Research project "(Re-)Discovering the audience. Journalism under the conditions of web 2.0"[1]

Online questionnaire for the journalists

The journalists questionnaire was directed to the editorial staffs of

1. a daily TV newscast called *Tagesschau* (the most traditional newscast in Germany, on a PSB)
2. a weekly political talk show on TV (*anonymous*, on a PSB)
3. a daily newspaper (*anonymous*, national circulation, but with a strong regional tradition)
4. a weekly newspaper called *Der Freitag* (national circulation, focusing on debates and commentary)

The wording, questions, items and response options were adjusted to the respective case study object. Here, we (mostly) use the questionnaire for the *Tagesschau* journalists as an example. Altered formulations are explained [in brackets]. The formulations highlighted differed for journalists of the TV-/print- and online departments, respectively. Questions, items etc. not included in all four surveys are marked: *[only/not included in X]*

Starting page
Thank you for your interest in and support for our research project. The following questionnaire contains questions about your journalistic practices and attitudes, especially with regard to "the audience", i.e. the viewers [*resp.* "readers"] of the [respective case study object] as well as the users of its online presence. Completing the questionnaire takes about 15 minutes. Your data is processed anonymously, and it is guaranteed that no respondent can be identified personally through analyses and publications. You can find further information on our data protection regulations on our project blog, where we also offer information about the progress of our studies.
The project team
W. Loosen, J. Schmidt, N. Heise, J. Reimer
Twitter: @jpub20team

---

[1] The research project which is funded by the German Research Foundation [grant number LO 853/4-1] for 2.5 years (2011_2014).

Questions and • response options	Sources and comments
1. Focus of journalistic activity	
Question: Which editorial department/section do you predominantly work for, i.e. where do you spend most of your working time? *[single selection]* • Predominantly TV [*resp.* "Predominantly print"] • Predominantly online • Both departmens/sections in equal parts [*for the political talk show, this item was changed into:* "production, PR, something else"]	Question and Items are based on in-depth interviews with staff members Comment: Respondents of the political talk show who chose "production, PR, something else" were not asked the strictly journalism-related questions 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7.
2. Target audience	
Question: First of all, which audience do you mostly think of in your day-to-day journalistic work? *[single selection]* • The viewers [*resp.* "readers"] of the [respective case study object] • The users of the [respective case study object]'s website • The users of the [respective case study object]'s social media-presences (*Facebook*, *Twitter*, *Google+*, *YouTube*) [*not included in the questionnaire for the staff of the political talk show*]	Question and items are based on theoretical considerations regarding the cooperation of TV resp. print and online departments as well as analyses of the respective case study object's social media-presences and in-depth interviews with staff members Comment: The highlighted formulations were changed based on the respondent's answer to this question. This does not apply to the political talk show for which in-depth interviews had shown that staff members regard online users as a sub-group of the TV audience. Also, the talk show does not offer any social media-profiles.
3. Usage of social media-features	
Question: Do you actively or passively use the [respective case study object]'s social media-features (e.g. the commentary section on the website, the *Facebook* profile, the editorial blog on the website, the *Twitter* account) at least sometimes? *[response options: yes / no]* [*For the political talk show, the question was changed into:* "Do you actively or passively use the following social media-features at least sometimes? *[multiple selection]* • The discussion forum on the talk show's website	Question and items are based on analyses of the respective case study object's social media-presences and in-depth interviews with staff members Comment: Depending on the answers to this question, respondents of the political talk show were asked question 6. not at all, once or twice, specified for the features they used.

