they have full awareness of how a reporter should act in social media to stay unbiased and objective. “Therefore, ethics, especially journalistic ethics, is essentially a practical activity (Black, Steele, & Barney, 1999) that seeks reasons to questions of how to act” (Ward, 2009, p. 296).

The next 5 participants their engagements in Facebook discussions describe as answering on the questions and clarifying misunderstandings around their publications. 4 out of these participants (all of them are male respondents) mention rules of their media companies concerning how reporters should behave while being on social media. The last fifth participant 44F3 (freelancer, female) does not recall guidelines during the interview, as opposed to the other 4 interviewees. Additionally, she admits that discussions around the topics she has written mostly take place on the online versions of the newspapers. Besides, 44F3 states that if she has time, she will engage in the discussions to answer questions asked directly for her.

Those 4 male participants highlight the ethical guidelines also. They specify their ways of drawing in Facebook dialogues. “I will answer questions about the stories, but I do not engage in the discussions on prime minister or any political aspects of the story” (28M5); “I try not to have opinion, but if it comes to correcting impressions, I mean, if the people have misunderstood that fact in the case, then I would correct this is how you should understand my story” (32M4); “I answer questions and clarify the facts” (32M1); “ I comment as *NRK*. I just answer comments as a member of *NRK* team on shared articles. If someone is commenting or wondering about anything, I clarify” (36M6). As it is illustrated, these respondents’ Facebook usage encompasses their engagement in the discussions about the stories they have worked with at some level. Despite of all of them attempt either avoid or never leave personal attitudes on Facebook, clarifying the misunderstandings can also be risky. The researcher claims that stating what is fact and what is not can at some point influence the ways the readers perceive the content of the media publications. “Journalists as member of media organizations have rights, duties and norms because as human beings, they fall under general ethical principles such as to tell the truth and minimize harm, and because as professionals they have social power to frame the political agenda and influence public opinion” (Curd & May, 1984; Elliott, 1986; In Ward, 2006, p. 296). These respondents’ participation in Facebook discussions does not directly affect impartiality of their outlets. Although the researcher argues that these participants’ attempt to clarify the facts and

misunderstandings can indirectly affect the public opinion. Precisely, the reporters' statement how their stories should be understood by the readers can indirectly influence the impartiality of the media outlets since social media is blurred when it comes to separation of private/ public spheres. "Readers may interpret news stories in different ways but their interpretations will be based, at least in part, on what the journalist has written" (Harcup, 2004, p. 114). Thus, further clarification of the reporters what is the statement of their media outlets may cause confusion between the readers who have differently interpreted the news stories. Due to this, the researcher stresses that everything the journalists might uncover in their publications, should be included in a clear and understandable way in their publications. "When writing a story for any news organization you should always retain the idea that your text is to be read- and understood- by others" (Harcup, 2004, p. 113).

In short, these interviewees' participation in Facebook discussions may not directly impact on the impartiality of their publications. Though, in order not to be perceived the latter by the readers as the parts of stories, the participants may avoid clarifying misunderstandings around their media outlets and adding more information. On the other hand, the most significant findings on this issue will be considered in the following section. The researcher will discuss to what extend the rest 4 participants' personal postings on Facebook directly impact on the impartiality of their publications.

5.3.1. Personal Postings on Facebook

These 4 (27M7, 38M2, 45F2 and 45M3) participants differ from the others in significant aspects when it comes to level of their activeness on Facebook. These interviewees uncover that they both engage in Facebook discussions and they periodically express personal attitudes on certain issues. Therefore, this section will rather lean towards assessing their tendencies to publish personal considerations. Presumably how their postings on this SNS affect the impartiality of their media publications will be further discussed.

“You read me wrong or there is nothing in the text that backs up for this” (45M3); “People who follow me on Facebook indirectly will understand my opinion”, “I wanted to be able to write what I wanted” (38M2); “Sometimes when the case is strong enough, I tend not to want to shut up” (27M7); “I can talk about the people on Facebook, I can do that. Depends on what kind of story, person, content it is of course” (45F2).

