CHAPTER 9

Digital Media, Conventional Methods: Using Video Interviews to Study the Labor of Digital Journalism

Tai Neilson

Online interviews extend the tools of qualitative research and facilitate new types of data and research outputs. They allow researchers to reach geographically dispersed populations, reduce some burdens on participants, and still facilitate necessary relationships and rapport between interviewer and interviewee.[1] What follows is a methodological treatise and a guide to conducting online interviews in the Digital Humanities.

[1] Susie Weller, "Using Internet Video Calls in Qualitative (longitudinal) Interviews: Some Implications for Rapport," *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 20, no. 6 (2017); Sally Seitz, "Pixilated Partnerships, Overcoming Obstacles in Qualitative Interviews via Skype: A Research Note," *Qualitative Research* early online publication, 16, no. 2 (2015): 229–235; Hannah Deakin and Kelly Wakefield, "Skype Interviewing: Reflections of Two PhD Researchers," *Qualitative Research* 14, no. 5 (2014); and Naomi Hay-Gibson, "Interviews via VoIP: Benefits and Disadvantages within a PhD Study of SMEs," *Library and Information Research* 33, no. 105 (2009).

T. Neilson (✉)
Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, Australia
e-mail: tai.neilson@mq.edu.au

l. levenberg et al. (eds.), *Research Methods for the Digital Humanities*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-96713-4_9

It is based on observations from my study of digital journalism in New Zealand and the United States. I outline the benefits and limitations of interview methods using digital tools as part of a Digital Humanities approach.

This chapter is animated by a set of concerns about the field, its methodological commitments, and digital media. My central question is: how are interview methods best adapted to digital contexts? First, I ask how research methods such as interviewing, which have been extensively codified in the social sciences and marketing, can be salvaged by and for critical Digital Humanities. To answer this question, I focus on reflexive and critical approaches that can inform a wide range of interests. Second, I pose the question: how should interview methods be rethought in light of changes facilitated by digital media? Digital media provide new opportunities for recruiting participants and conducting interviews, and allow us to develop multisite and transnational studies. They also facilitate types of archiving, analysis, and collaboration that, up until recently, have largely been limited to quantitative research. Third, because my research focuses on digital journalism, I ask: how can interview research be adapted to study technological and economic changes in the **culture industries**? I contend that Digital Humanities researchers can benefit from sustained analyses of labor in the fields that we study and reflections on the labor involved in the research process. I pose provisional answers to these questions using my own work as a case study and guide to conducting online interviews. Further, I draw on the work of exemplary researchers and educators to indicate some new directions for interview research in the Digital Humanities.

Interviews are most suited to investigating individuals' experiences and attitudes. They can elicit detailed accounts of people's lives and the meanings, reasons, and contexts of their actions.[2] They are effective when participants are invited to tell their own stories in their own words. For instance, I interviewed a journalist who worked for a now defunct newspaper in the United States before taking a job as a correspondent for a newswire service. He expressed the anxiety he and his colleagues felt as pension plans were frozen, friends were made redundant, and the paper underwent a merger before replacing its print operations with an anemic online edition. He provided personal narratives about his

[2] Seitz, "Pixilated Partnerships, Overcoming Obstacles in Qualitative Interviews via Skype."

biography, day-to-day work, colleagues, concerns, and aspirations. He also described his experiences of technological changes such as the implementation of a new content management system to govern workflow. His interview helped me to address the central challenge of my research, which was to express the experiences of journalists and to theorize them in relation to broader economic, political, technological, and cultural struggles.

Interviews for the Digital Humanities

Interviews are a fixture of qualitative research in the social sciences and humanities. Yet, there may be some controversy over whether they can be a part of a Digital Humanities approach. In response, I suggest that interviews produce textual data, they are fundamentally interpretive, and are opened to new potentialities through video link-up applications, textual analysis software, digital archiving, and web hosting. Interview methods need to evolve to meet the new opportunities and challenges of Digital Humanities.

Interviews are also well established among practitioners in marketing, health, and other fields. In Media Studies, pioneering work by Paul Lazarsfeld and Elihu Katz used interviews to study messages and audiences.[3] These studies attempted to test short-term "effects" of media content and "laws" about how messages are diffused. They often considered the interviewer a neutral expert tasked with uncovering the truth or laws of media and communication. In Sociology, interview techniques were formalized by members of the Chicago School of Sociology. Their interactionist approach emphasized the ways that people develop shared definitions of reality through social interaction. In research that focused on urban populations, they came to theorize interviews as sites of meaning-making between interviewers and interviewees, but these studies remained largely divorced from questions of inequality and political struggle.[4] Cultural Studies and other fields at the intersection of the social sciences and humanities continue to practice reflexive and critical interview methods.

