

Backstage Report: Research Strategies and Field Observations

An Extended Reflection on the Media Research in the Norwegian Power and Democracy Programs

TORE SLAATTA

This essay offers a reflection on some of the strategic considerations on media power research that were developed in connection with the recent Norwegian Power and Democracy Program. A central background for the reflection is the way Nordic power and democracy programs generally can be said to have influenced the fields of Nordic media research. Large scale, nationally coordinated research programs on the status of democracy and the distribution of power have almost become a speciality within the Nordic social science research community. And in due order the Norwegian, Swedish, Danish, and now also the Finnish governments have funded and organised such programs since the late 1970s. The recent initiative in Finland to launch a power research program in 2007 creates an excellent opportunity for reflection on the outcomes of previous research efforts, and on how the development and structures of our field of media research has been influenced by them. Thus, I do not want to comment on “outcomes” in usual, scientific or economic utility terms, and I do not mainly think of “outcomes” as research results or findings. Rather I want to reflect upon “field outcomes” or “field effects”, understood as the effects that these nationally coordinated, interdisciplinary, social scientific research programs might have had – and might have in the future – on the field of Nordic media research. Along the way, I want to touch upon some central questions, for instance:

1. Is it possible to locate and describe some specific or general field effects of the various Nordic media power research projects on the fields of media research? Is it for instance possible to locate specific forms of knowledge, theoretical orientations and research strategies that has emerged from these specific interdisciplinary research efforts? Can we trace a historical line of media power research, or are the effects more diverse and connected to individual careers, rather than collective and general?
2. What kind of external, structures structure the media researchers that chose to work within these national, interdisciplinary, large scale programs and what characterize the space of opportunities? Is it for instance possible for media researchers to develop original research strategies and designs for research on media power that at the same time become epistemologically challenging, ambitious and autonomous? In other words, is it possible for the field of media research to strengthen its position vs other fields within human and social sciences?

3. Are there any experiences and strategic lessons to be learned from the earlier interdisciplinary research and collaborative work within the power research programs that should be passed on to new, future generation of researchers conducting "Nordic media power studies" or pursuing similar research objectives on a European or international level?

Partly as an answer to the questions above, and partly as an opening up for a reflection on my own experiences in these matters, I want to present the major concerns and research strategies developed in the media research within the Norwegian Power and Democracy Program (1998-2003). I am perhaps not the right person to really say what came out of this work, and it is too early to do a proper investigation in terms of historical trajectory in the Nordic fields. But I can say something about how our research was intended, how we made our strategic choices, and how we tried to contribute to the overall production of knowledge within the national program. More generally I can say something about research organisations and my experience as responsible coordinator and media researcher within the program.

The Early Nordic Power Research Programs: Effects on the Emerging Fields

My general argument on field effects will be that the early media power research projects in Nordic social science in the 80s and 90s provided our field with important impetus through innovative theoretical developments and ambitious research designs. They should be seen as defining moments in our field's history, as particular important moments when large scale research on media power brought several researchers together in collaborative work, when original methodological weapons was tried out, and when theoretical concepts and arguments was developed to make an impact both inside and outside our own field. A sound hypothesis is, that during the 1980s and 1990s, the small scale of our media research enterprise meant that more or less, what ever the actual outcome of the research, the field in general would be strengthened by such external relations and research cooperation. However, there are many signs that the early programs also opened up for conflicts and rivalry towards outside disciplines. In trying to balance between internal and external benefits, media researchers risk being squeezed from two sides: From their own field, where there might be contesting interests in the theoretical understanding of how media power should be analysed, and from outside fields, notably political science and sociology, who more easily signals a strong interest in and ownership to the officially stated goals of the overall research program.