None of these interviewees mentioned the ethical guidelines during the interview process. As it was already explained, 45M3 is a columnist and accordingly his daily work is connected to expressing his attitudes in his media publications. The researcher attempted to uncover whether he equally applies Facebook to wide-spread his own considerations or not. Contrary to the rest of the respondents, he claims that he usually neither adds any information nor answers any questions on Facebook. The reason for this is that he includes everything he wants to write about in the publication itself. Though the latter affirms that since he works for a big media company, it is common that the readers start discussing around his articles. “It is a part of the game”. Since he is a columnist, his personal postings on Facebook do not affect impartiality of his publications that are already based on his subjective opinions. Though the analysis discovered that he uses Facebook to discover what the readers’ attitudes about his media outlets are. Moreover, in some cases he clarifies and corrects the considerations of the readers. According to this, he does engage in the process how the readers interpret his arguments/statements.

The remaining 3 participants’ engagements in Facebook discussions and expressing their personal attitudes affect the impartiality of their media publications at significant levels. 27M7 admits that he periodically works with the articles he strongly disagrees, though he never expresses personal considerations in the publications. On the other side, he sometimes posts his attitudes towards certain topics as a private person on this SNS. Additionally, 38M2 affirms that before accepting politicians as Facebook friends, he used to publish his personal thoughts about the issues he usually works with. Currently due to having politicians as Facebook friends, the latter attempts to be more professional on this SNS. Although he often shares stories he agrees with the political subtexts. From his point of view, his Facebook friends can still find out what his personal attitudes about some certain topics are.

In addition, the respondent 45F2 admits that she can take part in Facebook discussions about some individuals and topics depended on the content. Though she states that she neither will

make strong comments nor express personal opinions at the moment when she has something more to say. She admits that she can post personal opinions about some issues later. She gave an example which concerns a politician who was giving her an interview. As this participant affirms, at the end the politician changed her mind and asked her not to publish the content. At that moment 45F2 did not write anything about this issue on Facebook. In turn, today she has been commenting on this story on Facebook. From the researchers' point of view, this case may raise ethical questions regarding protection of the sources as well.

According to Everette E. Dennis, objectivity in journalism can be linked to three key aims. The first aim is separating facts from opinion; the second concerns an emotionally detached view of the news, while the last one is striving for fairness and balance (Maras, 2013, p. 7). Despite of that these journalists claim to be impartial in their publications, their Facebook usage significantly impacts on the impartiality of their publications. These participants' engagements in Facebook discussions and expressing their opinions affect the ways in which their publications are interpreted by the readers. The researcher argues that since these participants' personal opinions about certain topics can be revealed on Facebook, objectivity of their outlets can be imbalanced. "That said, objectivity is an ideal or value that is seen to be essential for an ethical approach to news; to be objective is to attain good ethical standards, the basis of where journalists' social responsibilities lie" (Berry, 2008, p. 125). Remembering, these participants use Facebook to promote their publications and increase the number of their readers. In this respect their media outlets and their considerations about similar issues are replaced on the same Facebook Wall. Hence their Facebook accounts consist of the combination of the impartially covered stories and (directly or indirectly expressed) personal considerations possibly about the similar issues these participants work with.

The researcher (like the other scholars) affirms that the boundaries between private and public life is blurred on this SNS. Thus, readers who are also Facebook friends of these participants can read their articles written in an impartial way and simultaneously learn their (indirectly or directly uncovered) personal attitudes. Obviously, these factors affect the ways the readers interpret the content of these respondents' publications. Therefore, these interviewees' revealed viewpoints and intentions influence the impartiality of their media publications at a substantial level. At the end, the researcher relates these findings to Maras' (2013) consideration about this subject matter.

The latter affirms that in on-line journalism sometimes the concept of objectivity is underestimated, whilst the subjectivity (expressing own opinions) is celebrated (2013, p.189).

To summarize, in the last two sections the participants' different approaches towards drawing in Facebook dialogues and posting personal thoughts were assessed. In the following section, which is the last section of the discussion chapter, the topic whether separation of private and public life on this SNS matters or not will be taken up.