● A user-initiated, unofficial fan-page on *Facebook*]	
4. Journalistic practices and routines I *Sources of audience image*	
Question: Which sources do you use for information about your audience? Please choose all the answers that apply to you. *[multiple selection]*	Questions taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 246) and Hohlfeld (2003: 430) (with wording slightly changed)
● Letters, e-mails, phone calls or faxes to the editorial staff	Items taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 246) and Hohlfeld (2003: 430) (with wording slightly changed)
● Personal encounters with viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users [*only included in the daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires:* "(e.g. at one of the [newspaper]'s events)"]	
● Results of market and audience research	
● Reports by social-media editors/community managers/members of the editorial office for viewers [*wording depending on the case study object*] in the editorial conferences	Items specify items by Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 246) and Hohlfeld (2003: 430)
● Conversations with social-media editors/community managers/members of the editorial office for viewers [*wording depending on the case study object*] outside the editorial conferences	
● Conversations with staff members who are no social-media editors/community managers/members of the editorial office for viewers [*wording depending on the case study object*]	
● Audience rates of the TV show [resp. "sales figures of the print issue"]	Items specify items by Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 246) and Hohlfeld (2003: 430) following theoretical considerations by Wehner (2010) and Neuberger/Wendelin (2012) Comment: The political talk show does not have any social media-presences.
● Access statistics of the [respective case study object]'s website	
● Access statistics of the [respective case study object]'s social media-presences, e.g. on *Facebook*, *Twitter*, *YouTube* or *Google+* [*not included in the political talk show questionnaire*]	
● Ratings and comments regarding the [respective case study object] on external platforms (e.g. *Facebook*, *Twitter*, *Google+*, weblogs)	Own items Comment: The political talk show does not offer an editorial blog on its website.
● Comments on/in [the respective case study object's online commentary section]	
● [*Only included in the daily newspaper questionnaire:* "Comments on news items on the newspaper's website"]	
● Comments on posts in the [respective case study object]'s editorial blog [*not included in the political talk show questionnaire*]	
● [*Only included in the daily and weekly newspaper questionnaires:* "Reader/user contributions which are published in the print issue of	

[the respective newspaper]"]	
• [*Only included in the weekly newspaper questionnaire:* "Blog posts by community members on *freitag.de*"]	
• Other sources, namely: … *[open answer]*	Item taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 246) and Hohlfeld (2003: 430) (with wording slightly changed)
5. Journalistic practices and routines II *Frequency of contact with the audience for different purposes*	
Question: How often are you in contact with your audience in your day-to-day work (e.g. via telephone, e-mail, in commentary sections etc.) for one of the following purposes? *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="never", 2="less than once a week", 3="once or twice a week", 4="three or four times a week", 5="every day"]*	Own question
• To introduce the editorial staff or single members of it.	Own item based on theoretical considerations by Evers/Eberwein (2011) and Meier/Reimer (2011)
• To explain (decision) processes in the newsroom.	Own items based on theoretical considerations by Meier/Reimer (2011)
• To provide further information on the sources a journalistic item is based on.	
• To discuss the kind and quality of journalistic work (e.g. the selection of topics, the style/tone of journalistic items etc.)	Own items based on theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig. 8)
• To exchange opinions with viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users about political decisions, current events or other topics of coverage	
• To call the audience's attention to external contents (e.g. *YouTube*-videos, external websites etc.).	Own item based on theoretical considerations by Bruns (2005).
• To establish and maintain networks of experts/specialists.	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 104) (with wording slightly changed)
• To call the audience's attention to content you have produced yourself. [*For the political talk show, the question was changed into:* "To call the audience's attention to the TV talk show or online contents produced by the editorial staff."]	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 104) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig. 8) and Singer et al. (2011)
• To welcome the audience or see them off.	Own items based on theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011)
• To moderate discussions among users.	

