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Abstract

This paper considers notions of agency, interaction and power in business news journalism. In the first part, we present a bird’s eye view of news access theory as it is reflected in selected sociological and anthropological literature on the ethnography of news production. Next, we show how these theoretical notions can be applied to the study of press releases and particularly to the linguistic pragmatic analysis of the specific social and textual practices that surround their transformation into news reports. Drawing on selected fieldwork data collected at the business desk of a major Flemish quality newspaper, we present an innovative methodology combining newsroom ethnography and computer-assisted writing process analysis which documents how a reporter discovers a story, introduces it into the newsroom, writes and reflects on it. In doing so, we put the individual journalist’s writing practices center stage, zoom in on the specific ways in which he interacts with sources and conceptualize power in terms of his dependence on press releases. Following Beeman & Peterson (2001), we argue in favor of a view of journalism as ‘interpretive practice’ and of news production as a process of entextualization involving multiple actors who struggle over authority, ownership and control.
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1. Introduction

Scene 1. In the newsroom of a major Flemish quality newspaper in Brussels, senior business reporter AMT receives a phonecall from a spokesperson for the Flemish Minister of Science. The spokesperson informs AMT that new management agreements between the Flemish Government and two prestigious Flemish research institutes have been signed this morning. He also announces that a press release will be issued later that day and that the powerpoint slides used during the press conference are available upon request.

Scene 2. Halfway through the 2:00pm story meeting a few hours later, AMT mentions the newly signed agreements, adding that the research institutes will be receiving a 20% budget increase. Following a brief exchange, the desk chief assigns AMT a 60-line story on page four of the newspaper’s business section.

Scene 3. Around 4:20pm, AMT retrieves an email from an assistant to the Flemish Ministry of Science spokesperson in his inbox, opens the attached press release, skims, prints and closes it. He then opens the second attachment and scans the six slides of a powerpoint presentation, reading the notes of the second slide in detail. Next, AMT
opens a text editing window and starts writing the lead. Some 25 minutes later, he forwards his story to the copy editors.

This paper focuses on the role of source media – press releases in particular – and the reporter’s social and textual practices as he discovers, negotiates, writes and reflects on a news story. We thus “follow the story” (Boyer & Hannerz 2006: 13) and zoom in on the interpretive decisions the reporter makes while writing from news sources. Introducing an innovative method combining newsroom ethnography and computer-assisted writing process analysis, our data shed light on the discursive transformations that lie at the heart of the news production process. As such, we confirm previous research which has shown that in business news journalism, story ideas are frequently drawn from “the routine flow of corporate and economic news releases” (Doyle 2006: 448). Crucially, we look at journalists as interpretive agents and newswriting as a form of reproductive writing which transforms news discourses such as press agency copy, press releases and interview notes into a single narrative, framed as an authoritative account of a news event.

Analytically, this paper takes its cue from Beeman and Peterson’s concept of interpretive practice: “the ways that routine procedures, cultural categories, and social positions come together in particular ‘instances’ of interpretation” (2001: 159). Applied to news production studies, this concept “turns our attention from the structures that organize action to the contingency that is always present in media production and the specific momentary, negotiated processes by which agency is employed to challenge, change or reproduce structure” (Peterson 2003: 186). These situated, negotiated processes refer to the interactions between sources, reporters and editors. In the case study we present here, we focus on the reporter’s social and textual practices surrounding his use of source media in newswriting. Our approach is thus decidedly focused on exploring agency1, as we put the individual journalists’ writing practices center stage, zoom in on the specific ways in which he sources his story and how he establishes authority.

The reliance on sources in business news forces attention to issues of institutional and textual power, source-media interaction and agency. Who sets whose agenda? What type of interaction is there between source media and news media? How does the journalist alter the words of the press release? How does (s)he write the news story? In what follows, we illustrate how these issues can be applied to the linguistic pragmatic analysis of newswriting. Our data are drawn from fieldwork conducted between October 2006 and March 2007. In addition to ethnographic methods of data collection (participant observation and interviewing), we used keystroke logging software to record and observe writing processes (cf. infra). Following Beeman & Peterson (2001), we conclude by arguing in favor of a view of journalism as ‘interpretive practice’ and of news production as a process of entextualization involving multiple actors who struggle over authority, ownership and control.

In the first part, we present a bird’s eye view of some of the theorizing on patterns of news access as it is reflected in selected literature on news production. As we
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1 Agency is a contested notion; see for example Ahearn (2001), Fairhurst (2004) and Frank (2006). In this paper, the concept of agency refers “collectively to the following behavioral and metacognitive characteristics: An awareness of the task at hand; an understanding of the demands of that task; the ability to envision possible steps of varying complexity leading toward goal accomplishment; the ability to recursively strategize, monitor, and evaluate problems and discover ways of solving them; and the ability to execute those strategies in accomplishing the goal” (Strauss & Xiang 2006: 356-7).
pointed out in the introduction to this special issue, news scholarship is vast and theoretically eclectic so it is by no means our intention to aim at completeness. Instead, since our interest is in journalistic writing processes, we propose to focus on a selection of the literature that is concerned with a) business news, b) news sources and c) ethnographic accounts of news production. Broadly speaking, we adopt Cottle’s (2000b: 28-9, original emphasis) distinction between a sociological and a culturalist paradigm in theories of news access. While the former investigates “news access in terms of strategic and definitional power, examining patterns of news access, routines of news production and processes of source intervention”, the latter theorizes “news access in terms of cultural and ritual power, [sensitive] to the symbolic role of news actors and how they perform/enact within the conventions and textual structures of news representation – ritual, story, narrative”. We thus survey classic newsroom ethnographies à la Tuchman (1978) and Gans (1979), sociological and cultural accounts of news production like Clayman (1990), Berkowitz (1992), Manning (2001) and Reich (2006) and recent anthropological studies of news production such as Ståhlberg (2002) and Peterson (2003).