[3] Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld, *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications* (New York: Free Press, 1955).

[4] Lana Rakow, "Commentary: Interviews and Focus Groups as Critical and Cultural Methods," *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 88, no. 2 (2011).

Qualitative researchers are now more likely to acknowledge that interviews are not neutral or objective. Participants' answers are context-specific and reflect complex and sometimes contradictory perspectives. As such, the role of researcher is not to simply find an existing "truth" by applying the right techniques. Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin's (1998) *The Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory* and Thomas Lindlof and Bryan Taylor's (2011) *Qualitative Communication Research Methods* provide instructive approaches to reflexivity in qualitative research.[5] In particular, this chapter is informed by Strauss and Corbin's "grounded theory." In their view, research is a process of developing and testing understandings, interviews are communicative contexts through which meaning is negotiated, and researchers should aim to build theory that can shape practice.

Reflexive research entails navigating power relations and inequalities that are manifested in the interview context and sensitivity to broader social stratifications. Cultural Studies scholars exploring issues of race, gender, and class find interviews useful for understanding the experiences and interests of different communities. For instance, Peter Lunt and Sonia Livingstone argue that interviews in feminist methodological traditions aim to undermine the "masculine paradigm" and establish the "egalitarian power relations implied by the notion of inter-view."[6] Nonetheless, this does not simply mean accepting the perspectives of interviewees. Researchers should not take "common sense" perspectives and assumptions for granted.[7] Rather, it is their role to question and sometimes challenge interviewees' assumptions. This can involve asking interviewees to "unpack" common sense claims or provide specific examples. Researchers can also ask interviewees to read and respond to research findings. In the later stages of my research, I incorporated some of my preliminary theses into the interviews and asked interviewees how they correspond to or differ from their experiences.

[5] Anselm Strauss and Juliet Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*, 2nd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998); Thomas Lindlof and Bryan Taylor, *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*, 3rd ed. (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011).

[6] Peter Lunt and Sonia Livingstone, "Rethinking the Focus Group in Media and Communications Research," *Journal of Communication* 46, no. 2 (1996): 80.

[7] Strauss and Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 98.

Interviews are suited to answering specific types of questions—questions related to individuals' biographies, experiences, and opinions. If the researcher is interested in demographics or the most common views held by a large population then in-depth interviews are not the right method. If the researcher wants to know about policies or industry statistics then, again, there are likely to be more effective ways of seeking answers. Interviews are time intensive; they require a lot of work in the development stage, setting up and conducting interviews, transcribing and coding, analysis, and writing. Nonetheless, interviews can be deeply rewarding, and the affordances of digital media entail new opportunities for reflexive and critical interview research.

Digital Media and Online Interviews

The relationship between qualitative research and digital media is more complex than simply providing new "tools" for researchers to incorporate into existing methodologies. The use of digital media has changed our work processes as researchers, academics, and students. They have also transformed other industries and the lives of many of our research participants.

Researchers in the Digital Humanities may find that the objects we study and the people we need to interview are increasingly geographically distributed. In my own research, I used Skype's video link-up service to speak with journalists over a large geographical area. I spoke to interviewees from my two national case studies without incurring the costs and time involved in international travel. I also spoke with people working in smaller towns and large urban centers, which expanded my access to a range of experiences and perspectives. As cultural industries become increasingly global, researchers can use communication technologies to explore these connections.

Digital communication also enables easy interview recording. I audio recorded my interviews, which allowed me to transcribe and relisten to them during the analysis and write-up processes. I also used NVivo software, which allows users to import transcripts, audio, and video for the purposes of coding. In addition to the considerable cost, NVivo and other off-the-shelf computer assisted qualitative data analysis software (CAQDAS) pose difficulties related to sharing coded data in a nonproprietary way. Nonetheless, they greatly improve the speed, ease, and searchability of coding for individual researchers and research teams.

Some qualitative researchers are beginning to archive their interview recordings and transcripts so that they may be accessed by other researchers or students. Universities and national research institutions such as the Australian Research Council (ARC) and the UK's Economic and Social Research Council have an interest in archiving qualitative data. Infrastructure like Qualidata and the Australian Qualitative Archive (AQuA) have been set up to facilitate archiving.[8] Archiving qualitative data raises a number of epistemological, ethical, and practical questions. For example, in my own research, I was unable to make my interview data available to other researchers because of issues related to anonymity. But, these concerns are not insurmountable if researchers consider opportunities to archive and share data at the beginning of their research design. This is a particularly promising area for interview research in the Digital Humanities.

