



FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
Charles University

**Conflicting perspectives on journalism:
Peripheral actors' changing position in the
journalistic field and its possible impact**

doc. PhDr. Alice Němcová Tejkalová, PhD., Dr. Kateřina
Turková, Dr. Sandra Lábová

Print Media and Peripheral Actors' Reach

Reach of the most-read traditional Czech print media vs. examples of the Czech famous alternative media and influencers' reach

(Source: Media Projekt Q2 2024–Q1 2025, authors' own monitoring – September 1, 2025)

Newspapers	Focus / Type	Readership (per issue)	Peripheral Actors	Focus/Type	Followers, SM total (FB, IG, YT, TT)	Followers, the strongest SM**
Blesk	Tabloid / General	458,000	Kovy	Various Topics	2,021,600	1,010,000 (YT)
MF Dnes	Quality / General	369,000	Jsem v obraze	General News Explainer	229,560	197,000 (IG)
Deník (ČR)	Regional / General	315,000	Shluk buněk	Greenfluencer	155,500	136,000 (IG)
Sport	Sports	138,000	Parlamentní listy	Politics	70,434	58,000 (FB)
Právo	Quality / General	129,000	Doktor Vajíčko	Politics	69,532	48,900 (YT)

Who is a peripheral actor in the journalistic field?

Methodology & Sample I

- ❑ Paper based on data collected for Worlds of Journalism Study and Horizon Europe project Resilient Media for Democracy in the Digital Age in 2022–2024
- ❑ Comparable questionnaires for WJS3 and ReMeD
 - ❑ 331 professional journalists (CAPI + CATI + CAWI) & 71 Czech peripheral journalists (CAWI)
- ❑ Ethnographic research of two alternative content media producers (M and F), both operating on social media, one sharing disinformation content, the other from the project focused on explaining news to the young audience → both these formats have been widely popular in the Czech Republic in recent years, with tens of successful projects
- ❑ Ethnographic research of two professional journalists (M and F) of different generations, working for quality nationwide media



The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement No 101094742.



Methodology & Sample II

- ❑ **Professional journalist (WJS)** = someone who meets the definition of journalist and who considers their activity, income, or time as a journalist to be their main or most important occupation because it provides financial sustainability.

Eligibility for inclusion in the main WJS3 sample → individuals have to obtain *at least 50% of their overall income* from working for news media, *or spend at least 50% of their work hours in journalism* if they work in multiple occupations

Source: Field Manual, WJS3

- ❑ **Peripheral journalists (ReMeD)** → five subgroups – alternative political media; journalistic start-ups; influencers; fact-checkers and corporate journalism



The project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon Europe Research and Innovation Programme under grant agreement No 101094742.



Theoretic Background

- ❑ Journalistic field (Bourdieu, 2005)
- ❑ Peripheral journalists (Maares & Hanusch, 2022; Hanitzsch & Riedl, 2025)
- ❑ Issues with terminology – are PR people from so called “in-house media” journalists? What about those who do not perceive themselves as journalists and still produce journalistic content in the field?
- ❑ Peripheral actors (Schapals, 2022) and their typology (Hanusch & Löhmann, 2022), inter and intralopers (Eldrige, 2019; Hanusch & Löhmann, 2022)
- ❑ “Alternative media” → agonists and antagonists (Eldrige, 2019)
- ❑ Shrinking centre, expanding periphery

Findings I – Working Situation

Current working situation

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
<i>Full-time permanent contract</i>	15.5% (11)	56.5% (187)
Part-time permanent contract	2.8% (2)	5.7% (19)
Full-time fixed-term contract	0% (0)	8.8% (29)
Part-time fixed-term contract	2.8% (2)	2.1% (7)
<i>Freelance or self-employed</i>	76.1% (54)	22.1% (73)
Don't know / did not answer	2.8 (2)	4.8% (16)

Years worked as a journalist / in the media

	Peripheral journalists (N=65, 6 N/A)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Mean	12.4	16.0
<i>Median</i>	10.0	15.0

Findings II - Importance of Journalistic Roles

Provide entertainment

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	40.9% (29)	32.3% (107)
Moderately important	22.5% (16)	33.2% (110)
Important **	36.6% (26)	34.5% (114)

Educate

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	1.4% (1)	7.8% (26)
Moderately important	14.1% (10)	18.4% (61)
Important **	84.5% (60)	73.7% (244)

Influence public opinion

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	36.6% (26)	40.7% (175)
Moderately important	23.9% (17)	35.0% (116)
Important**	35.2% (25)	23.9% (79)
Don't know / did not answer	4.2% (3)	4.2% (3)

* "Not at all important" and "Slightly important"

** "Very important" and "Extremely important"

Findings III – Importance of Journalistic Roles

Detached observer

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	43.7% (31)	16.3% (18)
Moderately important	12.7% (9)	12.7% (78)
Important **	42.3% (30)	71.0% (235)
Don't know / did not answer	2.8% (1)	0% (0)

