



INNOVATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS IN SOCIAL SCIENCES

Peer Review, Refereed, Biannual, Social Science Journal, Open Access Journal

ISSN: 3107-5096(ONLINE)

VOL. 2, ISSUE 1 (SPECIAL EDITION) 2026

Sports Journalism in the Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges

*Dr. Swarn Suman Assistant Professor Department of Journalism and Mass Communication Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi	Citation: Suman, S. (2026). Sports Journalism in the Digital Age: Opportunities and Challenges. Innovative Research Thoughts in Social Sciences, 2(1), 134–142. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23310534
---	---

Abstract

Digital media allows sports journalists to report live, explain a match through video and speak directly with audiences. It also gives athletes and sports organisations their own channels of communication. This paper examines what these changes mean for sports journalism, with attention to the Indian context. It uses a critical narrative review of seven selected sources. These include studies of newsroom practice, social media, professional boundaries and gender representation, together with an established journalism ethics code. No new interviews, audience survey or content analysis were conducted. The review argues that digital access can improve reporting, but access alone does not produce reliable or inclusive journalism. Speed

can weaken verification when newsrooms fail to support careful work. Team media can provide useful material while reducing the journalist's control over the questions being asked. Digital space offers room for less visible sports, yet published evidence shows that older inequalities can continue online. The paper proposes practical steps for verification, source transparency, staff support and regular coverage beyond major events. Its contribution is to connect opportunities in digital publishing with the editorial decisions needed to make those opportunities useful to the public. The findings are interpretive and do not measure the condition of all Indian sports newsrooms.

Keywords: sports journalism, digital media, social media, editorial independence, verification, India

Introduction

A sports result is easy to publish. Explaining what happened, why it matters and what still needs checking takes more work. A reporter can announce a victory within seconds, but a useful report may also need to explain a disputed decision, an injury or the conditions in which the players trained. Digital publishing makes the first task faster. It gives the second task more tools, although newsrooms must decide how to use them.

Sports journalism covers much more than scores. It can examine selection decisions, access to facilities, the use of public resources and the treatment of athletes. Readers also want analysis, entertainment and a sense of connection with a team. These purposes often meet in the same report. A lively account can still ask difficult questions. The problem begins when excitement, access or commercial interest prevents the journalist from checking a claim.

In this paper, digital sports journalism means sports reporting produced or distributed through websites, mobile services and social media. It can include written reports, live updates, podcasts, video and graphics. The definition concerns journalistic work, rather than a particular device. An account does not become journalism simply because it attracts

followers. Readers need to know who produced the information, what evidence supports it and whether the producer has an interest in the story.

India provides the main setting for the discussion. Two selected studies by Peter English include Indian newsrooms or journalists. The other studies offer comparisons from different settings. They help identify questions that Indian editors could examine, but they do not provide national estimates for India. The paper asks how digital tools can improve sports reporting, what pressures they create and which editorial practices can protect accuracy and independence. It also considers whether more publishing space leads to wider representation.

How the review was carried out

The paper uses a critical narrative review. Sources were located through public-web searches using terms related to digital sports journalism, sports journalists and social media, gatekeeping in India, workload and coverage of women's sports. Selection favoured identifiable research articles with accessible abstracts and publication records. Six research articles and one professional ethics document were retained because they address the questions of this paper. This is a

purposive selection. It is not a systematic review of every publication on the subject.

The research sources are Sherwood and Nicholson (2013), English (2016, 2017), Li and colleagues (2017), Cooky and colleagues (2021), and Perreault and Bell (2022). Their accessible abstracts and bibliographic records were examined. The discussion stays within the methods and findings reported there. Relevant sections of the Society of Professional Journalists' ethics code were also examined. No full-text claim is made for articles available only at abstract level. The studies concern different countries, periods and research designs. Their samples were not combined, and no new numerical result was calculated.

The sources were compared around four issues: reporting possibilities, control over publication, working conditions and representation. Professional advice and suggested newsroom practices are the present review's interpretation. They are distinguished from the findings of the cited studies. Examples involving a local tournament, an injury report or a selection

rumour are illustrations, not observations from a collected dataset.

