Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2025; 5(4):1569-1574

Received: 01-07-2025
Accepted: 11-08-2025

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Speed Vs. Accuracy in Digital Journalism: A Comparative Analysis of Nigeria, The United States, and The United Kingdom

[1] Emmanuel Chukwudi Achonwa, [2] Adeniyi Ephraim Adedeji

[1] Department of Theatre and Film Studies, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria
[2] Department of Guidance and Counselling, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

Corresponding Author: **Emmanuel Chukwudi Achonwa**

Abstract

The convergence of digital technology and social media has transformed the global news ecosystem, creating a 24/7 information environment where speed is often privileged over accuracy. This dynamic has intensified competitive pressures on journalists and news organisations, altering editorial routines and audience expectations. This study examines the tension between speed and accuracy in digital journalism, using Nigeria as a primary focus and drawing comparative insights from international contexts including the United States and the United Kingdom. Anchored in Gatekeeping Theory and the Hierarchy of Influences Model, the paper combines case study analysis with a review of existing empirical research to explore how technological innovations, economic imperatives, and social media cultures shape newsroom decision-making. Findings indicate that while immediacy enhances audience engagement, it also increases the risk of misinformation, erodes trust, and deepens ethical dilemmas. The study concludes with recommendations for strengthening verification protocols, promoting media literacy, and reorienting newsroom success metrics to prioritise accuracy alongside timeliness.

Keywords: Digital Journalism, Speed, Accuracy, Gatekeeping, Misinformation, Comparative Media

1. Introduction

In the digital age, the defining feature of journalism is its immediacy. News is no longer a periodic product packaged for morning papers or evening bulletins; it is an uninterrupted stream of updates delivered through websites, mobile apps, and social media platforms (Newman *et al*., 2023) [5]. For audiences, this real-time access to events as they unfold has become an expectation rather than a novelty. For journalists, it has become a professional imperative.

The rise of smartphones, mobile broadband, and social networking platforms has transformed the speed of news production and consumption. A decade ago, the expectation of instant updates was primarily associated with developed countries; today, it is a global phenomenon. In Nigeria, Twitter (now X), Facebook, Instagram, and WhatsApp have become dominant channels for breaking news, creating an environment where stories can "go viral" within minutes. Similar patterns are evident in the United States and United Kingdom, where digital-first strategies and live updates have restructured newsroom workflows (Thurman & Walters, 2013).

However, the speed imperative introduces a persistent ethical dilemma: how to balance immediacy with accuracy. The risk of misinformation - whether through unverified eyewitness accounts, manipulated images, or premature conclusions — is heightened in fast-paced digital environments (Vosoughi *et al*., 2018) [15]. This problem is particularly acute in politically sensitive or crisis situations, such as the 2020 #EndSARS protests in Nigeria or the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing in the United States, where inaccurate early reports have had lasting reputational and societal consequences.

This paper investigates whether the pursuit of speed in digital journalism inevitably undermines accuracy, and if so, how this tension manifests differently in Nigeria compared to other global contexts. It also explores strategies for reconciling these competing imperatives in a media landscape where credibility remains journalism's most valuable currency.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 The Historical Speed–Accuracy Dile

The conflict over timeliness and factual accuracy is not new to the online age. During the 19th century, the telegraph cut the time from the occurrence of events and the public release of information by a dramatic amount but significantly boosted the incidence of incomplete or inaccurate updates (Standage, 1998) [13]. In the American Civil War, for instance, telegraph dispatches were prone to speculative reports of battle occurrences and were subsequently corrected, presenting one of the first known cases of the practice of "publish first, correct later."

In the 20th century, television and radio hastened live reporting, most prominently in crisis situations, for example, the 1963 assassination of the U.S. President John F. Kennedy, in which early reports sometimes contradicted each other (Schudson, 2003) [8]. The 24-hour news cycle, engendered by the 1991 Gulf War coverage of CNN, made news production a dynamic and ongoing process, decreasing the buffer zone for verification.

Online publishing had practically erased such temporal buffers by the early 2000s. The advent of social media in the mid-2000s extended the cycle further such that eyewitnesses and citizen reporters could share unmediated information on the internet without going through mainstream media gates first (Hermida, 2012) [2]. This development challenged the classical role of the journalist as the first and foremost information gatekeeper.