Now, as more autonomy, size and numbers has been reached, the situation has changed. The media field has become stronger and more independent, but at the same time more spread out and diversified. Since the structures of interdisciplinary are now already found within the media research field itself, the invitation to participate in external, interdisciplinary research is not as tempting as it used to be. The dominance of political science in the research organisations usually also confirm that the media field is not expected to play a strong role in the definition of research objectives and methodologies. Hence, it is more uncertain if the field at all will be benefiting from cooperation and strong external relations to national power research programs. On the other hand, not to participate is to miss an opportunity for the field to engage in self reflection and external competition: the expansion and diversification of the media research field has

made it large and influential in society, but to some degree at the cost of lower scientific depth and loss of academic virtues. A general low degree of internal contestation and challenging debate across subfields and specialities tend to confirm and reproduce a weak, rather than a strong position of media research within the overarching field of human and social sciences.

The history of Nordic power research began in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The first was the Norwegian power study program which came to an end in 1982. Svennik Høyer, Helge Østbye, Anita Werner and their colleagues in Oslo and Bergen were drawing their conclusions on media power in a separate white paper. They produced a coherent report, but it was published too late and outside the publication series of the program and did not really contribute to the general findings of the whole program. Instead, it became the canonic text for the early years of Norwegian media studies. The field was in an entrepreneurial and embryonic stage and they were inventing Norwegian media research as they did it.

Their work and their writings bear evidence of ambivalence towards mother disciplines. On the one hand, the young discipline needed to draw the lines of their field against the dominant disciplines of Norwegian political science and sociology. On the other hand, its ability to deliver theoretically coherent, empirical research to the programs research objectives had to be proved. The white paper report that the assigned group of media researchers published in 1982 was an impressive collection of quantitative and qualitative data on media history, media use, political communication and news journalism, and also included a chapter on new media technologies. It became a central read for all media students, and secured a theoretical and empirical platform for the new discipline. But although written in the early 80s, the new winds already blowing within media and cultural studies, particularly in Europe and in British academia, were not felt. Neither an interpretative, ethnographic or a linguistic or semiotic turn could be traced in the report. Instead, the report inscribed Norwegian media research within the two competing schools of Norwegian social sciences at the time: the new rational choice theories and institutional theory. However, by not taking side and choosing between them, their balancing act stirred more controversy than expected. The two leading directors of the program, Gudmund Hernes and Johan P. Olsen both contributed with independent books and articles on media power, journalism and political communication which to some degree bypassed the media researchers in the final reporting of the program. Thus the effect of the report was to confirm Norwegian media research as a weak speciality within the social sciences with particular bonds to political science and sociology.

From the mid 1980s and onwards, a new generation of media researchers came to the fore, researchers that had spent formative years within departments of media sociology and journalism and who had a wider reading in the emerging cultural studies field in Britain and the U.S. Slowly, a new consensus in the field proliferated, emphasizing the cultural and constructionist understandings of culture and media power. Qualitative content analysis and frame analysis was increasingly acknowledged as important, methodological tools. The seminal work by Martin Eide and Gudmund Hernes (1987) on social journalism in *Død og pine* (Eide and Hernes 1987, see also Eide and Rasmussen 1986) was recognized among the new generation as being a successful attempt of bringing old and new perspectives together in the media research field.

Thus, a generational effect in the field emerged outside the official power research in Norway, advocating a more culturalist perspective on media and power. In Sweden, the same cultural turn was more integrated from the beginning when the political scientist

Olof Peterson, with the help of Johan P. Olsen, one of the pioneers of the Norwegian power study, started the Swedish power research program in the late 1980s. In developing their theoretical model for the research on the journalist profession, they combined the two main concepts from Eide and Hernes (Actor and Arena) within an institutional framework, emphasizing the power of the journalistic ideology (*journalism*) in maintaining a defining role on political discourse in society (Peterson 1989, Peterson and Carlberg 1990). Thus in Sweden, the political science-driven research on power probably put a more radical challenge to Swedish media researchers at the time. But, perhaps since Olof Peterson insisted on doing much of the media research himself and invited a journalist rather than a media researcher to write the final report, the effect on the field was quite similar to the Norwegian. To some extent the Swedish media researchers were bypassed by the director of the program, and in turn, the effect of the program on the media field in general became low. My impression is that a strong quantitative, social science tradition remained dominant in Sweden even after 1994, and remain stronger than in the other Nordic research communities throughout even today. But the Swedish research in fact had an effect on Norwegian media research: by referring to the twin concepts of “actor and arena” both in their theoretical and empirical writings, the early work by Martin Eide (and Gudmund Hernes) was confirmed as the major theoretical achievement following in the wake of the Norwegian power research.

