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Abstract

Few professions are changing as rapidly or fundamentally as journalism. Core to these changes is the role of globalisation and transformations driven by the interaction between the changing requirements, expectations, audiences and technologies with which journalists now work. In understanding this global dimension to modern journalism, a valuable lens is research into an area in which the international has always mattered, that of foreign correspondents. Hannerz (2004) attributed four features to this group: (1) mobility, (2) the skill of navigating various cultures; (3) the appreciation of difference; and (4) an awareness of diverse audiences. This study explores journalistic transformation in a global age by investigating whether cosmopolitan skills that have previously been attributed to the work of foreign correspondents now apply to journalists more generally.

Traditionally, journalism research has compared journalists within national categories. But the critique of methodological nationalism (Beck, 2008; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2008; Beck and Sznaidner, 2006) demands research into journalists that goes beyond national confines. By focusing on London and New York, as global journalistic centers, this thesis examines the views of editors through the conceptual frameworks of identity, autonomy and globalisation, while avoiding national categorisation. Thirty-one in-depth expert interviews were conducted with journalists from a range of genders, backgrounds, levels, ages and positions – to investigate how editors, who are journalists with a degree of autonomy, are negotiating the new global circumstances within which they work.

The working lives of journalists were investigated on three levels: (1) the level of the individual; (2) the level of their news media organisation and (3) the societal level. The study’s findings reflect to the prevalence of cosmopolitan skills, which have previously been attributed to foreign correspondents, among these journalists. However, the use and emergence of these skills are still restricted by identities, lack of autonomy and the general processes of consequences of globalisation.

Key words: journalism research; globalisation; cosmopolitan skills; autonomy; social identity; qualitative research
Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Terhi Rantanen for her continuous encouragement, support and open mind to my ideas over the last years. Our many intellectual discussions have enriched my work, and for that I am grateful. Dr Neil McLean, the “teacher of teachers”, has been indispensable and a huge source of wisdom and insight during the final year of my PhD. In the Department of Media and Communications I am indebted to Dr Shani Orgad and Dr Myria Georgiou whose advice was very valuable. Professor Sonia Livingstone has been a source of inspiration and support throughout my PhD. Thanks to Professor Charlie Beckett for inviting me to teach at the International Journalism summer school. It was an immense privilege to meet Professor Ulrich Beck in the beginning of my PhD. He was exceptionally kind and generous with his time and thoughts whenever we met and I hope to honour his memory with this dissertation.

Without the generous financial support of the Gerhard C. Starck Foundation I could not have done this PhD. I am immensely grateful for the legacy of Mr and Mrs Starck, who were fascinated by the intellectual and artistic wealth of Jewish life in Germany before 1933. They strongly believed that young Jewish students from Germany have an important societal contribution to make. I would also like to thank Charlotte Knobloch who has been a source of inspiration ever since she first interviewed me for this scholarship. I am grateful for all the support I received from the LSE, which included several LSE Research Studentships and two graduate teaching positions.

I am very grateful to all my interviewees in London and New York, who have granted me access to their venerable institutions and insights into their brilliant minds.

It has been a huge privilege to be a visiting scholar at Columbia University. A plaque in the Journalism School’s entry hall quotes Joseph Pulitzer who said: “The power to mould the future of the Republic will be in the hands of the journalists of future generations.” Once you get past the entry hall and into the classrooms it becomes clear that the plaque lives up to its promise. I would like to thank Professor Gil Eyal at the department of sociology for the invitation and for his advice throughout my time in New York. I have learnt a great deal from the work of Professor Paula Span, Professor Helen Benedict and Professor John Bennet. I would like to thank Professor Michael Schudson for inviting me to join the research discussion forum and Professor Victor Navasky for his many introductions and for sharing his thoughts on the “matters of opinion”. Many thanks to the Santander Travel Fund for enabling me to go on this journey.