2.2 Gatekeeping in the Digital Age

Gatekeeping Theory, as established by White (1950) [16] and extended by Shoemaker and Vos (2009) [10], theorises the journalist and editor as information filters. Traditionally, those gates held back stories conforming to editorial criteria before the public had access to them. With the dawn of the digital era, those gates have largely fallen. Online social media allow unverified, raw material to by-pass editorial controls and come directly into the hands of the masses.

This evolution has double meanings: it liberalises news production by giving voices to the margins, but it overloads the information space with unverified or false information (Karlsson, 2010) [3]. Nigerian journalism has suffered in particular from this development, since social networks have created a powerful counter-narrative to state-controlled or partisan mainstream media, but with the side effect of greater exposure to false information.

2.3 Misinformation Dynamics and the "First–Correct

Vosoughi *et al*. (2018) [15] show the faster and broader diffusion of inaccurate information than accurate information, largely because inaccurate information is typically more emotionally engaging. News desks on rapidly unfolding stories tend to presume that information can be improved or corrected later — presumption contradicted by research showing most readers never revisit stories after initial scan (Ecker *et al*., 2014) [1]. This "continued influence effect" means initial mistakes can affect public opinion even after corrections have been published.

2.4 Economic Incentives and Newsroom Pressures

The transition to online has placed pageviews, clicks, and shares alongside survival metrics for the newsroom. Ad-based revenue metrics punish slowness by rewarding content that grabs attention in the shortest time horizon possible (Tandoc & Jenkins, 2017) [14]. Live analytics boards solidify this practice by providing real-time feedback to editors about which stories are working on traffic, which often induces early publication.

2.5 African and Nigerian Perspectives

Okoro and Diri (2021) [7] noted that in the course of the #EndSARS protests, there were competing demands on Nigerian reporters: the pressure to break news fast, the fear of state censorship or retaliations, and the journalistic obligation to confirm information. Such limitations sometimes prompted editorial compromises in which unsubstantiated reports were released for the sake of competitiveness. The same tendencies have been noted in Kenya in the run-up to elections when early reports have sometimes heightened political tensions (Makori, 2017) [4].

2.6 Global Comparisons In the United States

The 2013 Boston Marathon bombing publicized the risks of rushed reporting when major news organizations incorrectly identified suspects based on unsubstantiated online conjecture (Silverman, 2014) [11]. In the United Kingdom, real-time coverage of the 2017 Manchester Arena bombing featured the power of fast reporting to educate and the hazards of spreading faulty initial information (Ofcom, 2018) [6]. Nonetheless, U.K. media in general used stronger disclaimers and incorporated corrections in the live blogs, preventing the propagation of stale information.

3. Theoretical Framework

This research is grounded in Gatekeeping Theory and the Hierarchy of Influences Model, two interlocking theories which account for the decline of editorial control in the online era and the structural forces maintaining the speed–accuracy trade-off in varying environments.

3.1 Gatekeeping Theory

First proposed by White (1950) [16], Gatekeeping Theory investigates the filtering of information before the public obtains access to information. Traditionally, there were filtration levels — reporters decided which events to cover, editors determined the stories to publish, and publishers dictated the overall editorial agenda. The multi-level filtration strategy tried to leave the audiences with only true, relevant, and newsworthy information.

Shoemaker and Vos (2009) [10] extended the model by including the influence of routines, organisational structures, and social norms in deciding what goes through the "gate." According to this perspective, not only is the gate not the exclusive decision of the individual journalist but the whole process is a collective one involving various actors and limitations.

In the online age, though, the very structure of news dissemination has altered. Social media enables information to sidestep conventional journalistic filters altogether, allowing unverified information to spread to millions in advance of professional reporters' ability to confirm it. This dynamic can be seen in Nigeria, where in the midst of the #EndSARS protests, citizen journalists' images and videos spread on social media in advance of mainstream outlets' ability to test their authenticity. Comparable bypassing can be seen in the United States in the Boston Marathon bombing case, in which Reddit users and citizen detectives spread suspect identifications repeated by larger outlets —

and then had to retract.