5.4. Does Separation of Personal/Private Life on Facebook matter?

The analysis chapter illustrated the ways the participants employ Facebook for the private and professional purposes. 7 participants admit that they do not separate their professional life from their personal life on this SNS. Accordingly those two different spheres of life are combined on their Facebook Walls.

“I don't write how I am feeling, but I have photos when I am drunk” (28F4); “I don't think in practice there is a need to separate private and public life on Facebook, because everything is public” (28M5); “Maybe I should have another Facebook account that could be more professional” (32M4); “I share only stuff I really like” (32F5); “You are sort of guide of the world of politics and international conflicts. In a way people are more interested about the things you are reporting on and they follow you in this world” (45M3); “That's s problem. This is why I am so careful about posting” (27M7); “I have opinions, but I try to control them, because it is a mix of mess (i.e., bit)” (45F2). These quotes belong to those participants who claim having combined the work-related and personal contents on Facebook.

The rest 5 participants have different points of views towards this topic. It was already emphasized that only one interviewee utilizes two Facebook profiles- one for professional purposes, another one for private life. “I don't want to mix my ski experiences with my articles on Facebook” (44F3). On the other hand, 38M2 states to be never personal on this SNS. As he has never posted personal pictures from his private life, he claims that his Facebook usage is

rather connected to professional purposes. Like him, 45M3 claims following- “I don’t write about my private life, I don’t post pictures of my children there”. Contrary to the latter, the last 2 participants affirm to be more personal than professional on this social network. “I am a musician, so, I don’t want to mix my private life with my professional life” (37M6); “I want to be as a private person” (25F1).

In short, the analysis showed that 7 participants do not separate their work from their personal life on Facebook. Only one participant (44F3) manages to balance personal and professional life by having two Facebook profiles. 2 respondents (38M2 and 45M3) claim to be mostly professional on this network; while another 2 (37M6 and 25F1) attempt to be more private on Facebook. Since 7 participants apply Facebook both personally and professionally, the question whether separation of personal/professional life on Facebook matters or not should be asked.

Separation of personal/work life on Facebook was described as a dilemma. This is a dilemma since all of the participants admit to be friend with many left and right sides of politicians, potential sources, experts, their readers and etc. In this aspect the latter have access to the participants’ private and professional contents. This, in turn, may affect the ways the participants’ publications are perceived and interpreted by the readers (including politicians, sources etc.). The researcher does not argue that the combination of personal/private life on Facebook directly affects either reliability or impartiality of the respondents’ media outlets, but possibly indirectly. It might influence the relationships between the reporters and their Facebook connections, be politicians or ordinary readers. For instance, 32F5 uncovers that she periodically gets to small talks with politicians about the private content she publishes on Facebook. ”Like an ice breaker, allowing me to take a small step into their personal life. Maybe opening up, telling me stuff from their professional world, on their background, maybe returning in a story”. Hence letting Facebook connections take steps in their private lives may also affect the participants’ professional side and relationships with their sources.

Taking into consideration those 4 respondents who periodically express their attitudes on Facebook is essential. Firstly, the balance between their professional/private lives, and secondly the blurred boundaries between their media publications and their personal postings can somewhat influence the ways their journalistic works are perceived by the readers. “Ethics does not simply ask how to live well. It asks how we should live well ethically, that is, in goodness

and in right relation with each other, a task that may require us to forego personal benefits, to carry out duties or to endure persecution” (Ward, 2009, p. 295). Presumably separation of personal/professional life on Facebook matters. It especially matters when the participants directly or indirectly reveal personal considerations about the issues/similar issues they work with. Making use of open criticism on this SNS evidently negatively affects the impartiality of the journalists’ outlets. Thus, separation of work/personal life, controlling time spent on Facebook, and avoiding criticism on this SNS are the ways by which the participant’ Facebook usage will decrease negative effects on their professional work.

5.5. Summary of the Discussion Chapter

The discussion chapter, based on the results of this research and the supportive theories, discovered the researcher’s main arguments concerning how the participants’ Facebook usage affects their publications. The issues regarding how their private and work-related Facebook employment impacts on the reliability and impartiality of their media outlets were assessed. In the concluding chapter of this project the researcher will answers on the RQs of this study. The most significant findings of this empirical work will also be highlighted.

6. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study will bring together the main findings of this project. This chapter will also answer the RQs of this study. At the end of this thesis a section concerning theoretical generalization of the results and suggestions for the further research will be provided.

To begin with, the analysis process discovered different motives behind employing Facebook during the workflow among the respondents. The researcher attempted to uncover differences between the age groups, though neither similar nor different tendencies in terms of Facebook usage did not emerge at a greater part. But immersing in the gained empirical data discovered the ways the participants utilize Facebook during the workday. Most importantly, the researcher argued how their Facebook usage affects the reliability and impartiality of their media productions.

The analysis chapter was four-folded. The illustration of the first two sections aimed to shed light on whether the interviewees' Facebook usage during the workflow leads to production of less reliable media publications or not. The researcher discovered the answer on the first RQ. Accordingly the hypothesis was tested and occurred to be reasonable.

RQ1: Does Norwegian journalists' Facebook usage during the workflow affect the reliability of their media publications?

In terms of the work-related Facebook usage various incentives were detected among the participants. The focus was made on the following issues: Facebook as- information spreading channel; a research tool; a platform for background researching, and a channel to gain information. The main importance was given to the following topics -use of Facebook content and Facebook as an arena for conducting interviews. Later the focus was zoomed on the interviewees' Facebook usage for the private purposes during the workflow. Thus, these are the incentives the participants regularly apply Facebook for. The researcher considered in what way their Facebook usage negatively affects the reliability of their media outlets.

The analysis stage discovered that all respondents employ Facebook as a research tool during the work processes at some level. Precisely, the latter either constantly or often seek for information

that can be either interesting or relevant for their media outlets. Though, the ways they use Facebook contents differ at significant levels. 7 respondents revise all kind of content published on this SNS before using them; while 5 participants periodically utilize Facebook content without double checking their reliability. Contents spread by public persons were described as credible and trustworthy by these participants. Their approach towards this issue was criticized by the researcher due to the insecure nature of Facebook. The researcher highlighted that this SNS allows everyone to spread easily any kind of information. Thus, she based on UGC approaches claimed that Facebook profiles can be run over by other individuals who are able to spread content by the name of the actual owner of the Facebook account. Accordingly, in order to produce reliable media publication and avoid harm all the participants must check Facebook content before employing the latter.

Furthermore, using Facebook for background researching was underscored by 4 respondents. These participants claim that they periodically apply Facebook to revise bio, work experience, education, and social-political relations of some certain individuals. In terms of Identity in CMC the researcher argued the negative effects of employing this SNS for researching. Users of the virtual communities are able to choose any name to mask their identities. Additional personal information can also be falsified. Hence researching individuals on Facebook can lead to time wasting, which logically negatively affects their workflows. Moreover, Baym's (2011) argument concerning use of content published on SNSs was applied. The latter claims that utilization of any given content spread in social media raises ethical issues. The users of SNSs are not informed about the uses to which the data/content they broadcast online may be put/further utilized (Baym, 2011, p. 400).

In addition, Facebook as a communication medium between the participants and their sources was discussed. Almost all interviewees admit that the first contact with any given source might be achieved on Facebook. Though, they give preference to calling when something has to be done immediately. Still 7 participants underline that Facebook is a convenient place to connect/contact their sources. Moreover, this SNS has been employed by 3 respondents as an arena to carry out interviews. The researcher argued that making use of Facebook for conducting interviews impact on the credibility of the content of their media publications. Her argument was that none of the journalists can totally be assured in the personality of any given source they are

communicating with via Facebook. On the other hand, the quality of the content gained through Facebook chat function differs from the content gained through real-life interaction. Precisely, interactions based on Facebook are neither socially rich nor satisfactory personalized. Identity in CMCs was given significant importance in discussing this issue.

Additionally, variable attitudes towards Facebook usage for the private purposes during the work processes were detected. 6 participants utilize this SNS continuously, whilst the others are less active Facebook users. However the researcher claimed that all participants employ Facebook on a regular work day at some level. Moreover, the personality traits that influence their Facebook usage were discussed in terms of Cyberpsychology.