What earlier research helps us understand

Sherwood and Nicholson interviewed 27 Australian newspaper sports journalists. Their study found that journalists used social media and fan forums for sourcing, research and audience contact. Much of this activity remained within established journalistic norms. The finding matters because a new platform does not necessarily replace the habits of checking, selecting and explaining information. It can become another place in which journalists practise those habits.¹

English's study of Twitter adoption covered six news organisations in Australia, India and the United Kingdom. It combined 36 interviews with analysis of 4,103 print and online articles. The study examined how newsrooms accepted or rejected a new tool. Its comparative design directs attention to organisational choices, rather than treating technological change as something every newsroom experiences in the same way.²

¹ Sherwood, M., & Nicholson, M. (2013). Web 2.0 platforms and the work of newspaper sport journalists. *Journalism*, 14(7), 942–959. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884912458662> (Abstract).

² English, P. (2016). Twitter's diffusion in sports journalism: Role models, laggards and followers of the social media innovation. *New Media & Society*, 18(3), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814544886> (Abstract).

His later study examined social media boundaries in India and Australia. It used 22 interviews and 2,085 Twitter posts linked to the Australia–India Test series of 2014–2015. The accessible abstract identifies gatekeeping across different publishing channels as a concern. Gatekeeping means deciding what information reaches the public and how it is presented. A reporter who publishes from a personal account still makes decisions that may affect the employer's reputation.³

Perreault and Bell interviewed 47 journalists who described their work as digital sports journalism. Their abstract highlights pressure from team and player media, which perform some tasks that journalists once carried out more exclusively. This helps explain why digital change involves competition over professional authority as well as changes in equipment.⁴

These studies do not establish that every newsroom has lost control over sports information. They show why control needs examination. An editor can shape a website, but an athlete, a club and a fan account may

each publish an alternative version of the same event.

Opportunities for clearer and wider reporting

Digital formats let a reporter offer different levels of detail. A live update can give the score to someone with little time. A longer report can explain the match. A diagram can show a movement that is difficult to describe in words. An audio conversation can explore the reasons behind a coaching decision. Each format should add information that the reader can understand.

Consider a reader who is unfamiliar with a sport. Technical terms may make even an accurate report difficult to follow. A short explanation of a rule, supported by a clear image, can help that reader understand a disputed moment. A Hindi report can explain the same rule without forcing readers to depend on English commentary. Editors can choose a language that makes the explanation accessible to the readers they serve.

Digital publishing can also make local reporting easier to distribute. A journalist

³ English, P. (2017). Social media boundaries in sports journalism: Individual and organisational gatekeeping in India and Australia. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 27(5), 480–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2017.1284876> (Abstract).

⁴ Perreault, G., & Bell, T. R. (2022). Towards a “digital” sports journalism: Field theory, changing boundaries and evolving technologies. *Communication & Sport*, 10(3), 398–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479520979958> (Abstract).

covering a school competition or a district tournament need not wait for a large print allocation to publish a report. A small website can maintain results, player profiles and follow-up stories. Yet publishing is only one part of this work. The reporter still needs reliable records, permission where appropriate and time to visit the venue. A page that copies an organiser's publicity offers less public value than a report that checks the account.

Audience contact can improve questions. A reader may notice a missing result, challenge an explanation or point to an overlooked player. Editors can use these messages as leads. The newsroom should then verify them before publication. The earlier Australian study supports the use of social platforms for audience contact and research. It does not show that audience messages are automatically accurate.⁵

There is room for useful analysis of sports data too. A reporter can explain what a score, ranking or average actually measures. A graph should identify its source and period. If two players competed under different conditions, a direct comparison may mislead readers. Better graphics depend on careful

interpretation. Software can draw the chart, but the journalist must explain what the chart can and cannot tell us.

Speed and the need to check information

Live sport creates a practical problem. Readers expect updates while the event is still taking place. A journalist may need to correct a score, confirm a substitution and check a report about an injury at almost the same time. The challenge is to make uncertainty visible. If a claim remains unconfirmed, the report should say so rather than present it as settled fact.