2. News production theory

This part should be read against the background of previous theoretical efforts in this area – most prominently Cottle (2000a), Lau (2004) and Boyer & Hannerz (2006). Cottle (2000a), to begin with, observes how ‘first wave’ ethnographies of news production have become outdated by technological, economic, regulatory and cultural change. Calling for a ‘second wave’ of news ethnographies, he questions the validity of six theoretical ‘orthodoxies’ of news production. These concern received views on the routinization of news production, professional objectivity in journalism, social hierarchies of news access, the role of the audience, models of information transmission and homogenization of news production, respectively. Secondly, Lau (2004: 693) argues that sociological news production studies are “bedevilled by some inconsistencies” and distinguishes between extraneous factors such as ownership and internal factors such as production routines. The former constrain news production he argues, while the latter are functions of journalistic autonomy. Finally, Boyer & Hannerz (2006) see journalism as a lens for better understanding a number of research problems facing contemporary social science, from the involvement of the media in processes of social mediation and cultural production to the emergence of new modes of translocal social experience. It is against this background that we highlight three salient issues in the literature on news production in general and on press releases in particular: Power, interaction and agency.

2.1. News production is an undecided power struggle

It is unanimously accepted that the news has a substantial impact on people’s lives and that the various parties involved in newsmaking should be seen as stakeholders who have all sorts of interests in actively determining what the media’s impact on people’s lives will be. John B. Thompson’s (2000: 105-6) analysis of political scandal is a case in point:
“The media are the key arena in which the struggle over symbolic power is played out. As the principal medium through which political leaders relate to ordinary citizens, the media become the primary means by which political leaders accumulate symbolic capital in the broader political field. Through the constant management of visibility and the careful presentation of self, political leaders use the media to build up a store of symbolic capital in the eyes of the electorate: and this in turn, by providing them with a popular basis of support, gives them leverage in the political subfield.”

While the view of the media as an arena for a power struggle – real or symbolic – remains largely uncontested, it is interesting to note that there does not seem to be any consensus on how the power of the news is distributed: i.e. who is in charge or who is dominating who. Take Maxwell McCombs’s widely known theory of agenda-setting (2004): The main point here, dating back to Walter Lippman’s seminal work on public opinion as early as the 1920s, is that the news media are so powerful that they can set a whole nation’s agenda, focusing people’s attention on one or more key issues and ignoring others as well as influencing personal behaviour (down to voting patterns on election day). McCombs talks about “the enormous social influence of mass communication” (2004: ix) and refers to over 400 published empirical investigations that support the idea. A related concept that sheds light on some of the complexities of agenda-setting is John B. Thompson’s so-called ‘discursive elaboration’, which refers to how media messages are relayed beyond the initial context of reception and transformed through an ongoing process of telling and retelling (Thompson 1995). At the far end of agenda-setting, we can refer to peace journalism as a special mode of socially responsible journalism which is aimed at actively contributing to the peaceful settlement of conflicts (Hanitzsch 2004). With regards to business news, Carrol & McCombs (2003) illustrate how the media define and influence corporate reputations among the general public.

In complete contrast, it has been claimed that in today’s free market the media have no power whatsoever; they are utterly defenseless against the carefully rehearsed press conferences and photo opportunities led by omnipotent spin doctors, on the one hand, and the demands of the general public backed up by the billions of advertising dollars, on the other hand. Indeed, it could be argued that it is the news managers and news consumers who are now setting the newsmakers’ agenda. Boorstin’s notion of pseudo-events, whose “occurrence is arranged for the convenience of the reporting or reproducing media” (1999: 16) should be mentioned here: At best, the journalists are turned into ‘gatekeepers’ (Shoemaker 1991); far worse, they are manufacturing consent for dominant special interest groups, “simply because they depend on information provided by them” (Herman & Chomsky 1988: 298).

With respect to business news, the impact of institutional powerhouses such as PR agencies and press relations offices of large corporations has been well documented. Apart from theories of news media manipulation (Blyskal & Blyskal 1985), strategic power (Davis 2000a; Davis 2000b) and elite media access (Erjavec 2005) these studies emphasize a strong corporate influence over news production and hence also public opinion. What is more, these studies raise another interesting issue: That of the textual power exerted by news agency copy, corporate ‘spin’ and, most importantly, press releases (see Doyle 2006; Velthuis 2006). Indeed, press releases by definition preformat the news. More specifically, they have been shown to “preformulate” (Jacobs 1999) the
news, thereby opening up avenues for research on issues of journalistic authorship and authority\(^2\). Authorship is seen here as “a cultural construction through which claims to authority are variously established, contested, overturned, and reproduced” (Peterson 2003: 166). Press releases play an important role here, as these texts routinely form the basis for story ideas in business news (Doyle 2006).

A third view on the distribution of power in the media is to be situated against the background of political economy and draws on Gramsci’s use of hegemony, not as a state of control, but as a process of consensus formation by which a world-view compatible with the existing structure of power in society is reproduced in a compromise equilibrium. Baron (2005) is an interesting case in point, spelling out a model of informational competition between an activist and an industry, with both interest groups seeking to influence public sentiment by advocating their positions through the news media.

Finally, there is a wide range of work on the impact of technology on the news. In the terminology of Marshall McLuhan’s technological determinism it is argued that the medium is the message: The rise of the Internet in particular has come to fundamentally change existing communication patterns and hence to disrupt the traditional distribution of power in the media. It has been argued that technology is the driving force behind the transition from powerless mass audiences to powerful and interactive media users (Livingstone 2003). More generally, Pavlik (2000) argues that it’s not just recent developments like the World Wide Web and digital video that have been transforming journalism. Instead, he shows that the whole history of journalism is in many ways defined by technological change and he proposes a new research agenda for the study of journalism and technological change.

2.2. News production involves interaction and negotiation

The above goes to show that institutional and textual power are key concerns in the sociology of news production and that there is theoretical debate about who is dominating who. Along with these notions of power come theories of source-media interaction: If indeed the various parties involved in the news have an interest in determining the media’s impact on people’s lives, then this implies that there must be a fair share of interaction or dialogue\(^3\) between them. The kind of interaction that is taking place here can be situated on a continuum ranging from struggle and conflict on the one hand to co-operation and partnership on the other hand. Take Sigal’s definition of a press release as a “routine channel by which information reaches the journalist” (1973: 225, emphasis added). Or Gans’s claim that news selection is “essentially composed of two processes: One determines the availability of news and relates journalists to sources; the other determines the suitability of news, which ties journalists to audiences.” In line with what we have argued before, he says that both processes have to do with power, which – he goes on – is “exercised by all participants in the

\(^2\) It should be noted that the concept of journalistic authority has been under fire with the rise of new media technologies like blogging and civic journalism. See Matheson 2004, Robinson 2006 and Carlson 2007.