Among the most active Facebook users keeping in touch with people, typing to friends, and checking what their connections post, share and like on this SNS were underscored. For 5 participants (who state to be less active Facebook users for private bearings during the workflow) keeping an eye what is happening on their Facebook Walls couple of times a day was stressed. Additionally, 2 respondents affirm that their Facebook usage at work is mainly work related; whilst another 2 affirm that their activeness on Facebook is solely connected to private reasons. The researcher argued that the frequency of employing Facebook and being an active user of this SNS distracts their concentration and leads to time wasting. These factors may cause decreasing of accuracy of their media outlets. Hence high frequency of using Facebook does affect work processes, and the ways the participants work with their publications.

Furthermore, the goal of the last two sections of the analysis chapter was uncovering whether the participants' engagements in Facebook discussions and expressing their personal attitudes affect the impartiality of their media publications. In addition, if and how they separate their personal/work lives was assessed. The researcher discovered the answer also on the second RQ.

RQ2: Does their open criticism on Facebook impact on the impartiality of the media productions they produce? If yes, in what way?

The analysis stage discovered that 8 out of the 12 participants do not express their personal opinions on Facebook; though 5 out of those 8 engage in Facebook dialogues, but do not reveal

their attitudes. As the latter describe, their participations in the discussions encompass either answering on their readers' questions or clarifying misunderstandings about their outlets. The researcher claimed that their drawing in dialogues do not directly affect impartiality of their media outlets, but indirectly. Her main argument was that clarifying misunderstandings and adding more information may affect the ways the readers reinterpret their publications. Statement regarding what is fact and what is not may assist the readers to perceive these participants as parts of the stories. In addition, their publications should be produced in that sufficient way when further clarification of the facts is not needed.

The most significant findings in term of this subject matter are connected to the remaining 4 participants. The latter uncovered that they periodically express personal attitudes on some certain issues on Facebook. Despite these respondents claim to be impartial in their publications, the researcher stated to what extend their personal postings affect the impartiality of their actual publications. Her main statement was that Facebook creates combination of impartially covered stories and flow of the personal considerations, possibly about the similar issues. In assessing this topic, the blurred boundaries between private and public life on this SNS was highlighted. The readers who are also Facebook friends of these participants are able to read their articles written in an impartial way and simultaneously learn their (indirectly or directly) uncovered personal attitudes. Obviously, these factors affect the ways the readers interpret content of their publications. Hence in this way these interviewees' (either directly or indirectly) revealed attitudes do influence the impartiality of their media publications at a significant level.

At the end, the findings concerning how the participants separate their professional and private lives on Facebook will be reviewed. 7 participants admit that they do not separate their professional life from their personal life. Accordingly those two different spheres of life are combined on their Facebook Walls. The rest 5 participants have different attitudes towards this topic. Only one participant has two Facebook profiles- one for work-related purposes, and another for private reasons. In addition, 2 participants claim to be mostly professional on Facebook; while the rest 2 claim to be solely personal.

The researcher argued that the combination of personal/private life on Facebook directly affects neither the reliability nor impartiality of their publications; rather it might influence the relationships between them and their Facebook connections, be they politicians or readers.

Letting the Facebook friends take steps in their private lives, may affect the ways the readers perceive their media outlets. Lastly, it is significant to recall those 4 participants who periodically unveil their personal considerations on Facebook. It was argued that the imbalance firstly between their professional/private lives on this SNS, and secondly the blurred boundaries between their media publications and personal postings can somewhat influence the ways their readers interpret their journalistic works.

6.1. Generalization and Further Research

This study based on the applicable theories, the results of the empirical data and by applying the findings of the similar study concerning how use of SNSs distracts concentration and causes negative effects on workflow attempts conceptual generalization. The researcher supposes that the similar results might occur in case of examination of effects of SNSs on work processes. As it was explained, the findings of this project do not attempt statistical generalization due to the limited sampling. Although use of CMC, UGC and Cyberpsychology combined with Objectivity in Journalism and Journalistic Ethics will be fruitful to discover results of Facebook usage in similar processes. Applying these approaches in bigger projects may shed light on how online era changes and challenges the traditional understanding of journalistic profession. More importantly, how digitalization and in general new technologies alter the accepted principles of journalistic work.