Beyond doubt, the power research programs had important and mostly beneficial effect on the social sciences on a whole in Sweden and Norway. But they particularly served to confirm political science in a privileged position in the hierarchy of disciplines. When the media and communication fields in the two countries were strengthened and consolidated in the academic institutions during the 1990s, it was of other reasons, and instead of becoming a core and long term research tradition within the field, research on power, journalism and political communication was challenged and attacked. The political scientists and sociologists working in the media field slowly lost their unique, dominant position within the emerging, more composite and interdisciplinary media research field.

In Denmark, both the media research field and the media power research was differently organized. Compared with Sweden, Finland and Norway, the media field in Denmark was marked by an earlier awareness towards post-structuralism, semiotics and British cultural studies. Audience research, film studies and semiotic analysis were more acknowledged within the field, and journalism and political communication studies were still mostly a vocation for political scientists. First with a series of commissioned governmental reports on media power from 1995 and onwards, media power research emerged within the media research field itself, without the presence and dominance of political scientists. A new generation of media scholars thus emerged within the media research field itself with up to date research on these themes which perhaps could challenge the dominance of political science more effectively.

From Consensus to Diversity in the Nordic Media Research Fields

It is my impression that a new consensus emerged during the 1990s regarding research priorities, theories and worldviews within the Nordic media field, particularly in the subfields of political communication and journalism. Disregarding many inescapable differences, the consensus based itself on theoretical insights from post-structural literature and a culturalist, non-essentialistic understandings of culture. This blended in with

a new approval of qualitative methods, ethnographies and the importance of semiotic perspectives, where texts and social contexts were studied together, and where audiences were treated as being active in the construction of meanings. This new consensus had a social foundation in the new generations of young researchers entering the field from ‘new’ disciplines. Media researchers now not only came from the social sciences, but from the humanities, from literature and linguistics in particular. A look into the formation of new standing working groups in the Nordic media research conferences at the time will confirm this generational change in the field. At the same time, media studies had a significant growth in faculty members, in numbers of students, courses and research projects, and media research became more institutionalised through independent research programs and funding schemes in the national research councils. Thus, although there might be a common understanding of some basic, fundamental concepts and insights concerning culture and the role of media in society, it is diversity rather than unity that has characterized the media research field ever since. The situation was therefore strikingly different at the end of the 90s, when again media researchers in Norway and Denmark were invited to take part in large scale, national research projects on media power.

Being unable to give a full picture, I want to mention three elements that I believe now characterized the field of media research, and that might become important for media researchers who now consider to enter a new large scale, power research program in a Nordic country.

First, compared with the situation of the 1980s it can be argued that social scientific research on power has itself diversified and become a more general and routine exercise in all research fields and subfields. Academic life had disintegrated and specialized in a wide range of subfields and subdisciplines, reflecting an ongoing specialization that totally surpassed earlier periods. The general output and number of articles, books, statistics and white papers that relates to an academic discourse on media power have grown beyond the wildest imagination, and the general knowledge sources on society has become extremely more complex and contested than before. This can be taken towards an argument that the demand for one, final and authoritative statement on power and democracy is institutionally (and epistemologically) problematic. Although the need for clear answers might be high among politicians, it is not equally high in demand among researchers, who more or less have given up on constructing totalizing, grand theories and large scale projects.