\(^3\) The interaction we are referring to here is to be situated in the flow of information between journalists and the various types of news sources, ranging from interviews to press conferences, from newswire to press releases and the like.
transmittal of information” (1979: 238, our italics). McCombs (2004), finally, refers to agenda-setting as a ‘transfer of salience’. What we would like to suggest here is that all three, Sigal, Gans and McCombs seem to take the news production process as one-way communication in which information is ‘transmitted’ through a number of ‘channels’.

This transmission model of communication is diametrically opposed to the ritual view of communication as put forth by Carey (1989). Such a cultural approach to news and media communication “helps explain generalized images and stereotypes in the news media - of predatory stockbrokers just as much as hard-drinking factory workers - that transcend structures of ownership or even patterns of work relations” (Schudson 2005: 123). For example, in his ethnography of foreign news correspondents in El Salvador, Mark Pedelty (1995) demonstrates how hard-nosed war reporters depend on the go-ahead of their editors back home on the one hand and on the goodwill of embassies and local authorities for access to elite sources on the other.

What this demonstrates is that news production is a process of sourcing and negotiation. Regardless of the underlying message press releases tend to convey, the news is not out there waiting to be reproduced. On the contrary, news is “negotiated between sources, reporters, and editors” (Peterson 2003: 165). As such, news production becomes a discursive process and journalists become interpretive agents.

2.3. News production is a matter of structures and agents

Theoretically, the notion of source dependence invariably summons the legacy of the newsroom ethnographies of the 1970s and 1980s (Tunstall 1971; Tuchman 1972, 1978; Gans 1979; Golding & Elliot 1979; Fishman 1980; Ericson, Baranek & Chan 1987). These scholars drew attention to structural dimensions of news production such as bureaucratic routines and organizational imperatives. Gaye Tuchman’s concept of ‘strategic rituals’ (1972) is a classic case in point. In an attempt to claim objectivity, Tuchman demonstrated that journalists present conflicting possibilities and supporting evidence, use quotations and structure information top-down (cf. the inverted pyramid form of news stories). While these mediacentric accounts of news production brilliantly argued how news institutions and their goals influence news texts, they undertheorized “the extent to which particular journalists do make a difference. Editorial experience, journalistic flair and the 'grit' of the investigative reporter clearly have their place” (Manning 2001: 53). In complete contrast, sociocentric studies of news production (Hetherington 1981; Bell, M. 1995) ascribe epic qualities to reporters and editors, reducing news manufacture to “a media version of the great men of history thesis” (Manning 2001: 53). Both approaches should be seen as "two poles of a theoretical continuum, both ends of which effectively deny agency to the social actors who produce media texts" (Peterson 2003: 164).

Practice theorists like Pierre Bourdieu appear to be steering a middle course: Bourdieu’s field theory foregrounds social actors and their struggles over cultural, economic and linguistic capital. Hence Bourdieu denounces the kind of mechanical
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4 Coman (Coman 2005: 8) notes that these ‘studies never claimed to be anthropological research - in fact it was labelled by M. Schudson as 'sociology of the newsroom', and by Ph. Schlessinger [sic, TVH&GJ] as 'the empirical study of news production'. Its topics, theoretical references, and even methodological inspiration are strictly sociological. When ethnography was invoked, it was non-reflexive, and entirely broken away from anthropological tradition".
thinking which takes for granted that the media are invariably dominated by big businesses. In his article on “The Political Field, the Social Science Field and the Journalistic Field” he talks about a ‘short-circuit fallacy’ which unquestioningly establishes a direct link between media production and societal processes. Instead, Bourdieu argues that we need to try and unravel the complex web of ‘mediations’ that lie at the heart of the news production process. Therefore more case studies are needed of the so-called journalistic field (‘champ’ in French), including newsroom ethnographies that are supposed to help investigate some of the institutional logics underlying the media. Or as Neveu, following Bourdieu, puts it: “The question of the power of the media and that of reception cannot be assessed a priori. It comes down to empirical questions. Field theory offers a toolkit whose proper use it is to reveal the changing structures of interdependencies, institutional mediations” (2005: 208).

This is how Bourdieu himself defines his ‘field’ work:

traditionally, most studies devoted to law, literature, art, science, philosophy, or any cultural productions, are distributed between two major forms of approach. One of them, which can be called internalist, posits that in order to understand law, literature, etc., it is necessary and sufficient to read texts without necessarily referring to the context, that the text is autonomous and self-sufficient, that there is therefore no need to relate it to external factors (economic or geographical ones, for example); the other approach (…) undertakes to relate texts to their social context. (…) The concept of field had the initial function of offering a route out of this forced choice, of refusing the choice between an internal reading of the text which consists in considering the text in itself and for itself, and an external reading which crudely relates the text to society in general. Between the two there is a social universe that is always forgotten, that of the producers of the works, the universe of philosophers, the universe of artists, the universe of writers, and not only writers but also literary institutions, journals for example, the universities where writers are educated and so on. (2005: 32-33)

The full-fledged analysis of this extract is of course beyond the scope of this paper, but it should be clear that Bourdieu seems to be calling for a renewed approach to the media that takes into account not just structure but also agency – and the key phrase here is ‘the producers of the work’. However, elsewhere in the same paper, we can see strong evidence of the fact that it is not journalists after all that are on Bourdieu’s mind:

As for the field of journalism, why does it seem to me important to talk about it? Because (…) it seems to me that for a number of years now the journalistic field has exerted an increasingly powerful hold – and we are not talking here about the “power of journalists” – on other fields (…). Why is it important to talk about the journalistic field and not about journalists? Because so long as one talks about journalists, one is talking within a logic of personal responsibility: (…) journalists (…) become scapegoats, whereas if one talks in terms of a field one substitutes for these visible agents (…) the structure of the journalistic field and the mechanisms that operate within it. (41-42)

Somewhat surprisingly – to say the least – Bourdieu returns to the power theme and seems to engage in the kind of reductionist discourse that we thought he should not be