FILTER: Only those respondents who had stated to use the respective case study object's social media features (question 3) were asked this question. Respondents of the talk show's editorial staff were asked this question not at all, once or twice and specified for the features they use depending on their answer to question 3.	
6. Journalistic practices and routines III *Usage of the respective case study object's social media-features for journalistic activities*	
Question: Social media-features can be used in different ways for journalistic activities. We are interested in your assessment of the [respective case study object]'s social media-features (e.g. the commentary section on the website, the *Facebook* profile, the *Twitter* account, the editorial blog). How relevant are they for certain aspects of your day-to-day work? Please indicate for each of the following statements whether it is absolutely applicable, rather applicable, neither applicable nor inapplicable, rather inapplicable or absolutely inapplicable. I use the [respective case study object]'s social media-features… *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="absolutely applicable", 2="rather applicable", 3="neither applicable nor inapplicable", 4="rather inapplicable", 5="absolutely inapplicable"]*	Own question
● ...to catch up on the development of a current event or topic for a journalistic item/story	Items taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 105) (with wording slightly changed)
● ...to search among users for eye witnesses of an event.	
● ...to research background information regarding a topic or event.	
● ...to have information "double checked" by users.	
● ...to obtain a picture/impression of the public opinion/mood regarding a topic or event.	
● ...to obtain a general overview of which topics are popular among users at the moment.	
● ...to receive notifications of errors in a journalistic item/story.	
● ...to receive feedback on my journalistic work in general.	
● ...to decide – on the basis of the users('s opinions) – whether a particular event or topic shall be covered or not	Own items based on theoretical considerations by the project team and by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig. 8), Singer et al. (2011), Blöbaum (1994: 20; 2000: 174, tab. 1, 177-179) and Matthes/Kohring (2003: 11) regarding steps and activities in the journalistic production process
● ...to decide which facts and aspects of a topic should be included into a journalistic item/story [*for the talk show:* "the talk show, a video used in it or an item on the website"] and which should not.	
● ...to receive pictures, videos and other material for my journalistic items/stories I would otherwise not have access to.	
● ...to discuss with users with regard to a topic or event.	

7. Journalistic role conception	Comment: This question was also included in the user questionnaires.
Question: The following questions deals with how one can understand one's work as a journalist, which goals one can pursue with one's professional work. Thus, the question is always: For you personally, what is your job about? Please indicate for each of the following statements whether you completely agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree or completely disagree to it. For me, my job is about… *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="completely agree", 2="somewhat agree", 3="neither agree nor disagree", 4="somewhat disagree", 5="completely disagree" + "I don't know. / Can't tell."]*	Question taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 243) (With wording slightly changed)
● …informing the audience as neutrally and precisely as possible.	Items taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 243-244) (with wording slightly changed)
● …explaining and conveying complex issues.	
● …informing the audience as fast as possible.	
● …concentrating on news that is interesting to an audience as wide as possible.	
● …controlling politics, economy and society.	
● …criticizing problems and grievances.	
● …giving people the opportunity to express their opinions about topics of public interest.	
● …presenting my own opinion to the audience.	
● …conveying/sharing positive ideals.	
● …providing help/counseling/useful information for the audience and acting as advisor/guidance.	
● …providing entertainment and relaxation for the audience.	
● …showing new trends and conveying/highlighting new ideas.	
● …getting into conversation with citizens about current topics.	Own items based own theoretical considerations by Kenix (2009)
● …building and maintaining a relationship to the audience.	
● …providing people with the opportunity to publish content they have generated themselves.	