This study discovered that Facebook takes an important place in the participants' daily routines. As among them this SNS is widely approved as a research tool and as a communication medium, it would be valuable to examine the impacts of other SNSs on workflow. Thus, the further research is encouraged to study the mix of Twitter and Facebook employment by journalists during work processes. In addition, it would be significant to discover which of these platforms plays more important role in journalists' work-life. Keeping the same demographics in mind, potential examination of which of these SNSs causes more either negative or positive effects on their workflows would also be considerable.

List of Literature:

Atton, C. (2009). Alternative and citizen journalism. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp: 265-278). New York, NY: Routledge.

Bakardjieva, M. (2011). The internet in everyday life: exploring the tenets and contributions of diverse approaches. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies* (pp.59-82). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Balasubramaniam, N. (2009). User-generated content. In *Proceedings of business aspects of the internet of things, seminar of advanced topics* (pp. 28-33). Zurich: ETH.

Bargh, J. A., & McKenna, K. Y. (2004). The Internet and social life. *Annual Review. Psychol.*, 55, 573-590. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.141922

Baym, K. N. (2011). Social networks 2.0. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies* (pp.384-405). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Berry, D. (2008). *Journalism, ethics and society*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Biernacki, P., & Waldorf, D. (1981). Snowball sampling: problems and techniques of chain referral sampling. *Sociological methods & research*, 10(2), 141-163.

boyd, d. (2011). Social network sites as networked publics: affordances, dynamics, and implications. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *A Networked Self: identity, community, and culture on social networking sites* (pp. 39-58). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cha, M., Kwak, H., Rodriguez, P., Ahn, Y. Y., & Moon, S. (2007, October). I tube, you tube, everybody tubes: analyzing the world's largest user generated content video system. *Proceedings of the 7th ACM SIGCOMM conference on Internet measurement*, 1-14.

[doi10.1145/1298306.1298309](https://doi.org/10.1145/1298306.1298309)

Consalvo, M. (2011). Introduction to part 2. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies* (pp. 111-115). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Consalvo, M., & Ess, C. (Eds.). (2011). *The handbook of internet studies*. Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Daugherty, T., Eastin, M. S., & Bright, L. (2008). Exploring consumer motivations for creating user-generated content. *Journal of Interactive Advertising*, 8(2), 16-25.

Domingo, D., & Paterson, C. (2011). *Making online news*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Duggan, M., Ellison, B. N., Lampe, C., Lenhart, A., & Madden, M. (2015). Social media update 2014. *Pew Research Center*. Retrieved March 24, 2015 from:
<http://www.pewinternet.org/2015/01/09/social-media-update-2014/>

Fulk, J., & Collins-Jarvis, L. (2001). Wired meetings: technological mediation of organizational gatherings. In L.L. Putnam & F. M. Jablins (Eds.), *New handbook of organizational communication* (2nd ed., pp 624-703). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Fulk, J., Schmitz, A. J., & Schwars, D. (1992). The dynamics of context-behavior interactions in computer-mediated communication. In M. Lea (Ed.), *Contexts of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 7-29). New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Harcup, T. (2004). *Journalism: principles and practice*. London: Sage publications, Ltd.

Hinton, S., & Hjorth, L. (2013). *Understanding Social Media*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Holton, C. F. (2008). *The impact of computer mediated communication systems monitoring on organizational communications content* (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Florida).

Retrieved May 15, 2015 from Graduate Theses and Dissertations

<http://scholarcommons.usf.edu/etd/298>

Hughes, D. J., Rowe, M., Batey, M., & Lee, A. (2012). A tale of two sites: Twitter vs. Facebook and the personality predictors of social media usage. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(2), 561-569. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2011.11.001

Jensen, B. K. (2011). New media, old methods- internet methodologies and the offline/online divide. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies* (pp.43-58). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Kendall, L. (2011). Community and the internet. In M. Consalvo & C. Ess (Eds.), *The handbook of internet studies* (pp. 309-325). Chichester, West Sussex, U.K.: Wiley Blackwell.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage publications, Inc.