5 The reason why we select this article is not just that it represents a fine summary of the views of one of the most influential scholars in this area, but also that it exemplifies some of the central ambiguities underlying the literature on news production processes when it comes to the role of the individual. For more information on Bourdieu’s field theory, see Benson & Neveu 2005.
associated with. Indeed, - and we would like to suggest that this is quite an eye-opener - the very reason why he wants to talk about journalism and not about journalists is that talking about journalists (agents, that is) instead of journalism (structure) would have forced him to abandon the rhetoric of power in favor of another kind of rhetoric (that of responsibility), one that he seems to feel less comfortable with (or at least less interested in). What this seems to indicate is that it is Bourdieu’s primary interest in power that leads him to focus on structures instead of agents and not the other way round. Here is how he talks about a TV show on election night, with a journalist interviewing a specialist in political history: “When the historian addresses the journalist it is not an historian who speaks to a journalist … it is the social science field talking to the journalistic field”. (31)

Another case in point is Bourdieu’s rather simplified view of the Public Relations business, one that seems to be the direct result of a consistent focus on power rather than responsibility, structure instead of agents:

[The fact that so much power is attributed to the media] has the effect of making specialized “public relations strategists” proliferate and prosper. These specialists design highly elaborate “events” and increasingly sophisticated “media campaigns” for clients whose requests are often rather naïve – “we want to be on the front page”, “we want to be on the evening news”, “we want our picture in the paper”, “we want to hold a press conference: get us a dozen journalists!”, and so on. (…) faced with these new enticements, journalists become complacent or even act out of material interest. They are generally taken in by this game by the best of faith because it is explicitly designed to take them in; public relations agencies really do put themselves in the journalists’ place (…). (54)

The implications of the extract quoted above are that Bourdieu seems to insist on the strict integrity of the various fields involved in media production (journalism, PR, general public…). He is definitely opposed against intrusions of one field into another, which is what Public Relations and press releases are all about. PR specialists, he seems to suggest, are sophisticated and strategic; the general public is naïve; and journalists are easily led or, worse, complacent. So our analysis of the ‘field’ concept illustrates that, in spite of what he says about combining internalist and externalist readings, Bourdieu continues to separate structures and agents – focusing on power and regarding texts as black boxes scarcely worth opening. Case in point is Champagne & Marchetti’s analysis of the 1985 contaminated blood scandal in France, in which the journalists wander around like faceless and voiceless support actors against the background of a nationwide drama (2005): Although the case no doubt presents ample opportunity for highlighting the responsibilities and the acts of individual journalists, it is institutions and structures that the authors focus on. Indeed, it could be argued that, from an analytical point of view, most of the existing literature has largely disregarded journalistic agency in favor of organizational and institutional levels of analysis6, thereby reducing newsmaking to a bureaucratic routine which, in turn, accounts for the “relatively unconscious role played by news journalists in news manufacture” (Cottle 2000a: 22).

The kind of approach that we propose here is one in which agency is promoted within the larger structural embeddedness of cultural production. To quote Mark

---

6 See for example Whitney & Ettema (2003: 160) for a brief discussion of “the role of individual values […] in the work of those who serve as gatekeepers for the flow of news.”
Peterson (2001: 207) once more: “To understand what a journalist writes, it is necessary to understand his or her place in the journalistic field – the status of the newspaper for which the journalist writes (and hence the authority with which he or she speaks and asks questions), the journalist’s specific competence in the writing technologies privileged within the field, the position of the journalist within the sets of roles within the newspaper, and the history of the journalist’s prior relations with the social actors he or she is constituting as sources.” Moreover, it is against this background that the ethnography of media production studies the interpretive practices of media producers; the social and textual processes of creativity and interpretation. Peterson (2003: 184) notes that these processes are “not random but constituted by and constitutive of social heuristics and cultural epistemologies.” It is here that we can begin to see how a social actor shapes the news product and this is exactly what we aim to do next.

3. News production practice

In this part of our paper we would like to demonstrate how all of the above can be linked up with our empirical research on the complex ways in which the media deal with the press releases that they receive from all sorts of would-be news sources in general and on the journalists’ entextualization practices in particular. The point we are trying to make is not just that the notions of power, interaction and agency that we have discussed in the previous part can help guide our fieldwork on the way press releases are used by journalists, but that the results of our fieldwork can contribute to a better understanding of these issues within the broader theorizing on news access and news production. It is interesting to note that these issues have not been explicitly addressed in previous work on press releases (Sleurs, Jacobs & Van Waes 2003; Sleurs & Jacobs 2005). In what follows, we present a case study of the journalistic practices of AMT, a senior business reporter at a Flemish daily newspaper, as he discovers, negotiates, writes and reflects on a news story. We first describe how we operationalize our notions of power, interaction and agency in a case study of journalistic reproductive writing processes (3.1), then we introduce our research method (3.2), data (3.3) and finally the results of our case study (3.4).

3.1. Operationalization

In order to apply our prolegomena to the analysis of newswriting, we operationalize news production as a form of reproductive writing (Jakobs 2003) involving the transformation of multiple news discourses (press agency copy, press releases, interview notes, other news media) into a single narrative, framed as an authoritative account of a news event. This view highlights the intertextuality of news texts. Intertextuality refers first and foremost to the ways in which news texts are linked to sources. Case in point is the genre of press releases. These texts are typically “prefabricated in an appropriate news style” (Bell, A. 1991: 58) to facilitate reproduction by the media. These ‘preformulation’ features are discussed at length in Jacobs (1999) and include the use of newspaper-like headlines, narrative structure and a number of metapragmatic features, most prominently third person self-reference (“J.P. Morgan announced today” instead of “we”) and pseudo-quotations (“Fortis Bank CEO John Sheffield noted that ‘the merger
signifies a major step forward’…”). In addition to having a textual dimension, intertextuality can also be seen as “a strategically deployed [social] practice through which producers […] construct meanings, frame activities and pursue outcomes” (Peterson 2001: 239). In this sense, news production becomes a process of entextualization (Bauman & Briggs 1990; Briggs & Bauman 1992; Silverstein & Urban 1996), i.e. the extraction (decontextualization) of source material and its subsequent insertion (recontextualization) into a (new) news discourse. It is here that our notions of power, interaction and agency begin to bite. Crucially, news production engages multiple social actors who “assign, and struggle over, authority, ownership and control over the text” (Peterson 2003: 193). These power concerns are played out in a social field of unequal authorial power. Indeed, "journalistic authority is built on silence, on the concealment of journalistic presence" (Peterson 2003: 83), as well as on the practice of sourcing. Balancing issues of confidentiality and credibility, most intertextual links between news sources and news texts are rendered implicit. In this sense, journalists are seen as interpretive agents who construct authoritative news accounts out of a multitude of news sources.