The weakening of gatekeeping has forced professional journalists into a reactive role, often chasing stories that originate outside the newsroom. This shift erodes the profession's traditional authority and increases the temptation to prioritise speed over accuracy to remain relevant in the public conversation.

3.2 Hierarchy of Influences Model

Shoemaker and Reese's (2014) [9] Hierarchy of Influences Model provides a multi-level approach to explaining the wide range of influences on news production. Five levels are identified:

1. Individual Level – Personal values, experiences, and judgments of the journalist. For example, a reporter's belief in public transparency may push them to publish early, even with incomplete details.
2. Routines Level – Standardised newsroom practices, such as expecting live updates or rolling coverage, which inherently favour speed.
3. Organisational Level – Economic demands, audience figures, and editorial orders by management that can compel reporters to write urgently.
4. Extra-Media Level – External factors including political pressure, legal limitations, and competition by other outlets or social media account holders. In Nigeria, the threat of state censorship in sensitive coverage provides one more level of pressure less common in the U.S. or U.K.
5. Ideological Level – Wider social norms and values governing both newsroom agendas and audience demands. As an example, in those societies with a resilient tradition of a free press, audiences are likely to insist on swift revelation of information as part of their "right to know."

By applying this model, we see that the preference for speed over accuracy is rarely the result of an individual journalist's negligence. Instead, it emerges from a convergence of pressures operating simultaneously at multiple levels — from the personal ambitions of reporters, to the metrics-driven incentives of media organisations, to the hyper-competitive information environment of the digital age.

3.3 Integrating the Frameworks

Together, Gatekeeping Theory and the Hierarchy of Influences Model provide a robust lens for analysing the speed–accuracy dilemma. Gatekeeping Theory explains how traditional editorial control is bypassed, while the Hierarchy of Influences Model explains why journalists and newsrooms often allow — or even encourage — speed to take precedence over verification.

This dual approach is most useful for comparative studies. In Nigeria, extra-media and organisational pressures of political sensitivity and lack of newsroom resources are most important in determining rapid publication. In the U.S., organisational and ideological pressure are most powerful (competition in the marketplace, viewer demands for transparency). In the U.K., strong editorial traditions and institutional insulation hold such pressure in abeyance but not the tension beneath.

4. Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This research employs a qualitative comparative case study approach (Yin, 2018) [17] to examine the tension between speed and accuracy in varying national contexts. The case study approach is especially suitable since it enables close examination of daunting phenomena that are contingent upon the environment — here, the editorial decision-making processes in fast-paced news events in digital journalism.

Compared to the United States and the United Kingdom, the research embodies global tendencies alongside locally varying circumstances. Nigeria was chosen as the main subject due to the country's dynamic but politically fragile media sphere, and the U.S. and U.K. are used as yardsticks with established digital news markets and varying regulations.

4.2 Case Selection Criteria

Cases were chosen based on the following criteria:

1. Breaking News Situation — The incident had to have received intense, timely coverage.
2. Factual Errors Documented — There needs to have been proof of factual mistakes or unsubstantiated statements released during the initial coverage period.
3. Significant Public Impact — The event must have influenced public opinion, trust in the media, or policy debates.

The chosen cases are:

- Nigeria: The #EndSARS Lekki Toll Gate shooting (20 October 2020.
- United States: The Boston Marathon bombing on April 15, 2013.
- United Kingdom: The Manchester Arena bombing of 22 May 2017.

4.3 Data Sources

The analysis relies on:

Primary Data — Online archived news reports, live blog posts, and television transcripts of mainstream media outlets (e.g., Channels TV, BBC, CNN, The Guardian).

Social Media Content — Posts by verified journalists, citizen reporters, and official accounts, saved utilizing tools such as TweetDeck and CrowdTangle.

Secondary Sources — Peer-reviewed journal articles, media reports, and surveys regarding trust, misinformation, and breaking news coverage.

4.4 Data Collection Process

For each case, a timeline of media coverage was constructed, starting from the first public report to 72 hours after the event. This period was chosen because the majority of factual corrections occur within this window. Content was coded for:

- The presence or absence of disclaimers (e.g., "unconfirmed reports").
- Source attribution (named vs. anonymous).
- Type of inaccuracy (numerical errors, misidentification, false attribution).
- Time spent on releasing corrections.