An illustration makes the point. A widely shared post says a player has withdrawn from a competition. Other accounts repeat it. The number of repetitions provides no new evidence if all the accounts depend on the same unverified message. A reporter should identify the original source, seek confirmation and explain what remains unknown. If confirmation is unavailable, holding the story can be a reasonable editorial decision.

The Society of Professional Journalists' code asks journalists to verify information, provide context and correct errors. It also

⁵ Sherwood, M., & Nicholson, M. (2013). Web 2.0 platforms and the work of newspaper sport journalists. *Journalism*, 14(7), 942–959.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884912458662>
(Abstract).

states that speed and format do not excuse inaccuracy.⁶ These principles also apply to live sports reporting. A correction should appear where readers encountered the error. Updating a long article may be insufficient if the wrong claim also appeared in a video caption or social media post.

Editors can prepare for predictable problems before a match begins. They can identify official result sources, agree on wording for unconfirmed information and assign responsibility for corrections. This will not prevent every error. It can reduce the pressure to make important decisions without guidance in the middle of a live event.

Access and editorial independence

Team media can be useful. A club may release an interview, a training video or information about an upcoming event. An athlete may explain a personal experience through an account under their own control. Journalists can examine these materials as sources. Readers should still be able to distinguish the source's account from independent reporting.

A team-produced interview may answer some questions while leaving others unasked. That does not make it worthless. It does limit what a journalist can infer from it. If a report relies on that interview, the source should be named. If the story concerns a contested decision, the journalist should seek other relevant accounts. Perreault and Bell's study supports attention to the changing professional relationship between journalists and team media. The reporting practices proposed here are this paper's response to that issue.⁷

The same care applies to sponsored content. A story funded by an interested organisation should carry a clear label. A reporter who receives benefits from a source may face a conflict when reporting on that source. The SPJ code addresses independence and conflicts of interest. Applied to sports coverage, that guidance supports disclosure and a clear separation between editorial decisions and promotion.⁸

Access can make reporting easier, but it can also create dependence. A journalist may hesitate to ask a difficult question for fear of

⁶ Society of Professional Journalists. (2014). *SPJ code of ethics*. <https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/> (Seek Truth and Report It section).

⁷ Perreault, G., & Bell, T. R. (2022). Towards a “digital” sports journalism: Field theory, changing boundaries and evolving technologies.

Communication & Sport, 10(3), 398–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479520979958> (Abstract).

⁸ Society of Professional Journalists. (2014). *SPJ code of ethics*. <https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/> (Act Independently section).

losing future interviews. The newsroom should support fair questioning and allow the source an opportunity to respond. Good reporting needs both access and the freedom to examine the account offered through that access.

More space does not guarantee fair representation

A website can publish more stories than a fixed print page. This creates a possible opening for women's sports, disability sports and local competitions. Editors can develop regular reporting beats rather than cover an athlete only after a major victory. A beat is a subject that a reporter follows over time. It helps build knowledge and makes follow-up reporting possible.

The opening should not be confused with an established outcome. Cooky and colleagues examined a long history of sports coverage in the United States. Their study also included online newsletters and social media. The accessible abstract reports that digital coverage largely repeated the gender imbalance seen in the wider sample. This is evidence from that study's setting, not a measurement of Indian sports media.⁹ It

shows why digital availability alone cannot be treated as proof of equal visibility.

For Indian newsrooms, the useful question is what regular coverage would involve. Editors could examine which competitions receive follow-up stories, whose expertise appears in analysis and whether coverage explains performance rather than focusing on appearance or private life. Such an examination would need a defined sample and a clear coding method. This paper proposes it for future research. It does not present an unsupported coverage percentage.

There is a practical connection between visibility and resources. A newsroom cannot sustain a local sports beat if it provides neither time nor travel support. Asking a reporter to cover more sports while keeping the same workload may produce brief mentions instead of informed reporting. Inclusion therefore needs planning as well as a publishing space.