In sum, we operationalize power as a function of journalistic authority, interaction as the practice of news sourcing and agency as interpretive practice. In an attempt to illustrate this process of entextualization, we follow a story (Boyer & Hannerz 2006), documenting how a senior business reporter discovers a story, introduces it into the newsroom, writes a news story and reflects on it.

3.2. Method

In order to put our notions of power, interaction and agency in news production to empirical work, we propose a combination of newsroom ethnography and computer-assisted writing process analysis. Using participant observation (Cottle 1998) and interview data, we contextualize how journalists write news stories7 within the institutional context of a newsroom. Complementing the ethnographic component is online registration of the writing process in the tradition of cognitive psychology (MacArthur, Graham & Fitzgerald 2006). To this end, two software applications were used: Inputlog and Camtasia Studio. Inputlog8 is a Microsoft Windows based logging tool which records keyboard strokes and mouse movements and generates datafiles for statistical, text, pause and mode analyses (Leijten & Van Waes 2006). Camtasia Studio9 is an online screen registration tool which we used to make screen videos of the observed writing processes. These files enabled easy and immediate playback of the recorded writing process data during retrospective interviews. Both applications were used to record, reconstruct and analyze writing processes10.

---

8 Inputlog is freely available to the research community at the following website: http://webh01.ua.ac.be/mleijten/inputlog/
9 For more information and download options, see http://www.techsmith.com
3.3. **Data**

Our data are drawn from an ethnographic study of journalists’ reproductive newswriting practices. Fieldwork was conducted by the first author of this paper between October 2006 and March 2007 at the business newsdesk of a major Flemish quality daily newspaper. Data include fieldnotes, audio recordings of story meetings (n=53) and interviews with reporters, copy-editors and the desk chief, internal memos, documents, emails as well as video recordings and keystroke logging data of writing processes and audio recordings of retrospective interviews. The story meetings and interviews were recorded using a digital voice recorder. To collect the writing process data, keystroke logging and screen recording software were installed on the journalists’ computers with their permission. The software was activated for the entire duration of the writing process: From the moment the journalists signaled that they were ready to start writing until they filed their finished story. As soon as possible afterwards, a retrospective interview with the reporter in question was conducted, if time permitted, with video playback of the recorded writing process. A total of 18 such writing processes by 3 different reporters were recorded.

The case study reported on here was selected because it provides a rich context for analyzing the situated practices of AMT, a senior business reporter. I was told in an interview with copy desk chief LRN that AMT was “a reporter pur sang”, an acknowledgement of AMT’s wide interest in and coverage of business news. During my fieldwork, AMT was promoted to assistant business editor and he won a professional award for journalistic excellence. Moreover, we were intrigued by the fact that, during preliminary interviews, AMT told us that “90% of press releases are useless.”

The news story (henceforth: The VIB story) we follow is concerned with increased government funding of biotechnology and nanotechnology research. Two prestigious Flemish research institutes, VIB and IMEC were awarded research contracts by the Flemish government. This event was not listed in the newsroom’s ‘story budget’; i.e. it was not a planned story. Instead, the event was brought to AMT’s attention by a spokesperson for the Flemish Minister of Science who had called AMT to announce a press conference later that day and to ask if he was planning on attending. Hearing that AMT was not going to attend, the spokesperson then informed AMT that a press release would be sent round and that the presentation slides used during the press conference were also available. Sensing a good story, AMT inquired about the increased funding and accepted the spokesperson’s offer. In an interview, AMT mentioned that the spokesperson had called him “because he had seen me a couple of times at press conferences.”

3.4. **Results**

In this section, we highlight AMT’s entextualization, sourcing and interpretive practices by presenting a transcript of the story meeting detailing story introduction and assignment as well as selected writing process and retrospective interview data, supplemented with ethnographic detail.
4.3.1. Story meeting

The story meeting provides a forum for introducing, reviewing, selecting, following up on and assigning developing stories for next day’s paper (see also Clayman & Reisner 1998). During these daily staff meetings, story selection, length and placement are decided, potential cover stories are discussed and general announcements are made. The meeting is attended by all the business reporters who are in that day and one or two copy-editors. It is chaired by desk chief LRN who also makes the ‘story budget’, a pool of possible stories based on the newsroom agenda, incoming press releases, news agency copy and other media. Every day around 2:00pm, the newsroom staff gathers around LRN at one of the newsroom conference tables. While they have access to it, the reporters do not usually bring a copy of the story budget to the story meeting. In a follow-up meeting at 2:45pm and again at 5:30pm, the copy editor acts as a representative for the business desk who communicates the business story budget to her fellow copy editors and the editor-in-chief.

The transcripts below are based on an audio recording of a story meeting during which AMT introduces the VIB story. The story meeting was attended and recorded by the first author of this paper during week 16 of his fieldwork. The meeting lasted 14 minutes. We focus on how AMT introduces the VIB story: A first, failed attempt around the 6 minute mark, and then a second, successful attempt 10 minutes into the meeting. The two transcripts are first presented in full, followed by a discussion of arrowed lines.

Participants:

GRI (senior reporter), ONL (junior reporter), TRE (senior reporter), AMT (senior reporter), HOM (senior reporter), LRN (desk chief), TRA (copy editor)

(DS_W16_D4_eco_6’12”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>122. LRN:</th>
<th>Look there’s a remarkable advertisement in today’s paper about Flanders looking for erm all attach[és in] erm biotech nano(,)technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>123. HOM:</td>
<td>[uhu (nasal grunt)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124. AMT:</td>
<td>• [•oh yeah, there’s also [erm, oh•]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125. LRN:</td>
<td>&gt;to to to&lt; to send out. Who can write something about that?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126. AMT:</td>
<td>(taps fingertips) •Yeah there are radiocommercials for this (taps fingertips)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127. LRN:</td>
<td>Ah I haven’t heard those yet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128. AMT:</td>
<td>Flanders Investment and Trade (2.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129. LRN:</td>
<td>could you erm?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This audio recording of the story meeting was transcribed according to conversation analytic conventions (see Appendix 2). Analysis is based on the original Dutch transcriptions, but these have been translated into English to accommodate a wider audience. The English transcriptions provide an idiomatic translation of the Dutch original, which can be found in the appendix to this paper.
This first transcript begins when LRN has just run down the stories listed on the day’s story budget. LRN mentions a job notice for biotechnology and nanotechnology expatriates (line 122). This triggers AMT’s memory about the VIB, prompting him to intervene and self-select a turn in which he tries to introduce the VIB story (line 124). Realizing he does not have the floor, AMT cedes the floor to LRN, who completes his turn. AMT then responds to LRN’s question by referring to radio commercials while tapping his fingertips (line 127) and naming the government body behind the job advertisement (line 128). LRN asks ONL, a junior reporter responsible for online news content to look into this story.