Secondly, the new media technology has opened up the field of media research in new ways. Digital media technology changes the media, as we used to know them – as research objects, and this has interesting and important effects on the research field. For instance our ability to define the borders of our field and its relations to other research fields become more complex. As the new technology permeates society in all aspects, many old distinctions become problematic: the distinction between mass media and personal media, between media institutions and business organisations, between state and civic society, etc. The new informational logics in social organisation, as Castells put it, that is, in network society (Castells 1996). Instead of making ourselves visible and understood through a clear understanding of what media *power* is, within a political science framework, the challenge seem now more to be that of finding out what the *media* is. Media power research has to some extent lost its object and we have to rethink what we want to study as “the media” and “media power”.

Third, interdisciplinarity has become a characteristic of our field, and a larger scope of theories on media and media power are being kept alive within our field than in other

fields. Particularly I believe this is the case if we compare ourselves with the political science field, which usually have and take the upper hand in steering committees of power research programs. And sometimes, a culturalist perspective can have an impact. Profiled academics from various fields and disciplines within cultural studies and humanities now more often than before manage to oppose the traditional political science domination. They can threaten to undermine unidimensional power research and instead of feeling compelled to contribute to upholding other disciplines worldviews they can successfully argue for the inclusion of a cultural, semiotic or textual orientation in the overall research design.

At the turn of the millennium, these three points – among others – painted a new, complex and dynamic backdrop for strategic reflection on the media research field and its external relations. For us, who were invited as media researchers to participate in the new program, a central question was whether one should be doing something totally new, or rename and circulate what had already been done. It was tempting to try something new and different: new theories and research strategies had been developed that potentially could give the media (understood through concepts as institutions, discourse or technology) a stronger and more central position in the understanding and defining research questions concerning the distribution of power in society. Could we still, as media researchers, at the one and same time, do our own, independently defined research *and* report up to date results to a central, national research program. Alternatively, we could try to connect existing empirical findings and subsume theoretical arguments from different epistemologies and methodologies.

Whatever the outcomes, so to speak, of the earlier power research programs, they had proved to be defining moments of our field, when theories and new methodological designs was tried out and new and original research findings was passed on into public discourse and common knowledge. Now what about the media research I coordinated for the most recent, Norwegian power and democracy program? What did we do, or what did we try to do?

The Media Research within the Norwegian Power and Democracy Program

Let me here present some informational background to the theoretical and methodological choices that were made concerning a) the choice of research object and empirical focus b) the development of theoretical and analytical tools, and c) the methods and research designs that were developed.

In the first proposal I wrote on behalf of my department (Department of Media and Communication, University of Oslo) in 1998 to the initial call for ideas from the recently started research group on "Power and democracy in Norway", I suggested three particular important areas of research: 1) financial journalism and the mediation of business, 2) globalisation and the increasing multicultural aspects of Norwegian society and the challenges these developments pose to mass mediated public spheres, and 3) convergence and new digital media as means for new democratic communication and connections between political institutions and civil society.

I still hold these three thematic areas of research as particular interesting ways into the problematic of media power of contemporary society, and I somehow regret that a choice between them was necessary. The final choice was made in favour of developing a research proposal on the rise of financial journalism and the mediation of business in Norway. As it developed, I became more and more pleased with this decision. Why?

A reflection on what had previously been done in our field on this topic was inspiring: There had been no research interest in the rise of business journalism in previous Norwegian media research what so ever: no discussion of the representation of economic power in the media, no research on the mediation of economic information, on conspicuous consumption among the rising capital class in Norway, no interest in the role of the media in the reporting of the booming 90s and the rise of Norway to the top of the UN list over best places to live, nothing on our booming oil-industry and the media (one of my more recent research interests), nothing on the media and the new patterns of social mobility, nor on increasing social and economic cleavages, nothing on the fast spread of economic knowledge, nor the increasing importance of the management of private capital in the declining welfare state, nothing on the increased demand for self-regulation in a economically defined society. Nothing, nothing, nothing. Not one single trace of Bill Clinton's truism "It's the economy, stupid!" So perhaps we must admit we are a bunch of stupid media researchers, too?