Investigating the Culture Industry

Interviews can be used to study workers' experiences across the cultural industries. In particular, there is a long history of ethnographic research on the experiences, attitudes, and practices of journalists. In 1972, Gaye Tuchman used participant observation to investigate journalists' opinions and practices regarding objectivity.[9] Later that decade, Herbert Gans' (1979) ethnographic work untangled some of the professional standards, values, and pressures that determine what journalists consider news.[10] More recently, David Domingo and Chris Paterson (2008 and 2011) continue to demonstrate the strengths of ethnographic methods for understanding journalism in their two collections of essays about digital newsrooms.[11] However, Christian Anderson attests that "as news production decentralizes, traditional methods of exploring the behavior

[8] Alex Broom, Lynda Cheshire, and Michael Emmison, "Qualitative Researchers' Understandings of Their Practice and the Implications for Data Archiving and Sharing," *Sociology* 43, no. 6 (2009): 1164.

[9] Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality* (New York: Free Press, 1978).

[10] Herbert Gans, "Deciding What's News: Story Suitability," *Society* 16, no. 3 (1979).

[11] Chris Paterson and David Domingo, *Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production*, 2nd ed. (New York: Peter Lang, 2011).

of journalists 'at work' grow ever more problematic."[12] Many news organizations have dispersed or outsourced tasks to different locations and companies. A lot of journalistic work is conducted outside of "brick and mortar" newsrooms by freelance journalists, contractors, and citizen journalists. These spatial and temporal changes in the organization of news work require us to rethink our methodologies.

Interviews are well suited to studying distributed workplaces and transnational industries. In Journalism Studies, they allow researchers to reach a range of actors in different institutional settings and investigate the changing contexts and processes of news production. My research included thirty-seven in-depth interviews with news workers in the United States and New Zealand. My respondents had a range of experiences in the industry working for different types of organizations (commercial, public, and nonprofit) and in different media (newswire, print, television, radio, and online). Many also had experience as freelancers. Including such a broad range of perspectives led to some difficulties in delimiting the size of the study, but it also meant that I could account for complexity and variation in the news industry. In addition to exploring diverse qualitative experiences, I situated journalists' experiences within more structural changes related to technologies, markets, and national cultures.

A methodological concern for my research was how to navigate the relationship between journalists' experiences and agency, and the political economic structures that shape their industry. I used the scholarship on **digital labor** to frame my research questions and theorize my findings. Issues of digital labor are significant for journalism, the cultural industries, and the work we do in the Digital Humanities. Digital labor requires new skills and forefronts the "information content" of commodities.[13] These changing forms of production include new contexts for work and have resulted in precariousness for creative workers.[14] Recently, ambitious studies have used interviews to study digital labor. Through

[12] Ibid., 153.

[13] Maurizio Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labor," in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardy (London, UK: Routledge, 1996).

[14] Nick Dyer-Witheford, *Cyber Proletariat: Global Labour in the Digital Vortex* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2015); Trebor Scholz, *Digital Labor: The Internet as Playground and Factory* (Florence: Taylor & Francis, 2012); and Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, *Multitude* (New York, NY: Penguin, 2004).

extensive interviews with European workers, Bettina-Johanna Krings, et al. (2009) find many digital laborers are working harder to meet tighter deadlines and working longer hours to keep up with demands.[15] Digital Humanities researchers should be sensitive to labor issues, not just in their area of study, but the work of others who contribute to their research including programmers, designers, IT specialists, lab technicians, librarians, archivist, and others who make Digital Humanities projects possible. Research tends to be the shared accomplishment of a range of actors.[16]

Procedure

Interview procedures and tools differ depending on each researcher's goals and the population being studied. But, all interviewers will likely undertake research design, recruit interviewees, conduct interviews, analyze their data, and write up or otherwise present their findings. If the researcher adopts a grounded theory approach, then these components of the research process will overlap and intertwine. To illustrate the different procedures involved in interviewing, I draw examples and insights from my own research on digital journalism. The majority of my thirty-seven interviews were conducted via internet video services, but I also conducted some via phone and in-person. I analyzed the transcripts on a rolling basis and supplemented interviews with the analysis of industry statistics and reports.

Research Design

Before initiating research design, it is necessary to have a strong understanding about the topic of study and what has already been written about the topic. This requires the researcher to describe the topic and define its key features and context. Based on the research area and prior reading, it is possible to develop original and answerable research

[15] Bettina-Johanna Krings, Linda Nierling, Marcello Pedaci, and Mariangela Piersanti, *Working Time, Gender and Work-Life Balance* (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Higher Institute of Labour Studies, 2009), 37, http://www.itas.kit.edu/pub/m/2009/krua09a_contents.htm.