(DS_W16_D4_eco_10'12")

---

As the second transcript begins with some playful banter about parenting between TRE, HOM and GRI, AMT tries to address LRN (line 245) but his initial attempt drowns in group laughter. In line 249, AMT mentions the VIB story by first referring to the pseudo-event of the signing of the agreements and then by adding the more newsworthy detail of the budget increase.
This double-edged pitch offers a first glimpse at how AMT (re)entextualizes the VIB story: Shifting into a more formal, nominal register typical of story summaries, AMT clearly echoes the opening paragraph of the VIB press release¹² (Figure 1):

Press Release from Fientje Moerman, Vice-Minister-President of the Flemish Government and Flemish Minister for Economy, Enterprise, Science, Innovation and Foreign Trade

08-03-2007

More than 400 million euro for biotech and nanotech

Today Flemish Minister for Science and Innovation Fientje Moerman has signed the new management agreements (2007 – 2011) for VIB and IMEC. The Flemish government reserves more than 400 million euro in the coming five years for research in these two top institutes. The budget of operation of both institutes increases with 20%.

Figure 1: opening paragraph of English translation of VIB press release

AMT’s (re)entextualization of “Today Flemish Minister for Science and Innovation Fientje Moerman has [sic] signed the new management agreements (2007 – 2011) for VIB and IMEC.” illustrates a social function of preformulation to draw LRN’s attention. Previously, the notion of preformulation (Jacobs 1999) was conceived of as a textual property of press releases. This excerpt, however, illustrates a social function. In order to promote his story, AMT draws on the press release. We believe that this social use of preformulation is here documented for the first time. Next, AMT drives his story promotion home by referring to the scale of the financial event involved; a 20% budget increase is a significant – and hence newsworthy – event. Again, this resonates information from the press release: “The budget of operation of both institutes increases with 20%.” It should be noted that AMT does not attribute the source, nor mention the actor involved, namely the Flemish minister of Science, Fientje Moerman. However, by doing so, AMT claims authorship of the story.

A very brief negotiation between AMT and LRN ensues (lines 266-8), in which AMT asks if this story should be run. The passive voice construction in line 266

¹² This English translation was attached in the original email to AMT.
functions as a sort of authorship hedge, indicating the supply and demand mechanism of story meetings.

| 266. AMT: | [should attention be paid to this?] |
| 267. LRN: | [60 line-] 60 lines on eco 4, no? |
| 268. AMT: | if they get more money |
| 269. AMT: | yes 20 procent [xxx] |

LRN immediately assigns AMT 60 lines on page four of the business section but asks AMT for confirmation of the budget increase. This conditional resonates the implicit newsworthiness assessment of AMT’s story promotion, which AMT confirms. It should be noted that AMT expresses the scale of the budget increase in relative terms (“20%”) and not in absolute terms (“400 million euro”).

At this point, the copy editor, who’s sitting at the other end of the conference table overhears the discussion and asks AMT for clarification as she writes in a notebook. AMT reiterates the appeal to newsworthiness (line 270):

| 269. TRA: | what’s that AMT, the Flemish government and? |
| 270. AMT: | VIB and Imec are getting more money |
| 271. HOM: | from Fientje? |
| 272. AMT: | from Fientje |

This triggers HOM to inquire about the actor involved (line 271). AMT confirms that it is Fientje Moerman, then Flemish minister of science and formerly a newsroom colleague of the business staff. AMT later told the first author of this paper that he never worked with Fientje but that HOM did.

By focusing on agency in the immediate context of a story meeting, this short excerpt illustrates how AMT introduces the VIB story into the newsroom by resonating the pseudo-event and title of the press release. This is what Mark Peterson calls the interpretive practice approach to media production: “The detailed description of the acts through which media texts are negotiated […] Such an approach allows us to examine creativity and interpretation as they are played out in both the social and textual dimensions […] This approach assumes that interpretive creativity is not random but constituted by and constitutive of social heuristics and cultural epistemologies” (2003: 184). The heuristics and epistemologies AMT employs in his story promotion are an authoritative voice (nominalization), the assumption of authorship (absence of source attribution), deictic reference to newsworthiness (budget increase, in relative terms and not absolute terms) and a false impression of journalistic presence, “based on having ‘been there’ so that [AMT] can ‘report it’” (Peterson 2003: 77). Crucially, the employment of these heuristics and epistemologies should be seen in the context of a social field in which reputations, power and professional status are at stake. In addition, this short fragment illustrates how source interaction and source status impinge on the news production process, and, ultimately, how “source power is ‘in play’ in the process of producing business news.” (Kjær & Langer 2003: 3)
4.3.2. Writing process

In AMT’s newspaper article, all intertextual links to news sources are rendered implicit. This is a common practice in news journalism; by concealing news sources – referencing at best to the source text in the form of a trope like “according to a statement issued by the company” – as well as their own actions for obtaining the information reported on, reporters assume authorship and thus establish journalistic authority. Our process data allow us to foreground these intertextual links by looking at the writing process in detail and seeing where and how AMT draws on source material. For these purposes, we draw on writing process data as well as screen video, interview and product data. One way of visualizing these intertextual links is to plot the writing process in an activity graph. Perrin (2003) distinguishes two meso level actions in the “writing progression” of journalists: Text insertion and deletion. These actions constitute revisions. We use a similar approach: Figure 2 graphically represents AMT’s writing process by plotting temporal data (in absolute time) against process data, i.e. keyboard strokes (the number of revisions) and mouse commands (movement and clicks).