● …pointing out interesting topics to the audience and showing them where they can obtain further information on them.	Item taken Neuberger (2012: 49, tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Bruns (2005)
● …providing audience members with the opportunity to maintain social ties among themselves.	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 49, tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed)
● …giving viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users topics to talk about.	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 49, tab. 11) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011) and Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224)
● …initiating and moderating discussions among viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users.	Item taken from Neuberger (2012: 50, tab. 12) and Kopp/Schönhagen (2008) (with wording slightly changed), reflects theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011)
8. Assumed motivations for audience participation	Comment: This question was also included in the user questionnaires.
Question: Viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users who speak out (e.g. in reaction to an issue of the [newscast/talk show/newspaper] or single journalistic items/stories) or participate in another way pursue certain goals when doing so. We have listed some possible explanations. What do you think for what reason do viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users participate in the [respective case study object]'s offers/services? I think users… Please, indicate for each motivation whether you think it is absolutely applicable, rather applicable, neither applicable nor inapplicable, rather inapplicable or absolutely inapplicable. *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="absolutely applicable", 2="rather applicable", 3="neither applicable nor inapplicable", 4="rather inapplicable", 5="absolutely inapplicable" + "I don't know. / Can't tell."]*	Own question
● …want to publicly display themselves and their knowledge.	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Altmanns (2011), Leung (2009), and Orians (1991: 47); formulated with references to items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Markman (2011), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)
● …search for help with a problem.	Item formulated with reference to (an item by) Altmann (2011), Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Orians (1991: 118)
● …want to pass on their own experiences and knowledge.	Item subsumes items by Altmann (2011: 148), Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Leung (2009: 1336), Kopp/Schönhagen (2008: 11), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), Orians (1991: 118) Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, Tab. 4.1)
● …want to state publicly their opinion.	Item formulated with reference to Altmann (2011: 148), Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Orians (1991: 118), Pasternack (1988:

	14, Tab. 6), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006)
● …want to attend their duty as a citizen.	Item taken from Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6) (with wording slightly changed); reference to Sutton (2006)
● …participate out of boredom.	Item taken from Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1) (with wording slightly changed); reference to Altmann (2011)
● …want to leave their role as passive viewers [*resp.* "readers"].	Item subsumes items by Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); reference to Altmann (2011)
● …simply want to "blow off steam" once in a while.	Item taken from Henning-Thurau et al. (2004), Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), and Springer/Pfaffinger (2012); reference to Altmann (2011)
● …want to build a relationship with an individual journalist or the editorial staff.	Item specifies an item by Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); reference to Orians (1991)
● …want to expand their knowledge by having contact with journalists and other viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users.	Own item reflecting theoretical considerations by Leung (2009: 1336), Orians (1991), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Wladarsch (2010); references to Altmann (2011) and Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224)
● …feel to be part of a community by doing so.	Item formulated with reference to items by Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Weischenberg/Scholl (1989: 425); references to Altmann (2011), Huth/Krzeminski (1981: 224), Markman (2011), and Orians (1991)
● …want to assist the journalists in their work.	Own item
● …want to support and promote a specific concern, an event, a community or a person.	Item specifies and subsumes items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1); references to Altmann (2011), Markman (2011), and Orians (1991)
● …want to place a topic that is important to them in the [respective case study object].	Item subsumes items by Kopp/Schönhagen (2008), Springer/Pfaffinger (2012), and Sutton (2006: 32, tab. 4.1)
● …want to point out errors in the coverage.	Item formulated with reference to Pasternack (1988: 14, tab. 6)
9. Image of the audience	

Question: Now we would like to talk about the audience once more. We have listed some terms and roles with which one might characterize the audience. Please, indicate for each term whether you think it is absolutely applicable, rather applicable, neither applicable nor inapplicable, rather inapplicable or absolutely inapplicable to your audience. *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="absolutely applicable", 2="rather applicable", 3="neither applicable nor inapplicable", 4="rather inapplicable", 5="absolutely inapplicable" + "I don't know. / Can't tell."]*	Own question
● Co-designers/co-shapers ("Mitgestalter") ● Specialists/experts ● (Eye) witnesses ● People seeking advice and help ● Charges ("Schützlinge"), clients	Items reflect theoretical categories established by Krzeminski (1985, as quoted by Orians 1991: 47) (with wording slightly changed)
● Providers of feedback and critics of my journalistic work ● Commentators ● Distributors of journalistic items/stories ● Providers of topics ● Producers of content ● Discussion partners	Own items based own theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig. 8) and Singer et al. (2011)
● People seeking entertainment ● Citizens, voters ● Addressees of advertising ● Passive viewers [*resp.* "readers"]	Own items
10. Expected expectations regarding participatory functions	Comment: This question was also included in the user questionnaires.
Question:	Own question