[16] Noortje Marres, "The Redistribution of Methods: On Intervention in Digital Social Research, Broadly Conceived," *Sociological Review* 60, no. 1 (2012): 140.

questions. I read widely in at least two large areas of scholarship before embarking on my interview research: Journalism Studies and the Political Economy of Digital Media. I was interested in differences between large and small national news markets and mixtures of public and commercial media, so I selected the United States and New Zealand as national case studies. While my interests lay in the economic and technological changes that were taking place in the news industry, I did not want to look at industry data and make sweeping claims. I wanted to learn about how journalists experience these changes and how they transform their daily work processes. As such, I posed the following questions:

Research Question:

1. How are journalists in New Zealand and the United States experiencing the economic and technological changes that shape their work?

Subquestions:

a. What are the trends impacting news production and how do they differ between the United States and New Zealand?
b. How are changing editorial policies and forms of employment shaping digital news production?
c. How are journalists trying to maintain control over their work and improve their working conditions?

My research questions shifted a little over the course of the research as my participants helped me refine the project. I decided that interviews were the most effective method for answering these questions, but I also knew that they would not suffice. I needed to analyze industry reports, professional publications, employment statistics, government regulations, and pay close attention to news sources about the rapidly changing state of the media in both countries. My questions also determined the populations from which I recruited participants and the interview questions I asked. I discuss these elements in more detail below, but it is important to create and document these questions during research design.

Developing and documenting your research questions, procedures, and recruitment material is often a requirement for getting permission to conduct research. If you are conducting research as a university student

or staff member then it is likely that you will need to gain institutional approval before beginning interviews. Permission is usually granted by ethics committees: in the United States these are called Institutional Review Boards (IRB) and New Zealand has Institutional Ethics Committees (IEC). My institution required that I submit a description of the project, an explanation of how I would minimize any risks to my participants, my recruitment material, and interview questions. Templates for gaining informed consent from your participants are available online and through research institutions. While ethical concerns may arise throughout research, it is important to prepare for them during the design phase. Ethical issues in online research can include challenges identifying participants' identities and navigating the differences between public and private information online.[17] The researcher should have documentation ready before beginning recruitment, and consent and ethics should be ongoing concerns.

Recruitment

Your research questions will determine who you need to interview, but you will also need to consider issues of access. For instance, are people in your population likely to take the time to speak with you? Can you ensure, with a reasonable degree of certainty, that the interviews will not subject you or your interviewees to undue risks? Digital communication tools entail a number of benefits for researchers looking to recruit interviewees, but also require researchers to consider new procedural and ethical issues. I recruited participants using publicly listed email addresses on news websites, emailed staff from journalists' organizations and unions, posted notifications in relevant social media groups, and asked interviewees for referrals. All of these methods yielded participants. I developed slightly different recruitment material for each country, different organizations, and personalized emails.

Ted Palys and Chris Atchison note that "modern network technology and communications are designed explicitly for the rapid transmission of information among and between members of distinct social networks."[18] Network sampling techniques using digital media are useful

[17] Deakin and Wakefield, "Skype Interviewing."

[18] Ted Palys and Chris Atchison, "Qualitative Research in the Digital Era: Obstacles and Opportunities," *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 11, no. 4 (2012): 352–367.

for recruiting participants even among marginalized, stigmatized, or isolated people. In online social networks, participants can vouch for the researcher and the project to help recruit others and prospective participants will also appraise the project by investigating your online profile, past work, and communicating with one another.

Using the grounded theory approach means that recruitment is an ongoing process that will likely only be completed when you decide that your data is rich and varied enough to sufficiently answer your questions. I used a type of **purposeful sampling** called **maximum variation sampling**. That is, I intentionally recruited journalists from each country with different amounts of experience in the industry who worked for different types of organizations and media, and in a variety of work arrangements. When I had spoken to a number of similar participants (for instance, journalists working full-time at New Zealand radio organizations), I directed my recruitment efforts elsewhere. Transcribing and analyzing interviews throughout the research process helped me to determine which types of journalists I still needed to speak with. I concluded recruitment of interviewees in New Zealand and the United States when my research questions had been thoroughly addressed and interviews ceased to contribute significantly new data. Strauss and Corbin term this **saturation**.[19] I decided that I had reached saturation after thirty-seven in-depth interviews.

Interview Questions

Interview questions are designed to elicit answers to your central research questions. However, they need to be far more concrete, avoiding any theoretical abstractions or specialist concepts. For instance, my central question about how journalists are experiencing changes in their industry is broken into prompts for journalists to talk about their work and some of the issues they face:

- Can you take me through the process of researching and publishing a story from start to end? You can describe a specific story that you see as representative or discuss the general process.
- What are the main professional concerns that you and your colleagues discuss?