![Activity graph of VIB writing process](image)

This graph is based on a five second period, linear log file generated by Inputlog. The graph shows 4 distinct phases in AMT’s writing process: A preparatory phase (0’00”-7’00”), two text construction phases (7’00”-16’01” and 17’02”-24’03”) and a revision phase. The preparatory phase consists of mouse movements (scrolling through emails and opening attachments), while the text construction phases show a high number of keyboard movements (text insertion and deletion) as well as mouse movements (cursor movement, switching and resizing computer windows, looking for online information).
During the revision phase AMT revises and edits his text, switching back and forth between the preview pane and the editing window. A screenshot is given by way of illustration (Figure 3).

With regards to AMT’s sourcing practices, the process data show that AMT draws on two sources: The press release issued by the minister of Science and the powerpoint slides used during the press conference. The former AMT prints out and places on his desk, the latter he opens in a text editing window. A screenshot taken from the video data illustrates this setup (Figure 4). AMT’s use of sources largely overlaps with the two main text construction phases: Information from the press release was used to write the headline, lead and background information about the research institutes during the first text construction phase, while the powerpoint slides were used to write the concluding paragraphs on government demands and agreement types during the second text construction phase (a translation of the news article can be found in the Appendix).

Crucially, this illustrates how and where preformulation ‘works’: Apparently, preformulated texts allow journalists to write quickly, and thus save time. The fact that AMT largely retells preformulated information partially accounts for AMT’s highly routinized and linear writing process (cf. infra). In addition, we would also like to underline AMT’s use of the presentation slides. Indeed, much like the press release, AMT draws on these slides to write about the requirement of a new corporate governance policy and performance indicators. By doing so, AMT assumes authorship of the information drawn from both sources and thus falsely taking credit for having been at the press conference. During the retrospective interview, AMT commented that overt source attributions such as ‘according to an official statement’ are “rather useless” and that he makes a point of not mentioning them. However, in his news article, AMT refers to the “new management agreements which were signed yesterday by the Minister of Science and Innovation Fientje Moerman…” Commenting on why he refers explicitly to this pseudo-event, AMT said “well, there was a press conference, so it would be weird not to write that”. This statement not only provides evidence for a conscious decision on AMT’s part but it also provides support for Peterson’s claim that journalistic authority is based on ‘having been there’. AMT’s journalistic authority is built on his concealment of the two preformulated news sources - which happened to fall on his lap – without his having to attend the press conference.

If we then look at some descriptive statistics of the writing process (Table 1), there is a strikingly small difference between process and product data: Differentials of 274 characters and 43 words are low. With a total production time of 9’22” and a pause time of 24’02 (including reading time), these numbers indicate a very linear and thus routine writing process. In those 9 minutes of text production, AMT is very productive:
not only does he write the article manually – he does not copy/paste text from the slides – he also double checks information online.
Interestingly, if we look for pause length in the writing process, we find that the mean pause time is 4.344 seconds (with a standard deviation of 7.734 seconds). While a full-fledged analysis of the pausing behavior is beyond the reach of this paper, we would like to conclude this part with a brief example of AMT’s pausing behavior in relation to his sourcing practices. In order to visualize the writing process, Inputlog generates linear logs of recorded writing sessions. If we look at how AMT writes the opening sentence, the linear log looks like this:

![Figure 5. Linear log passage](image)

This fragment shows a very fluent writing process, typical of the sort of highly routinized behavior that writing from sources is for business journalists. The fragment also shows the effects of preformulation: AMT rewrites the opening line of the press release from:

“Today Flemish Minister for Science and Innovation Fientje Moerman has [sic] signed the new management agreements (2007 – 2011) for VIB and IMEC.”

to

“The subsidy raise is included in the new management agreements which were signed yesterday in Ghent.”

AMT thus foregrounds the budget increase. In the linear log, we see a 5 second pause (5558 milliseconds) before AMT writes “subsidieverhoging” (Eng. subsidy raise). This hesitation is a direct result of AMT’s reliance on the press release, which does not mention the term ‘subsidy raise’. This hesitation is significant, because AMT does not pause when he writes the rest of the opening sentence. The typographical error at the 08’21” mark he corrects directly. He then switches to the preview pane (F6). During the revision phase toward the end of his writing process, the spelling error in the Dutch relative pronoun “die” (Eng. *that*) is corrected at the 26:53 mark.
4. Conclusion

This paper has dealt with the theory and practice of news production. Drawing on news production theory in media sociology and media anthropology, we presented three points of contention. First, it was argued that institutional forces continue to wield considerable power in newsrooms, leading to routines of news access and reliance on ‘preformulated’ sources. This, in turn, brought the notions of journalistic authority and authorship into focus. Second, source-media interaction was represented on a continuum of informational transmission at one end to practices of negotiation and entextualization at the other. Third, the impact of institutional structure was evaluated against the interpretive practice of newswriting. Drawing on fieldwork data, we then highlighted selected practices of a senior business reporter as he discovers, negotiates, writes and files a news story. By focusing on the role of source media (i.e. press releases) and the journalist’s interpretive practices in newswriting, we outlined how the discursive transformations shed light on journalists’ writing practices and how power concerns come into play in source-media interaction and journalistic agency. We believe that the analysis of the social and textual practices surrounding the use of source media in newswriting offers many exciting avenues for further research on news production. Or as Gaye Tuchman writes: "At the juncture between sources and reporters, 'source media' (press releases, government reports, telephone interviews, etc.) provide important and still under-researched raw material for what ends up as news texts" (2003: 89).

Our combined methodology of newsroom ethnography and computer-assisted writing process analysis offered a behind-the-scenes look at the situated practices of news production. Moreover, it was shown that, in addition to having a textual function, preformulation is used socially to promote a news story during story meetings and that the reliance on press releases allows for a linear, routine writing process.
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Appendices

1. English translation of AMT’s newspaper article

**More (Flemish) money for techno research**

Policy news

The Flemish research institutes VIB and IMEC are getting more money from the Flemish government.

BRUSSELS. The subsidy raise is included in the new management agreements which were signed yesterday by the Minister of Science and Innovation, Fientje Moerman (Open VLD). They are valid for five years.

During that time the Flemish government will shell out more than 400 million euro for both institutions.

For the Flemish Interuniversity Center for Biotechnology (VIB) in Ghent, the funds for the period between 2007 and 2011 will go upwards of 190 million euro, 43 euro million more than during the previous period.

Over the next five years, the Interuniversity Microelectronics Center (Imec) in Leuven will be receiving more than 210 million euro, a boost of more than 40 million euro.