In the following section we are interested in how you assess the audience's expectations regarding offers/services of the [respective case study object]. Thus, we ask you to "identify with the role of an audience member". Please, indicate for the following aspects if you think they are very important, rather important, neither important nor unimportant, rather unimportant or very unimportant to your viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users. In my opinion, it is important/unimportant for my viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users that… *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="very unimportant", 2= "rather unimportant", 3="neither important nor unimportant", 4="rather important", 5="very important" + "I don't know / Can't tell."]*	
● …they are able to make direct contact and get into dialogue with the editorial staff resp. single journalists.	Own items based own theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig.8) and Singer et al. (2011)
● …they are able to suggest topics for reporting to the editorial staff.	
● …they are able to provide own material (text, pictures, videos) for news reporting	
● …they are able to comment on/rate journalistic items/stories [*for the talk show:* "the talk show or items on the website"].	
● …the editorial staff provides a platform for discussing practices and quality of news reporting of the [respective case study object] (e.g. the selection of topics, the style/tone of journalistic items/stories etc.).	
● …they are able to easily and fast forward and recommend journalistic contents to friends or family members.	
● …they can discuss (with regard to) the topics of reporting [*resp.* "the talk show"].	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Braun/Gillespie (2011), Neuberger (2009: 82, fig.8) and Singer et al. (2011)
● …they can see which contents have been viewed, read, commented on or shared by many other viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 82, fig.8), Neuberger/Wendelin (2012) and Wehner (2010)
● …they can publicly show their attachment to the [respective case study object].	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Orians (1991)
● …the editorial staff members are introduced.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Evers/Eberwein (2011) and Meier/Reimer (2011)
● …they receive information about editorial decisions/routines/practices.	Own items based own theoretical considerations by Meier/Reimer (2011)
● …they receive additional information about and references to the sources a journalistic item/story is based on.	
● …the editors are present on social media.	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 108) (with wording slightly changed)

● …they are able to make contact and get into dialogue with other viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users.	Own items
● …they are taken seriously by the journalists.	
11. General assessment of and attitudes towards audience participation	Comment: This question was also included in the users questionnaires.
Question: We have nearly reached the end of the questionnaire. Now we would like to learn more about your opinion about different ways of audience participation. Please, indicate for the following statements whether you completely agree, somewhat agree, neither agree nor disagree, somewhat disagree or completely disagree to it. *[5-point Likert-scale with 1="completely agree", 2="somewhat agree", 3="neither agree nor disagree", 4="somewhat disagree", 5="completely disagree"]*	Own question
● Comments, discussions and other contributions by the audience provide additional facets and perspectives to our reporting/coverage.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Schweiger/Quiring (2006)
● Using user-generated content helps reduce costs.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Neuberger (2009: 81-83)
● Journalists keep the upper hand in selecting and processing/producing stories and news items.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Robinson (2010: 127, 132)
● The power constellations between journalists and the audience have changed.	
● Audience participation has a high entertainment value.	Own items based own theoretical considerations by Orians (1991: 36-39)
● Audience reactions show us at once whether we select the right topics and report them comprehensibly.	
● Audience participation makes the process of public information and opinion formation more democratic.	
● Audience participation makes the [respective case study object] more trustworthy/credible.	
● Audience participation increases viewer [*resp.* "reader"] loyalty.	
● Audience participation helps the [respective case study object] to reach/attract/win over new target groups.	Item taken from Neuberger/vom Hofe/Nuernbergk (2010: 104) (with wording slightly changed)
● Audience participation keeps the editorial staff from performing their actual tasks.	Own item based own theoretical considerations by Meier/Reimer (2011)
● Dialogue and exchange with the audience are an essential part/element of the [respective case study object].	Own items

• The importance ascribed to audience participation at the [respective case study object] is too high.			
• The quality of audience contributions and participation is too low.			