I am lucky to call Dr Alla Brodski my best friend. Her PhD life’s ups and downs have paralleled mine, despite her thesis being about eyes and brains. For valuable comments and sharp insights I am thanking my dear Raphael Cohen, Dr Elly Steinberg, Jessica Benhamou, Michelle Fan and also Gaby Charnas, who has commented on my thesis from the other end of the world. It has been a great pleasure working with my colleagues Xiaoxi Zhu, Gregory Asmolov, Keren Darmon, Tal Morse, Ben de la Pava and Daniel Kardefelt Winther, our many conversations over lunch and coffee have been a joy. I would like to thank the Davis family and the Aberbach family for welcoming me into their homes where I have spent many magical Friday night dinners and festivals – I look forward to many more.

I am hugely grateful to my editors, who have continued to believe that “for someone that academic” I remain a journalist and writer.

Most of all, I would like to thank my family, for whom education is the highest good on Earth. Thank you for your infinite love, encouragement, support and inspiration. I dedicate this dissertation to my grandparents who wrote their dissertations despite all the discrimination they faced in the Soviet Union. They tell me it’s a pleasure for them to know that their granddaughter can pursue a PhD in a country where she’s free to think and write without censorship and discrimination. Although I have not invented any new car safety control systems like my grandfather nor created any economic models like my grandmother, I am glad they find my interest in everything “cosmopolitan” amusing. After all, the term “cosmopolitan” was used against people like them for being Jewish and for thinking independently in the Soviet era. I am truly grateful that they have encouraged me to take this path.
To my grandparents,
With love and thanks.
Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction .................................................................................................................. 9

1.2. Research objectives and expected contribution ................................................................. 11
1.2. Motivations and research question .................................................................................... 12
1.3. Structure of the dissertation ............................................................................................. 13

Chapter 2: Theoretical premises for studying global journalists ............................................ 16

2.1. Journalism in transition ..................................................................................................... 17
2.1.1. Globalisation and journalism ......................................................................................... 18
2.1.2. Digitalisation and journalism ......................................................................................... 19
2.1.3. Audiences and journalism ............................................................................................ 22
2.1.4. Diversification and journalism ....................................................................................... 23
2.2. Limitations of previous journalism research in relation to this study ............................. 26
2.2.1. Previous journalism research has remained within national frames .......................... 26
2.2.2. Previous journalism research has focused on journalistic ideology .......................... 27
2.2.3. Previous journalism research has mainly concentrated on journalists without individual autonomy .......................................................... 29
2.2.4. Previous journalism research has focused on fast news and news gatherers .......... 31
2.3. An alternative approach: Research on foreign correspondents ...................................... 33
2.3.1. Previous research on foreign correspondents .............................................................. 33
2.3.2. Foreign correspondents and cosmopolitan skills ......................................................... 35
2.4. Cosmopolitan skills defined ............................................................................................. 40
2.4.1. Navigating different cultures ......................................................................................... 43
2.4.2. Mobility .......................................................................................................................... 45
2.4.3. The appreciation of difference in identities ................................................................. 47
2.4.4. Diverse audience awareness ......................................................................................... 48
2.5. Conclusion: The changing experience of journalism ....................................................... 51

Chapter 3: Methodology .............................................................................................................. 52

3.1. Choice of method ............................................................................................................... 53
3.1.1. How journalists have been studied before: Methodological lessons .......................... 53
3.1.2. Chosen method and its limitations: Semi-structured interviews ............................... 59
3.1.3. Interview Guide ............................................................................................................. 64
3.2. Choice of participants ...................................................................................................... 65
3.3. Collection of materials .................................................................................................... 68
3.3.1. Analysis ......................................................................................................................... 71
3.4. Ethical considerations ...................................................................................................... 75
3.4.1. Informed consent .......................................................................................................... 75
3.4.2. Issues of reflexivity ........................................................................................................ 75
3.4.3. The insider/outsider position ....................................................................................... 76
**Table of Tables**

Table 1: Publications .......................................................................................................................... 66
Table 2: Phases of Thematic Analysis ............................................................................................... 71
Table 3: Data extract, with codes applied .......................................................................................... 72
Table 4: Cosmopolitan skills and three types of identity ................................................................. 84
Table 5: Cosmopolitan skills and six kinds of autonomy and its constraints ................................. 117
Table 6: Cosmopolitan skills and the five landscapes of global flows .......................................... 156
Chapter 1: Introduction