[19] Strauss and Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 158.

The first question asks journalists to provide a narrative account in their area of expertise and allows me to ask for further explanation. The second does not prejudge which concerns are most prescient for my participants and allows them to draw on past experiences and conversations. It is good practice to have an experienced researcher read and comment on your questions. You may also be able to try out the questions in a pilot study. My pilot interviews included two informal interviews with journalists that I knew personally. I asked them to tell me if my questions were difficult or unanswerable, so I could edit them before conducting more formal interviews. My initial **interview schedule** included eleven questions and some possible subquestions. My interviews were semi-structured, so my questions changed depending on the stage of the project and whom I was speaking with. Sometimes they even changed during the interview. The interviews ran from 45 minutes to almost two hours depending on the time and detail that interviewees were willing to provide.

Conducting Interviews

This section describes how the process of conducting interviews is shaped by the use of online audio/video link-up services. Participants who are recruited online are likely to have an account or have the ability to create one. Free audio/video link-up applications that use the Voice over Internet Protocol (VoIP) such as Skype, FaceTime, and Google Hangouts are well suited for remote interviewing and their growing popularity increases this utility. Many universities pay for subscriptions to video calling software, which may have better quality connections and more functionality for group video conferencing or recording. Either way, researchers should be aware of the terms of use for the services they employ and investigate issues related to data security. These technologies are a cost-effective tool to bolster existing qualitative methods and facilitate new types of research.

Online video services reduce some of the logistical concerns related to face-to-face interviews, but instantiate new technical issues. Researchers should do everything possible to secure a high quality, sustained connection, and minimize disruptions.[20] Audio quality can impact the transcription process and is particularly important if you plan to archive or share

[20]Weller, "Using Internet Video Calls in Qualitative (Longitudinal) Interviews," 8.

the audio files. During my interviews, audio problems required me to ask some participants to repeat or explain points that were initially inaudible. The researcher should also prepare an appropriate space in which to conduct the interview and be prepared with their questions, a notebook and pen, and the recording software or hardware primed, before the scheduled start of the interview. Inevitably, issues will arise. For instance, I scheduled one interview on a Saturday morning after difficulties finding a time when the participant was available. The interviewee was taking care of two grandchildren while trying to respond to my questions. Unfortunately, the resulting data was disjointed and sprawling. Creating an appropriate environment for the interview reduces some of these obstacles.

The process of establishing rapport in an online interview can differ from in-person situations. It begins in advance of the interview through email exchanges, allowing for questions about the process, or sharing your online profile. Suzie Weller (2017) observes that supportive interchanges at the beginning and closing of online interviews may include a quick discussion about the quality of the connection and the framing of the video in addition to the usual greetings and informal discussion. There are some impediments to building rapport in video interviews. For example, eye contact can be difficult to maintain because of the position of the screen and camera, and audio delays can lead to confusion. However, mediated communication can be experienced as less daunting or formal and reduce the "pressure of presence."[21] My participants opened up about their work lives; one participant, in particular, described her experiences in male-dominated rural newsrooms and the precarity of her current editing job. As such, I organized a follow-up interview toward the end of my study to enquire about her ongoing concerns and recent changes. There is no reason why digital interviews should be more detached, formal, or limited than their offline counterparts.

Transcription and Coding

The affordances of CAQDAS are increasingly making coding a multimedia and collaborative process. Yet, there are still problems and limitations with proprietary software. Before transferring their data to a

[21] Ibid., 11.

CAQDAS platform and **coding**, most interviewers transcribe their interviews. Transcription can be the most labor-intensive part of interview research, and one hour of an interview normally requires 4 to 6 hours to transcribe. Palys and Atchison note that transcription software is now available to speed-up the process, including: Dragon Naturallyspeaking (DNS), IBM ViaVoice, MacSpeech, Microsoft Windows Speech Recognition, Philips SpeechMagic, Sphinx, and VoxForge.[22] In addition, CAQDAS such as NVivo now have options to upload and code audio and visual files. Researchers are developing ways to effectively code without transcribing entire interviews.

Coding is the procedure for identifying concepts and relationships in data, which can then be organized into categories and theory. During coding, data are broken into constituent parts: key terms or phrases that relate to opinions, actions, processes, objects, or events.[23] These instances are grouped into categories, and researchers create definitions to ensure consistency and aid in collaborative work. Irena Medjedovic and Andreas Witzel (2008) propose that qualitative researchers begin sharing data with codes and category schemes to make the process more transparent and to facilitate secondary analyses.[24] This is an area where Digital Humanities approaches to archiving and sharing data can extend and transform traditional qualitative research. Open source software solutions may be required to share coded data among research communities and facilitate rich and interactive archives.