Provide information

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	42.3% (30)	25.7% (85)
Moderately important	16.9% (12)	21.5% (71)
Important **	40.9% (29)	52.9% (175)

Counteract disinformation

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not important *	18.4% (13)	7.2% (24)
Moderately important	23.9% (17)	10.9% (36)
Important**	57.8% (41)	81.6% (270)
Don't know / did not answer	0% (0)	0.3% (1)

* “Not at all important” and “Slightly important”

** “Very important” and “Extremely important”

Findings IV – Ethical Orientations

Always by professional standards

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Disagree *	12.7% (9)	12.7% (42)
Neither agree nor disagree	26.8% (19)	26.6% (88)
Agree **	45.0% (32)	60.1% (199)
Don't know / did not answer	15.5% (11)	0.6% (2)

Depend on each specific situation

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Disagree *	36.7% (26)	49.8% (164)
Neither agree nor disagree	25.4% (19)	15.7% (52)
Agree **	22.5% (16)	34.2% (113)
Don't know / did not answer	14.1% (10)	0.6% (2)

*“Strongly disagree” and “Disagree”

** “Agree” and “Strongly agree”

Findings V – Freedom

Freedom in selecting stories

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Little freedom	2.8% (2)	1.2% (4)
Some freedom	11.3% (8)	22.1% (73)
A great deal of freedom	32.4% (23)	56.2% (186)
<i>Complete freedom</i>	53.5% (38)	20.5% (68)

Freedom in deciding which aspects to emphasize

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Little freedom	0% (0)	2.4% (8)
Some freedom	16.9% (12)	15.7% (52)
A great deal of freedom	29.6% (21)	53.7% (178)
<i>Complete freedom</i>	50.7% (36)	28.1% (93)
Don't know / did not answer	2.8% (2)	0% (0)

*“Strongly disagree” and “Disagree”

** “Agree” and “Strongly agree”

Findings VI – External Influences

Feedback from audience

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not influential *	14.1% (10)	26.9% (89)
Moderately influential	45.1% (32)	34.1% (113)
<i>Influential **</i>	40.9% (29)	38.7% (128)
Not relevant	0% (0)	0.3% (1)

Government censorship

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Not influential *	70.4% (50)	70.4% (233)
Moderately influential	4.2% (3)	5.4% (18)
<i>Influential **</i>	15.5% (11)	3.3% (11)
<i>Not relevant</i>	8.5% (6)	20.8% (69)
Don't know / did not answer	1.4% (1)	0% (0)

* “Not influential” and “Slightly influential”

** “Very influential” and “Extremely influential”

Findings VII – Epistemology

It is possible to represent objective reality

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Disagree *	19.7% (14)	14.8% (49)
Neither agree nor disagree	26.8% (19)	19.3% (64)
Agree **	50.7% (36)	65.2% (216)
Don't know / did not answer	2.8% (2)	0.6% (2)

Truth is shaped by those in power

	Peripheral journalists (N=71)	Professional journalists (N=331)
Disagree *	62.0% (44)	70.1% (232)
Neither agree nor disagree	15.5% (11)	20.8% (69)
Agree **	19.7% (14)	8.7% (29)
Don't know / did not answer	2.8% (2)	0.3% (1)

*“Strongly disagree” and “Disagree”

** “Agree” and “Strongly agree”

Conclusion – Changing the Field

- ❑ **Similarities and its impact** – greater focus on the **feedback from the audience** and **providing entertainment** (stronger focus on content production for social media and online content monetization by traditional media due to rising influence of peripheral actors in the field)
- ❑ **Differences and its impact** – **ethical orientation** (possibly the most important future impact into the traditional perception of journalism), peripheral journalists having greater **freedom of decision** what to cover → lack of freedom about editorial decisions mentioned by professional journalists as one of the reasons why to go for PR or own “peripheral” projects, rise of **subjective and opinion-based formats** typical for peripheral journalists also in traditional media → **from information provider to the influencer**
- ❑ Who defines **what is news** and how it should look like? People without journalistic education with intuitive approach and various interests. **Activist approach** on both agonistic and antagonistic sides, orientation on **power**
- ❑ **Peripheral** journalists or even actors → **not sufficient enough** term
- ❑ Prediction of even **further convergence of perspectives** of traditional media and peripheral actors **in favour of current peripheral actors**

A comic-style illustration featuring two women. The woman on the left has short brown hair and is wearing a red collared shirt. The woman on the right has long blonde hair and is wearing a blue long-sleeved shirt. A large white speech bubble with a black outline is positioned between them, containing the text 'THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!'. The background consists of a yellow field with a grid of small blue dots, and a teal field with a grid of small yellow dots behind the women's heads.

***THANK YOU
FOR YOUR
ATTENTION!***

alice.tejkalova@fsv.cuni.cz

katerina.turkova@fsv.cuni.cz