4.5 Analytic Method

We applied a thematic coding scheme to identify common patterns and differences in the three contexts. Comparative analysis then ensued in identifying the degree to which political environment, newsroom practice, and social media processes shaped editorial decisions.

5. Findings and Case Studies

5.1 Nigeria: #EndSARS Lekki Toll Gate Incident

- Context

On October 20, 2020, in the midst of countrywide protests over police brutality, there were reports of security forces firing on protesters at the Lekki Toll Gate in Lagos. Eyewitness videos, images, and reports of casualties flooded social media. In minutes, hashtags like #LekkiMassacre and #EndSARS were going viral worldwide.

- Speed–Accuracy Dynamics

Several Nigerian media, under tremendous public and political pressure, based their initial reports on social media updates. Some released casualty figures without verifying independently, attributing to "sources on the ground." Others were reluctant to quote figures, mindful of the political sensitiveness and possible backlash.

The authorities Initially rejected reports of any fatalities, creating a stark difference between official reports and citizen reports. That increased the authentication problem because reporters had to cope with a split information space where the truth was contested in real-time.

- Misinformation Consequences

Conflicting reports of casualties lingered for weeks, not only undermining faith in government narratives but also in outlets perceived as complicit or irresponsible. Foreign reports frequently repeated unsubstantiated figures from locals, exaggerating the extent of possible inaccuracy.

5.2 United States: Boston Marathon Bombing

Two bombs detonated on April 15, 2013, near the Boston Marathon's finishing line, causing the death of three individuals and injuring over 260 people. Speculation flooded Twitter, Reddit, and police scanners instantly after the event occurred.

- Speed–Accuracy Dynamics

Some large US newspapers, such as CNN and The Associated Press, falsely indicated a suspect had been arrested in the first 48 hours after the bombing. This inaccuracy occurred with the use of unverified law enforcement sources and the desire to keep up with competitor stories.

The amateur sleuthing community on Reddit fanned the flames by incorrectly identifying people in pictures, an error which was exacerbated when some mainstream media outlets reported on the internet accusations without adequate vetting.

- Misinformation Consequences

The wrongly accused suffered damage to their reputation, and the validity of mainstream and citizen journalism websites suffered in the process as well. While the corrections emerged in a short amount of hours, they received significantly less attention than the original accusations, illustrating the "continued influence effect" (Ecker *et al*., 2014) [1].

5.3 United Kingdom: Manchester Arena Bombing

On May 22, 2017, a suicide bomber attacked the Manchester Arena during an Ariana Grande concert, killing 22 people and injuring hundreds. The attack prompted wall-to-wall coverage on British television and online platforms.

- Speed–Accuracy Dynamics

U.K. outlets, including the BBC and The Guardian, maintained live update pages that balanced speed with careful attribution. Early reports avoided definitive casualty numbers, instead stating "police have confirmed fatalities, but the number is not yet known."

Textual highlights like "this is a breaking story" and "details are coming in" kept reappearing. Corrections and updates were woven into the main story instead of being released as separate follow-ups so that people viewing the live page would see the most recent information verified.

- Misinformation Consequences

Though there were small mistakes made (like incorrectly stating the order of emergency measures), corrections were promptly made and the latter did not overshadow the public account. Faith in major British media stayed relatively sound in part because of the apparent transparency by the outlets throughout the crisis (Ofcom, 2018) [6].

5.4 Cross-Case Patterns

Examination of the three cases demonstrates:

1. Social Media as Catalyst and Complication — In every sense, social media had given us important early tips but had also circulated false information fast.
2. Correction Visibility Gap — The corrections never received the same level of visibility as the initial wrong reports.
3. Editorial Culture Makes a Difference — U.K. newspapers demonstrated that norms of transparency and prudent attribution can cut back — but not eliminate — rush-to-print errors. 4. Political Context Shapes Risk — Nigerian journalists faced greater personal and organisational risks when publishing unverified information, while U.S. and U.K. journalists operated under stronger legal protections but intense commercial competition.

6. Discussion

The findings in the case of the United Kingdom, the United States, and Nigeria indicate that the speed–accuracy trade-off is no isolated flaw in journalism but a structural feature of the online-news sphere. The section integrates the findings of the case studies with the theories and the literature in order to explain the similarity and the national-level differences.