Coding occupies an intermediary position between raw data and theory. For instance, I found that the term "engagement" was used by journalists during my interviews to describe their actions and interactions with online audiences. I then adopted engagement as a concept for understanding how journalists interpret and place limits on changes in their work. I placed discussions of engagement within the context of structural relations, such as the relationship between journalists and audiences, and critical theories of labor and digital media.[25] Researchers

[22] Palys and Atchison, "Qualitative Research in the Digital Era."

[23] Strauss and Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 68.

[24] Irena Medjedovic and Andreas Witzel, "Secondary Analysis of Interviews: Using Codes and Theoretical Concepts from the Primary Study," *Historical Social Research* 33, no. 3 (2008).

[25] Tai Neilson, "'I Don't Engage': Online Communication and Social Media Use among New Zealand Journalists," *Journalism* 19, no. 4 (2018): 536–552.

using the grounded theory approach may work both **deductively** and **inductively**. In this case, I worked inductively by grouping qualitative instances together to reduce some of the complexity of raw data and provide a framework for understanding similar occurrences. In contrast, working deductively means using concepts established by other researchers to understand instances in your data. Integrating both of these approaches, researchers can move back and forth between raw data, coding, and evolving theoretical concepts.[26] Hence, the processes of coding, theorizing, and writing up should overlap. Further, Digital Humanities approaches include archiving and circulating research products that result from each of these processes.

Theorizing and "Writing Up"

Digital Humanities scholars are experimenting with new venues and methods for presenting research. Terry Flew (2008) argues that digital media challenges the structural breaks between producers and consumers, design and critique. He observes, the "critique of existing systems happens through design such as open source software, open publishing, citizen journalism and participatory media systems."[27] In the Digital Humanities, for example, practitioners who have identified gaps in access to historical records and literary sources build and host public archives (see Rissam in this volume), and those focusing on interactivity and performance have constructed alternative ways to explore research findings (see Hunter in this volume). Making cultural objects available to a wider public or to other researchers is a commendable pursuit. Nonetheless, I believe it is necessary for digital humanists to pose and answer explicit research questions and theorize their practices (for more on the roles of "making" and "interpreting" in the Digital Humanities see Matthew Gold's excellent edited volume *Debates in the Digital Humanities*). In this section, I present findings from my research and indicate ways that scholars using digital interviews may choose to present their own work.

My interview, research, and findings are organized around my set of thesis questions. Foremost, I set out to ask how journalists in New Zealand and the United States are experiencing the economic and

[26] Strauss and Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 46.

[27] Terry Flew, *New Media: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2008), 41.

technological changes that shape their work. I broke this question into its constituent parts related to (1) differences between my national case studies, (2) changes in news production processes and journalists' professional concerns, and (3) how journalists are imposing some control over their work. My findings do not attempt to derive direct causal relationships; for instance, I do not argue that changes in journalism are the result of new technologies. Rather, I find a number of factors that interviewees discuss in different combinations and consider how they come together to shape the context of news production and journalists' experiences. Similarly, Strauss and Corbin suggest that the result of qualitative research "is much more likely to be a discussion that takes readers along a complex path of interrelationships, each in its own patterned way, that explains what is going on."[28]

Conducting digital interviews with New Zealand and US news workers allowed me to establish differences in the experiences of interviewees between and within each country. Comparisons between the media systems of New Zealand and the United States required additional political economic research because the two national media systems are characterized by differences in market sizes, media policies, and political cultures. In New Zealand, publicly owned broadcast and digital media has a large role, while in the United States nonprofit news media play a supportive role in an otherwise highly commercialized news industry. News production and circulation is increasingly globalized as media corporations, technologies, and content traverse political and cultural boundaries. As such, journalists in both countries shared concerns about redundancies, the quality of news media, shrinking budgets, and media consolidation. The affordances of digital interviewing allowed me to make comparisons between the two national case studies.

I identified two prominent ways that journalists describe changes in their work processes and categorized these as "extension" and "intensification." These concepts are present in other labor scholarship, which allowed me to consider how my data can and cannot be explained by existing theory. First, journalists discuss needing to be "always on" or to "work until the job is done." The gross extension of working hours, facilitated by technology, can be subsumed under Karl Marx's concept

[28] Strauss and Corbin, *Basics of Qualitative Research*, 130.

of absolute surplus value extraction.[29] Journalists' work is also extended qualitatively, in ways that blur distinctions between news and marketing, work and leisure. Here, scholarship in the critical Digital Humanities including Trebor Scholz's work on digital labor is instructive. Second, journalists described ways that their work is intensified through managerial directives, online publishing deadlines, and **content management systems** that standardize and streamline work processes. Myriad commentators argue that the value of immediacy in digital journalism is detrimental to the quality and accuracy of news.[30] My interviews provide a detailed account of how immediacy is operationalized by news organizations and demonstrate how journalists experience and react to these demands.