VIB employs more than 1,000 researchers, divided over 65 research units. Around 1,500 people work at Imec. Both institutes are important for the development of the Flemish nanotechnology and biotechnology sector.

The extra funds come with new demands. The institutions are required to develop new individual codes of proper management (*corporate governance*). There is also a new list of performance indicators such as total revenue from research, the number of joint ventures and the number of spin-offs.

The new policy agreements have been drawn up using a sort of model contract, valid for all Flemish top-level research institutes. This contract will also be valid for the Flemish Institute for Technological Research (Vito) and the Interdisciplinary Institute for Broadband Technology (IBBT). (amt)

2. Transcription conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>rising intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!</td>
<td>exclamation intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>falling intonation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te:xt</td>
<td>stretched sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(.)</td>
<td>micro pause (shorter than 0.5 s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.0)</td>
<td>approximate pause length (in seconds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>speaker emphasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;text&lt;</td>
<td>talk produced quicker than surrounding talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>text-</td>
<td>interrupted word or utterance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xxx</td>
<td>inaudible speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Original story meeting transcript (in Dutch)

failed introduction (English translation)
“oh yeah, there’s also erm” (DS_W16_D4_eco_6’12”)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> Look there’s a remarkable advertisement in today’s paper about Flanders looking for erm all attach[és in] erm biotech nano(.)technolo[gy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td><strong>HOM:</strong> [uhu (nasal grunt)] [†oh yeah, there’s also [erm, oh₁]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td><strong>AMT:</strong> [†to to to&lt; to send out. Who can write something about that?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> [†taps fingertips] Yeah there are radiocommercials for this (taps fingertips)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> Ah I haven’t heard those yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127.</td>
<td><strong>AMT:</strong> Flanders Investment and Trade (2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> could you erm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130.</td>
<td><strong>GOP:</strong> su:re</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> who who you should have a look maybe there’s an advertisement in that that says who’s responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.</td>
<td><strong>HOM:</strong> oh it’s from, it’s from Jobpunt Vlaanderen [so] huh so that’s the Flemish government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> [oh yeah]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

failed introduction (original)
“oh yeah, there’s also erm” (DS_W16_D4_eco_6’12”)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> Zeg er staat een opvallend advertentie in de krant vandaag dat Vlaanderen zoekt euh allemaal attach[és in] euh biotech nano(.)technolo[gie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123.</td>
<td><strong>HOM:</strong> [aha (nasaal)] [†ah ja, er is ook nog [euh, oh₁]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124.</td>
<td><strong>AMT:</strong> [†om om om&lt; om uit te sturen. Wie kan daar [nog eens iets over maken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> [(roffelt met z’n vingers)] Ja daar hebben ze ook radiospotjes voor (roffelt met z’n vingers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126.</td>
<td><strong>LRN:</strong> Ah die heb ik nog niet gehoord</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
128. **AMT:** Flanders Investment and Trade (2.3)
129. **LNR:** kunt gij eens euh?
130. **GOP:** ja:
131. **LNR:** wie wie ge moet eens zien misschien staat er een advertentie in dat wie daar verantwoordelijk voor is
132. **HOM:** oh het komt van, het komt van Jobpunt Vlaanderen [uit] he dus da’s de Vlaamse overheid
133. **LNR:** [ah ja]

**successful introduction (English translation)**
“there’s also erm” (DS_W16_D4_eco_10’12”)

| 244. **TRE:** | Pieter- xxx Pieter on his cartoons xxx |
| 245. **AMT:** | there’s also erm- |
| 246. | (laughter) |
| 247. **HOM:** | gosh, are you already doing that now? |
| 248. **GRI:** | yeah, that’s incre[di]ble that xxx that’s going to become a xxx or something |
| 249. **AMT:** | [the signing of the new management agreement between the Flemish government and erm the V I B and IMEC they’re getting 20% [more money |
| 250. **GRI:** | [what? two months? |
| 251. **TRE:** | three |
| 252. **GRI:** | three months and he’s already putting him in front of the [tv]? |
| 253. **ONL:** | [woohahaha] |
| 254. **AMT:** | [should we pay attention to this?] |
| 255. **LNR:** | [60 lijn-] 60 lines on eco 4, no? if they get more money |
| 256. **AMT:** | yes 20 procent [xxx] |
| 257. **TRE:** | [xxx] |
| 258. **TRA:** | what’s that Ruben, the Flemish government and? |
| 259. **AMT:** | v i b and Imec are getting more money |
| 260. **HOM:** | from Fientje? |
| 261. **AMT:** | from Fientje |
| 262. **LRN:** | that’s biotechnology [and (1.1)] |
| 263. **HOB:** | [xxx so biotechnology] |
| 264. **LRN:** | (jokingly) o’mon, do you still don’t know this? goddammit??? all too often have I xxx |

**successful introduction (original)**
“there’s also erm” (DS_W16_D4_eco_10’12”)

| 244. **TRE:** | Pieter- xxx Pieter over z’n tekenfilms xxx |
| 245. **AMT:** | er is ook nog euh- |
| 246. | (gelach) |
| 247. **HOM:** | goh, gij begint daar nu al mee? |
| 248. **GRI:** | ja, da’s onge[loofelijk dat xxx dat wordt een xxx of zoiets |
| 249. **AMT:** | [de ondertekening van het nieuwe beheersovereenkomst tussen de Vlaamse Overheid en euh het V I B en IMEC die krijgen 20% [meer geld |
| 250. **GRI:** | [wat? twee |
|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 251. | maand? | drie | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 252. | | drie maand en hij zet hem al voor [tv] | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 253. | | | woohahahaha | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 254. | | | moet daa:r aandacht aan geschonken] [worden? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 255. | | | [60 lijn-) op 60 lijntjes op eco 4, nee? als ze meer geld krijgen | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 256. | | | ja 20 procent [xxx] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 257. | | | [xxx] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 258. | | | wat is dat euh Ruben, Vlaamse overheid en? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 259. | | | v i b en imec krijgen meer geld | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 260. | | | van Fientje? | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 261. | | | van Fientje | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 262. | | | da’s biotechnologie [en (1.1) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 263. | | | [xxx dus biotechnologie] | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 264. | | | (grappend) alé, weet ge da nu nog nie? godverdomme??? al zo dikwijls heb ik u xxx | | | | | | | | | | | |