6.1 Speed as a Structural Imperative

Gatekeeping Theory has conventionally explained a process in which information was filtered and verified by professionals prior to publication (White, 1950; Shoemaker & Vos, 2009) [16, 10]. In the modern technological era, however, the gates have become compromised by the advent of social media, in particular. Information can short-circuit professional verification and reach audiences in a matter of seconds. In each of the three examples, the initial wave of coverage often stemmed from user-generated material and not information gathered by the newsroom.

This shift has altered newsroom routines, as predicted by the Hierarchy of Influences Model (Shoemaker & Reese, 2014) [9]. At the routines level, live blogging, rolling updates, and push notifications are now standard in breaking news coverage. At the organisational level, analytics dashboards and real-time traffic monitoring reward immediacy with higher visibility and advertising revenue. At the extra-media level, competition from citizen reporters and rival outlets creates constant pressure to publish before competitors.

6.2 The Nigerian Context: Political Pressures and Verification Risks

In Nigeria, extra-media pressures are particularly extreme. Reporters on the Lekki Toll Gate case had to operate in a highly politicized environment where official stories diverged strongly from citizen reports. Threats of legal or political retribution for releasing particular information created further hesitation. But the same environment prompted some media outlets to draw on social media viral claims without checking, as this suited public opinion and boosted engagement.

The result was an uneven coverage landscape: some outlets exercised caution and were criticised for being too slow, while others rushed unverified reports and faced later credibility issues. This illustrates how the ideological level of the Hierarchy of Influences — the societal expectation that media should challenge official narratives — interacts with both political constraints and the commercial logic of immediacy.

6.3 The U.S. Context: Market Competition and Source Dependence

The Boston Marathon bombing investigation illustrates the pressure of competition in the marketplace and the use of unverified law enforcement sources to undermine accuracy. In the American press, reporters are highly protected by law but under tremendous commercial pressure. Competition to have a competitor "scoop" tends to trump cautious verification, particularly where most outlets seem to validate the same assertion.

The amateur detective work of Reddit also shows a blurring of the lines between citizen and professional journalism. The willingness of some newspapers to echo Reddit's unverified reports is a sign of relaxed gatekeeper norms — in which the risk of missing a breaking point outweighs the risk of reputational damage for getting the story wrong.

6.4 The U.K. Setting:Editorial Protections and Measures

Manchester Arena bombing coverage illustrates the effectiveness of cautious attribution, prominent disclaimers, and blended corrections in reducing — but not eliminating — the harm caused by initial mistakes. British media such as the BBC and The Guardian were forthcoming in the name of full disclosure, flagging doubt again and again and avoiding conclusive statements even when final confirmation became possible.

On the gatekeeping side, this is indicative of a newsroom environment in which routine-level protections are effective, reinforced by public service obligations and external regulation (Ofcom, 2018) [6]. These institutional underpinnings assist in reconciling speed with accuracy even in the most extreme breaking news circumstances.

6.5 The Correction Visibility Problem

In all contexts, corrections did not reach the same people as original errors — a pattern thoroughly documented in the literature on misinformation (Ecker *et al*., 2014) [1]. This "visibility gap" is compounded by platform algorithms prioritizing novelty and emotional response over updates or corrections. The result is that even the most open correction processes can't entirely reverse the harm done by early publication.

6.6 Ethical Consider

The SPJ Code of Ethics (2014) [12] asserts that "neither speed nor format excuses inaccuracy." Yet the findings here suggest that speed is not simply a choice — it is embedded in the economic and technological logic of digital journalism. Without structural reforms, individual journalists will continue to face impossible trade-offs between professional ideals and organisational imperatives.

7. Conclusion

This comparative analysis confirms that the tension between speed and accuracy in digital journalism is both global and structurally embedded. The drivers of this tension — weakened gatekeeping, commercial incentives, social media competition — operate across Nigeria, the U.S., and the U.K., but their manifestations are shaped by local political, economic, and cultural contexts.