12. Job title/name of position				

Question:
What is your job/position called? You can select more than one answer.
[multiple selection]

Question and items taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 230, 232-233) (with wording slightly changed), complemented through research and in-depth interviews at the respective case study object

Daily newscast	Political talk show	Daily newspaper	Weekly newspaper
• Head of the editorial department/editor-in-chief ("Redaktionsleiter/-in")	• Leading position (head of the editorial department/editor-in-chief, managing editor/editor on duty etc.	• Head of the editorial department/editor-in-chief ("Redaktionsleitung")	• Head of the editorial department/editor-in-chief ("Redaktionsleitung")
• Managing editor/editor on duty ("CvD")	[see above]	• Managing editor/editor on duty ("CvD")	• Managing editor/editor on duty ("CvD") ("verantwortliche/-r Redakteur/-in oder CvD")
• Editor/writer ("Redakteur/-in")	• Editor/writer ("Redakteur/-in")	• Editor/writer ("Redakteur/-in")	• Editor/writer ("Redakteur/-in")
• Correspondent			
• Anchorman/-woman			
• Social media-editor	• Member of the editorial office for viewers resp. community manager	• Community editor	• Community- or social media-editor
• Multimedia assistant			
• Freelancer	• Freelancer	• Freelancer	• Freelancer
		• "Feste/-r freie/-r Mitarbeiter/-in"	• "Feste/-r freie/-r Mitarbeiter/-in"
• Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*	• Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*	• Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*	• Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*

13. Editorial department/issues				
Questions:				Question and items taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 233-234) (with wording slightly changed), complemented through research and in-depth interviews at the respective case study object
Daily newscast: Which of the following issues do you work on? Please, select all answers applicable. [multiple selection]	*Political talk show* -	*Daily newspaper:* Which of the following departments do you work for? Please, select all answers applicable. [multiple selection]	*Weekly newspaper:* Which of the following departments do you work for? Please, select all answers applicable. [multiple selection]	
• Main newscast at 8 p.m.		• Politics	• Politics	
• Newscasts in the afternoon		• Society		
• Newscasts in the morning		• Business		
• 10 p.m. newscast "Tagesthemen"		• Arts and culture	• Arts and culture	
• Late night newscast		• Sports		
• Weekly newscast "Wochenspiegel"		• [Region]		
• Digital news channel "tagesschau24"		• Media		
• Website "tagesschau.de"		• Cars		
		• Travel	• Community	
		• [Special department]	• Everyday life ("Alltag")	
		• Knowledge		
		• Digital		
		• Mobile life		
		• Weekend		

		● Video		
		● Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*	● Something else, namely:… *[open answer]*	

13. Shares of working time for differenct activities	
Question: If you think of a typical work day: How are your working hours distributed across the following activities? If your work days differ very much, please, provide an estimate for your total working time. How big is the share of your working hours (in per cent) that you spend with… *[slider bar with 5-per cent steps from 0 to 100 per cent; if respondent had no javascript enabled, the question was asked as three questions with open answers: "About … per cent of my working hours."]*	Question and items inspired by Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 234-236) and Worlds of Journalism project (2007: 2)
● Organisation, coordination and administrative activities (e.g. strategic and resource planning)	
● Journalistic activities (e.g. research, writing, (copy-)editing etc.)	
● Contact with the audience (e.g. reading user comments on [the respective case study object's online commentary section] or a *Facebook* profile, discussing with viewers [*resp.* "readers"]/users etc.	
14. Start of journalistic activity in general	
Question: When have you started working in journalism? In the year … . *[open answer]*	Question taken from Weischenberg/Malik/Scholl (2006: 234) and Worlds of Journalism project (2007: 8) (with wording slightly changed)
15. Start of journalistic activity at the respective case study object	
Question: And when have you started working for the [respective case study object]? In the year … . *[open answer]*	Question taken from Worlds of Journalism project (2007: 8) (with wording slightly changed)
15. Sex	
Question: Are you … ? *[single selection with response options: "male", "female"]*	