In a way, it was an obvious choice: An important focus had to be the rise of professional business journalism since the 1980s and I began thinking about different ways to analyse different roles and powers of business journalism. The research design would have to be built on a theory of symbolic power, exercised through journalistic practice and routines and connected to a specific set of media platforms and publicly mediated discourses. I wanted to theorize connections between journalism as a vocation and journalism as a kind of political and social discourse with legitimating effects. Within this perspective, business journalism would have to be seen as creating symbolic spaces where representation and social construction of meaning take place. Typical power effects would be discursive and social exclusion/inclusion based on tacit and implicit requirements for knowledge, language and codes. In public discourse a process of naturalizing economic realities would take place, but the public exposure of economic, private information would also open the economic field up for public judgement and journalistic powers and norms. I wanted to think through how the connection between media and economy as a cultural and discursive connection could be theorized and empirically studied. Taking the economy and business journalism as research object meant a move to the fast lane of society. We suddenly saw new connections between media studies and elite studies, to the studies on the "new economy" and anthropological studies on business practices, money, finance and capital. An economy is not only a system for exchange and value, it must also be seen as socially embedded, as a form of culture and social knowledge where the mediation of business has a lot to say for the construction of meaning of money, morals, and manners (taken from the title of Michèle Lamont's brilliant work, (Lamont 1992, see also Kjær and Slaatta 2007). Or for construction and mediation of the social meaning of money, to cite another famous academic book title, this time from a publication by Viviana A. Zelizer (1997). This was a place where media scholars usually didn't go, to a place from where we felt we were looking into the bull's eye. Power was everywhere.

The choosing of empirical focus was essential and part of an overall reflection on the field, the trajectory of media power studies and the relationship between project (media) and the overall program (social science). However, the most important element in the media research strategy in my view was the attempt to work from a consistent set of theoretical considerations, concepts and methodologies. This was achieved through the deliberate choice of using Pierre Bourdieu's sociological theory. This made the media research project at IMK substantially different, both from earlier projects on media

power and from the more loose, uncommitted theoretical strategy that were chosen for the research program as a whole. In a short-term perspective, this meant that the conceptual framework and methodological particularities in the project were not picked up and mediated in a coherent form in the programs final reporting. However, in my view, the project became methodologically and theoretically more consistent and strong, from an internal point of view. Working our way through the strength and consistency of Bourdieu's theoretical framework and trying to comply to its methodological imperatives, was an inspiring lesson.

In my view, Pierre Bourdieu's theories should be seen as particularly fruitful to research projects that aim at saying something about power relations, and that particularly want to include a social, cultural and symbolic dimension. This should of course also be one of the main interests of media research, and I think Bourdieu's theory is a strong bridge for media researchers who want to connect back to the heartland of the social sciences. Bourdieu's sociology is a relational sociology that automatically challenges any attempt to look exclusively on "the media". Thus, it prevents media researchers from covering over important differences within "the media" itself. Through the use of correspondence analysis we learned and observed that there is a strong consistency between theory and method in Bourdieu's work. A *Norwegian media order* could actually be constructed on the basis of statistical data on media and cultural consumption, despite the common belief that the media nowadays are mostly "more of the same". And, perhaps not surprisingly, the new and modernized "business press" occupied a particularly *privileged position* in this order, one that corresponds to important shifts in symbolic power in the Norwegian society from the political to the economic field (Slaatta 2003).

We developed a traditional tripartite research strategy: the production of business news in various media (interview and observation of the production processes specific to business news production), the contents and particular texts, genres and formats of business news in various media (news sections, notes, comments, specialist magazines, Internet websites, etc), and the reception of economic information and news (in various socially defined groups and in a comparative elite perspective). Looking back, it has been a rewarding professional experience and I can recommend others to do similar choices in their research designs: the economy, symbolic power, the theory of Bourdieu and a focus on the media order. However, I have to admit that one thing remains problematic: With Bourdieu, we probably became too ambitious. With limited funding and limited time at our hands, I know that important parts of the project are still not reported, particularly not to an international audience. The main publication that went into the book series of the program, was mainly a theoretical discussion and a report on our findings from our studies on business news production. An important report was additionally made in the last minute on the reception data from our social groups data (Høijer and Must 2002). However, the comparative elite data has still not been reported, and the ambition to write it "all together" in a single publication is also not fulfilled. Yet. I find some comfort in the fact that it took Bourdieu 15 years to complete *La Difference*, and the famous Decatur study of Merton, Mills, Katz and Lazarsfeldt nearly almost never was completed. So we are still working on it.... But universities are not always the best places to organize and manage research teams. Since the program ended, the research team has been spread with the wind, the brilliant students we managed to recruit have all left the university, and the funds and the time to do the last effort is hard to find.