In Nigeria, political sensitivities and public distrust of official narratives amplify the risks of both underreporting and misreporting. In the U.S., market competition and the influence of online amateur investigations encourage premature publication. In the U.K., stronger editorial safeguards moderate but do not eliminate speed-related errors.

Speed can be a virtue — providing the public with timely warnings and updates during crises. But speed without accuracy eats away at trust, distorts public debate, and can inflict real damage. To preserve its democratic role as a credible teller of truths, accuracy must under no circumstance become negotiable, even when that means going second.

8. Recommendations

1. Institutionalise Verification Protocols
   - Require double-source confirmation for all high-impact claims.
   - Use dedicated verification teams in breaking stories.
   - Utilize online resources like reverse image search, geolocation identification, and metadata examination to verify user-generated material.
2. Strengthen Transparency Practices
   - Clearly label unverified or developing information.
   - Provide source context and reasons for uncertainty.
   - Make corrections as prominent and shareable as original errors, including via push alerts and social media updates.
3. Reform Newsroom Performance Metrics
   - Rate reporters on accuracy, fairness, and contextual richness in addition to speed and engagement metrics.
   - Encourage and recognize journalists who emphasize verifying information over getting there first.
4. Enhance Journalism Education
   - Integrate social media content verification techniques into all courses of training.
   - Practice breaking-news scenarios to help students strike a balance of speed with accuracy.
   - Incorporate ethics as a regular dialogue and not as a distinct module.
5. Promote Media Literacy
   - Educate audiences to understand that early reports are often incomplete.
   - Encourage cross-checking of multiple sources before

accepting breaking news. Run public campaigns — led by news outlets, NGOs, and schools — to foster critical consumption of digital news.

9. References

1. Ecker UKH, Lewandowsky S, Tang DTW. Explicit warnings reduce but do not eliminate the continued influence of misinformation. Memory & Cognition. 2014; 42(2):292-304. Doi: https://doi.org/10.3758/s13421-013-0365-3
2. Hermida A. Tweets and truth: Journalism as a discipline of collaborative verification. Journalism Practice. 2012; 6(5-6):659-668. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2012.667269
3. Karlsson M. Rituals of transparency: Evaluating online news outlets' processes for disclosing the origins of information. Journalism Studies. 2010; 11(4):535-545. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/14616701003638398
4. Makori M. The role of the media in Kenya's 2017 elections: Balancing speed and accuracy. African Journalism Studies. 2017; 38(2):42-58. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2017.1334823
5. Newman N, Fletcher R, Robertson CT, Eddy K, Nielsen RK. Reuters Institute Digital News Report 2023. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, 2023. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2023
6. Ofcom. News consumption in the UK: 2018. Office of Communications, 2018. https://www.ofcom.org.uk/research-and-data/tv-radio-and-on-demand/news-media/news-consumption
7. Okoro N, Diri CT. Journalism in the eye of the storm: Speed, accuracy, and verification in Nigeria's #EndSARS coverage. African Journalism Studies. 2021; 42(1-2):41-59. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1080/23743670.2021.1924513
8. Schudson M. The sociology of news. W. W. Norton & Company, 2003.
9. Shoemaker PJ, Reese SD. Mediating the message in the 21st century: A media sociology perspective (3rd ed.). Routledge, 2014.
10. Shoemaker PJ, Vos TP. Gatekeeping theory. Routledge, 2009.
11. Silverman C. Verification handbook: A definitive guide to verifying digital content for emergency coverage. European Journalism Centre, 2014. https://verificationhandbook.com/
12. Society of Professional Journalists. SPJ code of ethics, 2014. https://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp
13. Standage T. The Victorian Internet: The remarkable story of the telegraph and the nineteenth century's on-line pioneers. Walker & Company, 1998.
14. Tandoc EC Jr, Jenkins J. The BuzzFeedication of journalism? How traditional news organizations are talking about a new entrant to the journalistic field will surprise you. Journalism. 2017; 18(4):482-500. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884915620269
15. Vosoughi S, Roy D, Aral S. The spread of true and false news online. Science. 2018; 359(6380):1146-1151. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aap9559
16. White DM. The "gate keeper": A case study in the selection of news. Journalism Quarterly. 1950; 27(4):383-390. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1177/107769905002700403
17. Yin RK. Case study research and applications: Design and methods (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, 2018.