16. Age	
Question: How old are you? … years. *[open answer]*	
17. Comments	
Question: Is there anything else that you want to tell us with regard to the topic "journalism and its audience"? *[open answer]*	

Last page

Thank you for your support. The results of this survey will not only be used for scientific publications but also for a presentation in the newsroom of the [respective case study object]. Of course, the anonymity of your answers is guaranteed in any case. In the meantime, you can contact us via e-mail. Furthermore, you can catch up on the latest progress of our studies on our project blog and via Twitter. The project team of the Hans-Bredow-Institut

References:

Altmann, Myrian-Natalie (2011): User Generated Content im Social Web. Warum werden Rezipienten zu Partizipienten? Berlin: Lit.

Blöbaum, Bernd (1994): Journalismus als soziales System. Geschichte, Ausdifferenzierung und Verselbständigung. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Blöbaum, Bernd (2000): Organisationen, Programme und Rollen. Die Struktur des Journalismus. In: Löffelholz, Martin (ed.): Theorien des Journalismus. Ein diskursives Handbuch. Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag, pp. 169-183.

Braun, Joshua; Gillespie, Tarleton (2011): Hosting the public discourse, hosting the public. When online news and social media converge. In: Journalism Practice, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 383-398.

Bruns, Axel (2005): Gatewatching. Collaborative online news production. New York: Peter Lang.

Evers, Huub; Eberwein, Tobias (2011): Can a million toothless tigers make a difference? Potentials and pitfalls of web-based accountability processes in German journalism. URL: http://www.mediaact.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/WP4/WP4_Germany.pdf (accessed on August 20 2013).

Henning-Thurau, Thorsten; Gwinner, Kevin P.; Walsh, Gianfranco; Gremler, Dwayne D. (2004): Electronic word-of-mouth via consumer-opinion platforms. What motivates consumers to articulate themselves on the internet? In: Journal of Interactive Marketing, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 39-52.

Hohlfeld, Ralf (2003): Journalismus und Medienforschung. Theorie, Empirie, Transfer. Konstanz: UVK.

Huth, Lutz; Krzeminski, Michael (1981): Zuschauerpost – ein Folgeproblem massenmedialer Kommunikation. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Kenix, Linda Jean (2009): Blogs as alternative. In: Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 790-822.

Kopp, Mirjam; Schönhagen, Philomen (2008): Die Laien kommen! Wirklich? Eine Untersuchung zum Rollenselbstbild sogenannter Bürgerjournalistinnen und Bürgerjournalisten. In: Quandt, Thorsten; Schweiger, Wolfgang (eds.): Journalismus online – Partizipation oder Profession? Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 79-94.

Leung, Louis (2009): User-generated content on the internet. An examination of gratifications, civic engagement and psychological empowerment. In: New Media & Society, vol. 11, no. 8, pp. 1327-1346.

Krzeminski, Michael (1985): Präsentationsformen der Zuschauerbeteiligung. In: Bentele, Günter; Hess-Lüttich, Ernest W. B. (eds.): Zeichengebrauch in Massenmedien. Zum Verhältnis von sprachlicher und nichtsprachlicher Information in Hörfunk, Film und Fernsehen. Tübingen: Niemeyer, pp. 265-273.

Markman, Kris M. (2011): Doing radio, making friends, and having fun. Exploring the motivations of independent audio podcasters. In: New Media & Society, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 547–565.

Matthes, Jörg; Kohring, Matthias (2003): Operationalisierung von Vertrauen in Journalismus. In: Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft, vol. 51, no. 1, pp. 5-23.

Meier, Klaus; Reimer, Julius (2011): Transparenz im Journalismus. Instrumente, Konfliktpotentiale, Wirkung. In: Publizistik. Vierteljahreshefte für Kommunikationsforschung, vol. 56, no. 1, pp. 133-155.

Neuberger, Christoph (2009): Internet, Journalismus und Öffentlichkeit. Analyse des Medienumbruchs. In: Neuberger, Christoph; Nuernbergk, Christian; Rischke, Melanie (eds.): Journalismus im Internet. Profession, Partizipation, Technisierung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 19-105.