Lea, M. (Ed). (1992). *Contexts of computer-mediated communication*. New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Lusted, A. M. (2011). *Social networking: my space, Facebook & Twitter*. Minnesota: ABDO Publishing Company.

Maras, S. (2013). *Objectivity in journalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, B. G. (1999). *Designing qualitative research*. London: Sage publications.

McClard, A., & Anderson, K. (2008). Focus on Facebook: who are we anyway. *Anthropology News*, 49(3), 10-12.

medianorway. (n.d.). Retrieved May 19, 2015 from <http://www.medienorge.uib.no/english/?cat=statistikk&medium=avis&queryID=371&aspekt=oppdatering>.

Mrva-Montoya, A. (2012). Social Media: new editing tools or weapons of mass distraction?. *Journal of Electronic Publishing*, 15(1). doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3998/3336451.0015.103>

Nadkarni, A., & Hofmann, S. G. (2012). Why do people use Facebook?. *Personality and individual differences*, 52(3), 243-249. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.007

Kock, N. (2004). The psychobiological model: towards a new theory of computer-mediated communication based on Darwinian evolution. *Organization Science*, 15(3), 327-348.

Kollock, P., & Smith, M. (1996). Managing the virtual commons: cooperation and conflict in computer communities. In S. C. Herring (Ed), *Computer-mediated communication: linguistic, social, and cross-cultural perspectives* (pp 109-128). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Norman, K. (2008). *Cyberpsychology: an introduction to human-computer interaction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nygaard, L. P. (2008). *Writing for scholars: a practical guide to making sense and being heard*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Paolillo, C. J., & Zalenkauskaitė, A. (2013). Real-time chat. In S. C. Herring., D. Stein., & T. Virtanen (Eds.), *Pragmatics of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 109-133). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.

Papacharissi, Z. (2011). *A Networked self: identity, community, and culture on social networking sites*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Phillips, S. (2007). A brief history of Facebook. *the Guardian*, 25(7). Retrieved March 24, 2015 from: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2007/jul/25/media.newmedia>

Power, A., & Kirwan, G. (2014). *Cyberpsychology and new media: a thematic reader*. London: Psychology Press.

Punch, F. k. (1998). *Introduction to social research: quantitative qualitative approaches*. London: Saga publications.

Rubin, J. H., & Rubin, S. I. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: the art of hearing data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Russel. A. (2011). *Networked: a contemporary history of news in transition*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Schostak, J. (2006). *Interviewing and representation in qualitative research*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Schröder, C. K., Drotner, K., Kline, S., & Murray C. (2003). *Researching audiences*. London: Arnold.

Shih, C. (2011). *The Facebook era: tapping online social networks to market, sell, and innovate*. Boston: Prentice Hall.

Smith, A. M., & Kollock, P. (1999). *Communities in cyberspace*. London: Routledge.

Sophia van Zyl, A. (2009). The impact of social networking 2.0 on organisations. *The Electronic Library*, 27(6), 906-918.

Spears, R., & Lea, M. (1992). Social influence and the influence of the “social” in computer-mediated communication. In M. Lea (Ed.), *Contexts of computer-mediated communication* (pp. 30-65). New York, NY: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Statista. (n.d.). Number of monthly active Facebook users worldwide as of 1st quarter 2015 (in millions). Retrieved 9 March, 2015 from: <http://www.statista.com/statistics/264810/number-of-monthly-active-facebook-users-worldwide/>

Waisbord, S. (2014). Citizen journalism, development and social change: hype and hope. In E. Thorsen & S. Allan (Eds.), *Citizen Journalism. Global perspectives* (pp.185-197). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Ward, A. J. S. (2009). Journalism ethics. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The handbook of journalism studies* (pp. 295-309). New York, NY: Routledge.

Waston-Manheim, B. M. (2011). Exploring the use of social network sites in the workplace. In Z. Papacharissi (Ed.), *A Networked self: identity, community, and culture on social networking sites* (pp. 168-179). New York, NY: Routledge.