Critical approaches to Digital Humanities should be directed toward challenging unequal power relations. I found that journalists in both countries are trying to impose control over their work processes and conditions through unions. In addition to unions at legacy media organizations, unionization votes in digital newsrooms are a small, but significant, development in labor relations. Drawing on my interview data, I provide concrete steps toward securing better conditions for news production. One such step is the creation of publicly available guidelines for online engagement. More broadly, I argue that labor activism must address the identities and interests of professional journalists and connect their campaigns to other digital laborers and audiences.

Digital Humanities scholars have a range of options for how to present or publish research. Some interviewers archive their data to facilitate secondary research or to provide pedagogical resources. Louise Corti, Andreas Witzel, and Libby Bishop (2005) are strong proponents for archiving and sharing qualitative data, including interviews, for the purposes of secondary analysis.[31] That is, so that researchers can pose different questions in the analysis of existing qualitative data sets. Contributors

[29] Karl Marx, *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy* (London: Penguin, 1976).

[30] Megan Le Masurier, "Slow Journalism," *Journalism Practice* 10, no. 4 (2016): 439–447; Neil Thurman and Anna Walters, "Live Blogging–Digital Journalism's Pivotal Platform?" *Digital Journalism* 1, no. 1 (2013); and Alfred Hermida, "Twittering the News: The Emergence of Ambient Journalism," *Journalism Practice* 4, no. 3 (2010).

[31] Louise Corti, Andreas Witzel, and Libby Bishop, "On the Potentials and Problems of Secondary Analysis. An Introduction to the FQS Special Issue on Secondary Analysis of Qualitative Data," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no. 1 (2005).

to their special journal edition propose ways of anonymizing interviews for secondary analysis, using open source CAQDAS to share coding, and creating searchable qualitative data archives. For instance, Harry Van den Berg (2005) developed a large interdisciplinary project to reanalyze interview data from different theoretical and methodological perspectives. In addition to these approaches to secondary analysis, digital humanists can publish interview data as a pedagogical resource.[32] Ping-Chun Hsiung (2016) created an interactive archive and guide using a selection of her interview transcripts to teach qualitative research methods. Her courseware, called "Lives & Legacies: A Guide to Qualitative Interviewing," includes 39 interview transcripts and even some of her coding to emphasize that "there is no singular 'right' way of coding."[33] The project emphasizes pedagogical principles that challenge linear conceptions of qualitative research, promote hands-on learning, demystify research processes, and destigmatize mistakes. These cases incorporate Digital Humanities approaches to sharing and presenting data, while posing explicit research questions and theorizing the process.

Conclusion

Inherent in my approach are two of my hopes for the future direction of the Digital Humanities. First, digital humanists can pose specific questions and theorize their work to integrate making and critique, practice and theory.[34] Second, Digital Humanities approaches need a reflexive approach to labor in the topics we study and the research process itself. Interviewers can produce new types of data and research outputs. Nonetheless, these new opportunities should not come at the expense of rigor or critical analysis. Digital Humanities projects often set out to archive or represent historical or artistic content without posing or answering specific research questions. Making cultural objects available to a wider public or to other researchers is a commendable pursuit.

[32] Harry Van Den Berg, "Reanalyzing Qualitative Interviews from Different Angles: The Risk of Decontextualization and Other Problems of Sharing Qualitative Data," *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no. 1 (2005).

[33] Ping-Chun Hsiung, "Lives & Legacies: A Digital Courseware for the Teaching and Learning of Qualitative Interviewing," *Qualitative Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (2016): 135.

[34] Fitzpatrick in *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, ed. Matthew Gold (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012): 13.

However, critical research is also a process of probing difficult theoretical and practical issues. This requires explicit research questions that are embedded in existing theories and critical practices. It also means that digital humanists need to engage with the vast array of critical theories that are already available among the humanities.

Digital media are facilitating the transformation of industries such as journalism, the lives of many of our research participants, and our own work. I found that journalists are experiencing the extension and intensification of their work. We can extend this emphasis on technology and labor to understand changes taking place in universities and research institutions. Digital technologies enable us to engage new participants and audiences, but they are also accompanied by expectations that researchers curate online profiles and self-monitor the reach or impact of our work. Hence, we may reflect on how we, as humanities researchers, experience new technologies and economic changes, and how we maintain control over our work processes and conditions.