Neuberger, Christoph (2012): Journalismus im Internet aus Nutzersicht. Ergebnisse einer Onlinebefragung. In: Media Perspektiven, vol. 42, no. 1, pp. 40-55.

Neuberger, Christoph; Nuernbergk, Christian; vom Hofe, Hanna Jo (2010): Twitter und Journalismus. Der Einfluss des „Social Web" auf die Nachrichten. Wuppertal: LfM-Dokumentation.

Neuberger, Christoph; Wendelin, Manuel (2012): Mehr Transparenz im Netz? Öffentlichkeit als Raum der Wahrnehmung und (Meta-)Kommunikation. In: Springer, Nina; Raabe, Johannes; Haas, Hannes; Eichhorn, Wolfgang (eds.): Medien und Journalismus im 21. Jahrhundert. Herausforderungen für Kommunikationswissenschaft, Journalistenausbildung und Medienpraxis. Konstanz: UVK, pp. 121-137.

Orians, Wolfgang (1991): Hörerbeteiligung im Radio. Eine Fallstudie zu Motivation, Erwartung und Zufriedenheit von Anrufern. München: Reinhard Fischer.

Pasternack, Steve (1988): The open forum: A study of letters to the editor and the people who write them. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, July 2-5 1988, Portland, USA.

Robinson, Sue (2010): Traditionalists vs. convergers. Textual privilege, boundary work, and the journalist-audience relationship in the commenting policies of online news sites. In: Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 125–143.

Schweiger, Wolfgang; Quiring, Oliver (2006): User-Generated Content auf massenmedialen Websites – eine Spielart der Interaktivität oder etwas völlig anderes? In: Friedrichsen, Mike; Mühl-Benninghaus, Wolfgang; Schweiger, Wolfgang (eds.): Neue Technik, neue Medien, neue Gesellschaft? Ökonomische Herausforderungen der Onlinekommunikation. München: Reinhard Fischer.

Singer, Jane B.; Hermida, Alfred; Domingo, David; Heinonen, Ari; Paulussen, Steve; Quandt, Thorsten; Reich, Zvi; Vujnovic, Marina (2011): Participatory journalism. Guarding open gates at online newspapers. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Springer, Nina; Pfaffinger, Michael (2012): Why users comment on online news and why they don't. Paper presented at the 62nd annual conference of the International Communication Association (ICA), May 24-28 2012, Phoenix, USA.

Sutton, Shaun (Sep 1 2006): The "my" in ohmynews. A uses and gratifications investigation into the motivations of citizen journalists in South Korea. Leeds. University of Leeds.

Wehner, Josef (2010): „Numerische Inklusion" – Wie die Medien ihr Publikum beobachten. In: Sutter, Tilmann; Mehler, Alexander (eds.): Medienwandel als Wandel von Interaktionsformen. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, pp. 183-210.

Weischenberg, Siegfried; Scholl, Armin (1989): Kommunikationserwartungen und Medieneffekte. Wie Publikumsvariablen Wirkungsabläufe beeinflussen können. In: Rundfunk und Fernsehen, vol. 37, no. 4, pp. 421-434.

Weischenberg, Siegfried; Malik, Maja; Scholl, Armin (2006): Die Souffleure der Mediengesellschaft. Report über die Journalisten in Deutschland. Konstanz: UVK.

Wladarsch, Jennifer (2010): Auf der Spur der Massenmedien in sozialen Onlinenetzwerken. Wie und warum Internetnutzer massenmediale Inhalte in sozialen Onlinenetzwerken nutzen. MA-Thesis (unpublished). Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München.

Worlds of Journalism project (2007): Master questionnaire: journalists. URL: http://www.worldsofjournalism.org/docs/Master%20questionnaire%20journalists%20EN%20final.pdf (accessed on August 20 2013).