Workload and audience pressure

Digital sports reporting can involve a written article, live posts, video and audience replies during the same assignment. Li and

⁹ Cooky, C., Council, L. D., Mears, M. A., & Messner, M. A. (2021). One and done: The long eclipse of women's televised sports, 1989–2019. *Communication & Sport*, 9(3), 347–371.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/21674795211003524>
(Abstract).

colleagues surveyed 133 Chinese print sports journalists using snowball sampling. Their abstract reports that nearly half said monitoring social media increased pressure and workload. Snowball sampling recruits participants through networks, so the result should be understood within that sample. It cannot be converted into a percentage for Indian journalists.¹⁰

The study raises a question that Indian newsrooms could investigate directly. How much time does a reporter spend checking social media compared with speaking to sources or examining documents? A new platform may help gather information while also creating additional work. Counting the number of published items alone would miss this tension.

Editors should make responsibilities clear. One journalist may lead reporting while another prepares graphics or monitors audience questions. Smaller newsrooms may lack that option, but they can still choose realistic output priorities. Producing fewer carefully checked formats can serve readers better than requiring every available format from one person.

Audience contact also needs boundaries. A reader's criticism can help improve a report. Abuse and threats require a different response. Newsrooms should establish a way to record serious incidents and support staff. Staff should have someone to turn to when direct audience contact becomes difficult.

Discussion and limits

The review connects digital possibilities with the conditions needed to use them well. A live platform needs a verification process. Audience contact needs editorial checking. Team content needs source transparency. Wider publishing space needs a deliberate coverage plan. These relationships form the main argument of the paper. They explain why buying equipment or opening a new account cannot, by itself, settle questions of journalistic quality.

The selected studies differ in country, period, medium and method. Much of their evidence concerns social media practices before some newer formats became common. Abstract-level access also limits the depth of comparison. The review cannot assess every detail of the studies' analysis or establish the present condition of Indian newsrooms. It

¹⁰ Li, B., Stokowski, S., Dittmore, S. W., & Scott, O. K. M. (2017). For better or for worse: The impact of social media on Chinese sports journalists. *Communication & Sport*, 5(3), 311–330.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479515617279>
(Abstract).

does not measure audience trust, income, platform reach or the frequency of errors.

Future research could compare regional and national sports desks in India. Interviews could examine workload and source access. A defined content sample could compare verification signals, corrections and coverage of different sports. Researchers should keep sponsored material, team media and independent reporting distinguishable in the sample. These steps would test questions raised here with evidence from Indian practice.

Conclusion

Digital media gives sports journalists more ways to report and explain events. The benefit becomes clearer when newsrooms use those tools to answer readers' questions, check claims and follow stories beyond the final score. The selected research also draws attention to workload, competing sources of authority and continuing inequalities in coverage.

For the Indian context, this review recommends careful live reporting, clear source labels, support for journalists and regular attention to less visible sports. These are proposals grounded in the issues

identified by the literature. Their effect would need to be studied in particular newsrooms. Digital sports journalism serves the public when editorial decisions turn quick access to information into reporting that readers can examine and understand.

References

- Cooky, C., Council, L. D., Mears, M. A., & Messner, M. A. (2021). *One and done: The long eclipse of women's televised sports, 1989–2019*. *Communication & Sport*, 9(3), 347–371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21674795211003524>
- English, P. (2016). *Twitter's diffusion in sports journalism: Role models, laggards and followers of the social media innovation*. *New Media & Society*, 18(3), 484–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444814544886>
- English, P. (2017). *Social media boundaries in sports journalism: Individual and organisational gatekeeping in India and Australia*. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 27(5), 480–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01292986.2017.1284876>
- Li, B., Stokowski, S., Dittmore, S. W., & Scott, O. K. M. (2017). *For better or for worse: The impact of social media on Chinese sports journalists*. *Communication & Sport*, 5(3), 311–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479515617279>
- Perreault, G., & Bell, T. R. (2022). *Towards a “digital” sports journalism: Field theory, changing boundaries and evolving technologies*. *Communication & Sport*, 10(3), 398–416. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479520979958>
- Sherwood, M., & Nicholson, M. (2013). *Web 2.0 platforms and the work of newspaper sport journalists*. *Journalism*, 14(7), 942–959. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884912458662>
- Society of Professional Journalists. (2014). *SPJ code of ethics*. <https://www.spj.org/spj-code-of-ethics/>