References

Broom, Alex, Lynda Cheshire, and Michael Emmison. "Qualitative Researchers' Understandings of Their Practice and the Implications for Data Archiving and Sharing." *Sociology* 43, no. 6 (2009): 1163–180.

Corti, Louise, Andreas Witzel, and Libby Bishop. "On the Potentials and Problems of Secondary Analysis. An Introduction to the FQS Special Issue on Secondary Analysis of Qualitative Data." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no. 1 (2005): 1–7.

Deakin, Hannah, and Kelly Wakefield. "Skype Interviewing: Reflections of Two PhD Researchers." *Qualitative Research* 14, no. 5 (2014): 603–616.

Dyer-Witheford, Nick. *Cyber Proletariat: Global Labour in the Digital Vortex.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2015.

Flew, Terry. *New Media: An Introduction.* 3rd ed. Melbourne: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gans, Herbert. "Deciding What's News: Story Suitability." *Society* 16, no. 3 (1979): 65–77.

Gold, Matthew K. *Debates in the Digital Humanities.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Hardt, Michael, and Antonio Negri. *Multitude.* New York, NY: Penguin, 2004.

Hay-Gibson, Naomi. "Interviews via VoIP: Benefits and Disadvantages Within a PhD Study of SMEs." *Library and Information Research* 33, no. 105 (2009): 39–50.

Hermida, Alfred. "Twittering the News: The Emergence of Ambient Journalism." *Journalism Practice* 4, no. 3 (2010): 297–308.

Hsiung, Ping-Chun. "Lives & Legacies: A Digital Courseware for the Teaching and Learning of Qualitative Interviewing." *Qualitative Inquiry* 22, no. 2 (2016): 132–139.

Katz, Elihu, and Paul Lazarsfeld. *Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications*. New York, NY: Free Press, 1955.

Krings, Bettina-Johanna, Linda Nierling, Marcello Pedaci, and Mariangela Piersanti. *Working Time, Gender and Work-Life Balance*. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Higher Institute of Labour Studies, 2009. http://www.itas.kit.edu/pub/m/2009/krua09a_contents.htm.

Lazzarato, Maurizio. "Immaterial Labor." In *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, edited by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardy, 132–146. London, UK: Routledge, 1996.

Le Masurier, Megan. "Slow Journalism." *Journalism Practice* 10, no. 4 (2016): 439–437.

Lindlof, Thomas, and Bryan Taylor. *Qualitative Communication Research Methods*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2011.

Lunt, Peter, and Sonia Livingstone. "Rethinking the Focus Group in Media and Communications Research." *Journal of Communication* 46, no. 2 (1996): 79–98.

Marres, Noortje. "The Redistribution of Methods: On Intervention in Digital Social Research, Broadly Conceived." *Sociological Review* 60, no. 1 (2012): 139–165.

Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. London: Penguin, 1976.

Medjedovic, Irena, and Andreas Witzel. "Secondary Analysis of Interviews: Using Codes and Theoretical Concepts from the Primary Study." *Historical Social Research* 33, no. 3 (2008): 148–178.

Neilson, Tai. "'I Don't Engage': Online Communication and Social Media Use Among New Zealand Journalists." *Journalism* 19, no. 4 (2018): 536–552.

Palys, Ted, and Chris Atchison. "Qualitative Research in the Digital Era: Obstacles and Opportunities." *International Journal of Qualitative Methods* 11, no. 4 (2012): 352–367.

Paterson, Chris A., and David Domingo. *Making Online News: The Ethnography of New Media Production*. 2nd ed. New York: Peter Lang, 2011.

Rakow, Lana F. "Commentary: Interviews and Focus Groups as Critical and Cultural Methods." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 88, no. 2 (2011): 416–428.

Scholz, Trebor. *Digital Labor: The Internet as Playground and Factory*. Florence: Taylor & Francis, 2012.

Seitz, Sally. "Pixilated Partnerships, Overcoming Obstacles in Qualitative Interviews via Skype: A Research Note." *Qualitative Research* 16, no. 2 (2015): 229–235.

Strauss, Anselm, and Juliet Corbin. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory.* 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 1998.

Thurman, Neil, and Anna Walters. "Live Blogging–Digital Journalism's Pivotal Platform?" *Digital Journalism* 1, no. 1 (2013): 82–101.

Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality.* New York: Free Press, 1978.

Van Den Berg, Harry. "Reanalyzing Qualitative Interviews from Different Angles: The Risk of Decontextualization and Other Problems of Sharing Qualitative Data." *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 6, no. 1 (2005).

Weller, Susie. "Using Internet Video Calls in Qualitative (Longitudinal) Interviews: Some Implications for Rapport." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 20, no. 6 (2017): 1–13.