In July 2014, the journalist Tim Burrowes reflected on how journalism has changed over the last twenty-five years:

“It used to be that we decided what was important to readers and told them. They bought the papers regardless, or maybe sent in something to the letters page. At the same time though, we were taught to write for the readers. Every story we wrote had a picture of those imaginary people (they were called Sid and Doris Bonkers), and what would matter to them, in our mind. Social media has made that two-way. And traffic analytics tell us in real time if anybody’s interested in reading what we write. The comment thread that follows does the rest.”

This, Burrowes concluded, “changes how we write.”

Burrowes, who began his career as a journalist at Aldershot News, in the South of England, is now editor of Mumbrella.com in Sydney. This travel has given him a more global insight: “I happened to start my career in the UK, but I think the trends have been the same for journalists across the developed world.” Burrowes’ reflections show how journalism as a profession is in a state of transition, which reveals its singular, new challenges. Core to these changes is the role of globalisation and the role of new technology, in particular digitization, the evolving concept of audiences as well as the diversification of journalists in terms of gender and ethnicity.

Up to now, the focus of journalism research has been on national frames. This thesis, however, argues that it is no longer possible to think of journalism within national boundaries. Where “global” themes were researched in previous studies, this has been with foreign correspondents (Hannerz, 2004). This thesis explores the transformation of journalism in a global age. It zooms into the working lives of individuals and argues that in the age of globalisation, all journalists need the skills that have previously been required of foreign correspondents.

This study focuses on journalists’ sense of self and individual autonomy inside of organisational and societal structures. It analyses the ways in which journalists give meaning to their professional activity. It sets out to discover whether leading editors in New York and London possess the skills that have previously been attributed to foreign correspondents and how they use these skills. For my thesis, I researched editors on an individual, organisational and societal level, in relation to their identity, autonomy and the wider process of globalisation. It is important to note that this study focuses on editors, rather than journalists more generally. On 14 April 2015 Sathnam Sanghera, a journalist at The Times, tweeted: “Journalists slagging off PRs is tedious, but I swear 60 per cent of
publicists who email me don't understand difference between writers and editors.” Writers and reporters mainly provide stories, while editors are in charge of assigning spaces for stories in addition to writing them. The difference has been overlooked by journalism research as well. I argue that researchers need to pay attention to the special role of editors, because what differentiates editors from other journalists is essentially a matter of power and responsibilities. Further, editors have the autonomy to shape journalism in its current state of transition.

Today, in an age of information overload there is a growing need for journalists who can filter and package that information (Beckett, 2008: 19). In a world saturated with news, eminent news media publications, such as those in this study, “continue to provide a trusted lens on the world.” (Greenslade, 2015). Even though many journalistic institutions are struggling, there is a role for journalism to play in the future, writes Brock (2013: 229). He argues that the global debate about the future of journalism, while agonised and gloomy, testifies to a wide understanding of the importance of journalism and its role to serve the public. Journalists have the power to filter and frame information, depending on the kind of publication they work for, they also have the power to analyse and interpret information. In the 1930s there was a vogue for “interpretative journalism” leading journalists and editors of this strand believed that “the world had grown increasingly complex and needed to be not only reported but explained,” writes Schudson (2001: 164).

Journalists are faced with deep transformations in their profession. “In the past, newspapers basically gave readers what the newspaper decided was the news, in the way the newspaper decides they should have it. There was no consumer choice. You either took the paper or you didn’t,” explains Gillian Tett, US Managing Editor of the Financial Times. “What is changing is people are actually saying: Okay, how are consumers, our readers, actually consuming the news?” (Ellis and Tett, 2014). Transformations in journalism have been brought about by globalisation and technological change. The change this study identifies, by conducting thirty-one expert interviews, is that new skills are required of journalists to do “global” journalism. However, this study also found that journalists are restricted in using some of these skills by their identities, lack of autonomy and the wider process of globalisation.
1.2. Research objectives and expected contribution