Experiences and Possible Lessons to be Learned

Media researchers, when invited to participate in large scale, national research programs, are not simply asked to collaborate in a jolly good research project. Some are actually chosen to do a particular job, perhaps because they have come up with a particular interesting and important research proposal or because they seem to fit an overall research strategy of the program. As contracting partners in a defined, but large scale research program involving many partners, they have to sign a contract of delivery of scientific results and textual material as reports, books and chapters. Next, they have to pull through the proposed project or series of projects within a defined period of time and within specific financial limits. This is not so different from other contemporary research projects.

But maybe one of the most interesting thing about nationwide, interdisciplinary research programs like these, is how conflicting interests in defining interdisciplinarity is meant to be overwon. There is a kind of programmatic expectation concerning the end result, which idealize a collaborative platform for research organisation, across different projects and research strategies, across theoretical and methodological differences, across disciplines and fields. For media researchers I believe it always has been clear that the institutional borders that were given to us were temporary and arbitrary, and the possibility for us to evoke an autonomous research tradition and institutional history to our own advantage slim. Still, as representatives of their field, media researchers participating in power studies programs make important experiences concerning how they are collectively confronted and challenged to define their specific field of research. A common feeling among media researchers has often been that one has to teach social scientists a lesson about the media. Political scientists never took it serious, or not seriously enough, and they had a shallow understanding of culture, media and communication. But today, knowledge on media, mediation and symbolic power cannot be ignored, and I believe media researchers today often find themselves to be partners in high demand.

The major lesson learned is that it is extremely important to think through how we frame and focus our research on media power and that we are reflexive about our own positions within the media field, and the position of the media field vs. other fields. We have to reflect upon ourselves as researchers, our interdisciplinarity, our history as a field and its position towards other fields within social sciences and humanities. And since our research is meant to exist within large scale, nationally organized, social scientific research programs, it is equally important to continuously reflect upon what kind of relationship is being developed to the overall research organisation and research agenda. My humble hope is that my reflections can be of some use to directors or coordinators of future media research projects contributing to or working within similar, national, European or international research programs.

One thing I would like to stress, is that research that aims at accurately measuring "media power" is doomed to fail if it involves an attempt to reify and objectify media power as something that can be said to increase or decrease. The category of "the media" has no empirical counterpart and general statements on media power risk ending up as helpless, commonsensical and reductive statements. The success or failure of our research efforts is more a question about being able to ask the right research questions at the right time. It is about the capacity to be able to formulate a research design in a theoretically consistent language that can guide empirical research. But to be able to chose research questions and empirical focus that will matter for society at large, one has

to take into consideration the position of our own research field, its historical trajectory and relations to society, and the particular way in which our research is situated in time and space. A parallel reflection on the changing, external relations between the academic field and society must also be undertaken. Without this exercise, media research easily becomes trapped as in the famous metaphor; looking for the lost wallet in the circle of light from the lamppost.

Our own perception is too often that we are a vanguard, an avant-garde within academia who have to teach others about the right way to understand the media, communication and culture. This point of view often coincide with a defence of the popular against what is seen as elitism and arrogance within other fields. But as Bourdieu has described it, sociology is a weak academic subfield (Bourdieu 2002). And so is the media research field. There is a constant risk that we become too technology-driven in our research agenda, too close to industrial powers, dynamics and externally defined, societal needs: that we become defenders of utopian futures, obsessed with new gadgets and things that are said to change the world, that our research become too dispersed, fragmented and isolated from other disciplines and research traditions in "quasi opposition" to the disciplines that originally gave birth to our field. There is a risk that too little real discussion, academic competition and production of unique knowledge takes place as media departments becomes the paradigm examples of successful university units with a high proportion of external funding, lots of international publications in obscure, Anglo-American journals and high visibility frequency in the national news media.