Zyl van, S. A. (2009). The impact of social networking 2.0 on organizations. *The Electronic Library*, 27 (6), 906 – 918. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02640470911004020>

Writing a bibliography: APA format. Retrieved March 25, 2015, from http://www.sciencebuddies.org/science-fair-projects/project_apa_format_examples.shtml

Appendix: 1. Interview Guide.

Demographical information:
Gender:
Age:
- Work place
- Duration of work experience:
1. How often do you use Facebook?
2. What do you use your Facebook account for?
3. Do you employ your Facebook account during the work day?
4. Do you use Facebook during the workflow for private purposes?
5. Do you employ Facebook while you are working on the article, news, reportage?
6. Do you use Facebook to get information regarding the topic you are writing?
7. Do you contact your interviewees by use of Facebook?
Sub question: If yes why and how often?
8. Do you utilize content revealed on Facebook as a source of information?
9. Do you include content broadcasted on Facebook in your articles/ reportages?
10. Do you post your personal opinions about the issues/ people involved in those issues you are writing/making programs about?
If so: 10.1. How often do you engage in the discussion about those issues on your Facebook Wall?

10.2 Why do you publish your subjective opinions about the issues (people involved in those issues) you are reporting on?

11. How do you maintain impartiality in your articles, programs while posting on Facebook your own consideration about the similar topic/s?

Appendix: 2. Consent for participation in the study

I have received information about the project and am willing to participate

(Signed by participant, date)

Appendix: 3. Code book

1.1. Age
1.2. Gender.
1.3. Duration of work experience.
2.1. Having two Facebook profiles.
2.2. Work-related Facebook usage
2.3. Employing Facebook as a private person.
3.1. Frequency of employing Facebook.
4.1. Facebook as a research tool.
4.2. Facebook as a contacting/connecting social platform.
4.3. Facebook as a source of information.
5.1. Engaging in the discussions on Facebook Wall.
5.2. Posting personals opinions.
5.3. Separation of personal/private life on Facebook.

Appendix- 4. Request for participation in research project

Project title: “Facebook usage among Norwegian journalists during the workflow”

Background and Purpose of the Project

The project is a main part of the researcher’s study process on a Master level at the University of Oslo, (Master programme in Nordic Media). This project has to be completed by 10th of May, 2015.

The purpose of the study is to research how Norwegian journalists make use of Facebook during the workflow; on the other hand how usage of this social platform by Norwegian journalists affects accuracy and reliability of media outlets that they daily/weekly produce.

The sample for this study has been made by focusing on the biggest media institutions in Norway. The random sampling has been employed. News journalists, mainly working on political and social issues are requested to participate in this project.

What does participation in the project imply?

The research will be based on qualitative in-depth anonymous interviews. The duration of each interview will be depended on the length of each respondent’s responses. There will not be collected any kind of data about the participants from other sources. The interview questions will concern the respondents’ Facebook usage; precisely their opinions regarding utilization of this social platform during the workflow will be discovered. In addition, participants will be asked about possible effects of Facebook usage on the accuracy and reliability of the media products they produce. During the interview process audio recorder will be employed, as well as written notes made by the researcher.

What will happen to the information about you?

All personal data will be treated confidentially. No one apart from the researcher will have access to collected data. The audio recordings will not contain any kind of directly identifiable information about participants. Only fictional names will be utilized in the process of transcribing and analyzing of collected data. Thus the participants will not be recognizable in the final publication. All data will be transferred to the researcher's private computer which will be password locked and accessible to no one.

The project is scheduled for completion by 10th of May, 2015. The selected data (written notes and audio recordings) for this project will be deleted after one year since the publication of this project. The collected data will not be utilized for further usage.

Voluntary Participation

It is voluntary to participate in the project, and you can at any time choose to withdraw your consent without stating any reason. If you decide to withdraw, all the data revealed by you will be deleted.

Contact Information

If you would like to participate or if you have any questions concerning the project, please contact:

Master Student (Researcher): Sophio Rusishvili

Tel: + 47 46387958

Sophie_rusishvili@yahoo.com

Supervisor (Professor): Charles Melvin Ess.

Tel: +47 22850404

c.m.ess@media.uio.no

The study has been notified to the Data Protection Official for Research, Norwegian Social Science Data Services.