Although the situation has changed, we are still fighting to make ourselves heard. We are not really active in defining the overarching research agendas of large scale, national research programs and we are still confronted with imported theories, concepts and methodologies. So be it. We should not try to compensate our lack of strength as research field with getting rid of society and over-exaggerating the power of the media through exotic, theoretical means. Instead, we must continue to do empirical investigations of the changing relations between media orders and other fields in society: politics, the field of cultural production, and the economy. I have argued here that Bourdieu's sociology and the theoretical framework and conscious reflection on research design and methodologies that comes with it, is a possible way forward.

Epilogue

While the defining, international moments and canonical writings in our field is usually detected in Chicago, Colombia, Birmingham or Paris, (see for instance Katz, Peters, Liebes and Orlov 2003 and Scannel 2007) the history of media power research can be read as the most important red thread to an understanding of the *Nordic* field of media research. We should perhaps not contribute too eagerly to a mythologization of a Nordic research identity, although participating in Nordic research seminars every second year always reminds me of the possible impact of wonderful, long Nordic summer nights, the special, and the transparent Nordic light and the way these things seem to inspire a particular joy of life (at least at the parties after the conference is over), of everything living and perhaps also a moral sensibility towards the larger community, a peaceful, friendly and empathic solidarity with the world, with humanity, with ourselves. But, let us at least admit that the Nordic research community continues to play an important role in our lives, and that the institutional structures of Nordicom and the bi-annual conferences are productive instruments in maintaining a mutual consciousness of a

potential research community among Nordic media researchers. And now we have the experiences from national research programs on power to share, as well!

References

- Bourdieu, Pierre (2002) *Science de la science et réflexivité*. Paris: Liber.
- Castells, Manuel (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Vol.1. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Eide, Martin and Hernes, Gudmund (1987) *Død og pine! Om massemedia og helsepolitikk*. Oslo: Fafo.
- Eide, Martin and Rasmussen, Terje (1985) 'Kildene, makten og æren', *Nytt Norsk Tidsskrift* 2(4), s.36-43, Oslo.
- Højjer, Birgitta and Must, Trine (2002) *Fornuft og begjær. Om mennesker, penger og mediernes økonomistoff*. Rapport nr. 77.
- Kjær, Peter and Slaatta, Tore (2007) *Mediating Business*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business Press.
- Katz, Elihu, Peters, J.D., Liebes, T. and Orlov, A. (2003) *Canonic Texts in Media Research*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lamont, Michèle (1992) *Money, Morals & Manners. The Culture of the French and the American Upper-Middle Class*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lund, Anker Brink (2002) *Den redigerende makt*. Magtutredningen. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Peterson, Olof (1989) *Makten i det öppna samhället*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Peterson, Olof and Carlberg, Ingrid (1990) *Makten över tanken*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Phillips, Louise and Schrøder, Kim (2004) *Sådan taler medier og borgere om politik*. Magtutredningen. Aarhus: Aarhus Universitetsforlag.
- Scannel, P. (2007) *Media and Communication*. London: Sage.
- Slaatta, Tore (2003) *Den norske medieorden*. Oslo: Gyldendal Akademisk.
- Slaatta, Tore (1999) *Medier, makt og demokrati*. rapport nr. 6, Makt og demokratiutredningen. Oslo: Unipub.
- Slaatta, Tore and Sæbø, Gunnar (1997) 'Makten og Hernes i evighet...?', *Norsk Medietidsskrift* 1/97 s.47-82, Oslo: Novus.
- Zelizer, Viviana A. (1997) *The Social Meaning of Money*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