This study explores the theories of Hannerz (1990, 2004) and Beck (2006) in order to understand the “global” aspect of journalism. I have created the concept of “cosmopolitan skills”, which is defined in chapter 2. Then I provided empirical support for the existence and limitations of cosmopolitan skills. This is how I hope to contribute to both journalism research as well as globalisation research within media and communications. My concept of cosmopolitan skills is derived from different fields of studies, including journalism studies and sociology. It is inspired by the work of Beck, but Beck did not study journalists. It is also inspired by the work of Hannerz, who did study journalists in the form of foreign correspondents. In contrast to me, however, Hannerz conducted his study from the perspective of an anthropologist, and not a media scholar. I compared and contrasted concepts that have been previously used when studying journalists, and combined them with these new cosmopolitan skills. I studied these skills in conjunction with different concepts such as identity, autonomy and global flows. It is important to note that having cosmopolitan skills does not answer the identity question as to whether somebody is cosmopolitan or not, but rather whether they have developed these skills that are necessary for global journalism.

Rather than studying newsroom cultures or news content, this study makes a contribution to the qualitative analysis of individual actors. For the methodology in this study, I conducted semi-structured in-depth expert interviews with thirty-one leading editors at publications in in London and New York. The resulting materials were analysed through thematic analysis. I chose London and New York as locations for my fieldwork, because they are two global cities and important media centres. This means that the “global” aspects of journalism and journalists were more likely to occur there. Additionally, the research design helped me avoid methodological nationalism, by focusing on two cities rather than two countries.

I chose to interview editors at slow news publications, rather than journalists at “fast news” (or “rolling news”) publications such as news agencies or newspapers, for three reasons. First of all, I chose journalists at slow news publications, because they have long been neglected by researchers. In particular, editors who work at “slow news” publications, such as weeklies and monthlies, have been overlooked in previous studies, which primarily focused on newspaper and broadcast reporters. However, it needs to be pointed out that the demarcation between slow and fast news does no longer hold in the digital age. While all three publications in my sample have a printed flagship product, they also produce online news pieces on a daily and hourly basis.
Secondly, I chose to investigate leading editors because the nature of journalism is going through a radical transition, and editors have a degree of autonomy in shaping the profession. When it comes to the status of journalism in the world, the interviewees in this study are at the very top of their league. Thirdly, digitalisation and globalisation have made news and information freely available online, and thus, journalists can no longer add value to their publications by being newsgatherers only. In the current media landscape, it becomes increasingly important to conduct research on journalists who have the autonomy to interpret the news.

The editors in this study work at three prestigious publications: The Economist, The Intelligent Life Magazine and The New Yorker. These publications are part of transnational media corporations Condé Nast and The Economist Group, which are based in New York and London respectively, and have foreign offices on all continents. These three publications have made it through the financial crisis of 2008 and remain powerful opinion makers in the current media landscape. All three publications have transitioned to new digital models, by taking their subscription packages online, establishing multimedia teams, creating online-only content, implementing various social media channels, creating apps and more. All three publications are still in the process of transitioning.

1.2. Motivations and research question

The main research question and the three sub-questions of this study are:

RQ: How do leading journalists perceive themselves, their audience, their work and their world in the age of globalisation?

(1) To what extent, if any, do journalists have and make use of their cosmopolitan skills and how do these relate to their identities?
(2) To what extent, if any, do journalists have autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills?
(3) What limitations, if any, do journalists face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the global age?

I choose the verb “perceive” in the research question because it addresses perception, previous experience and expectations for the future. Kunelius and Ruusunoksa define the notion of journalists’ professional imagination as “the collective potential of agency inherent in the professional culture of journalists” (2008: 663). The emphasis of the question’s ending is on
globalisation. What has previously been wanting in the globalisation debate is the acknowledgement that media has emerged “as an independent institution with a logic of its own that other social institutions have to accommodate to” (Hjavard, 2008: 105). I argue that we need to reconsider the professional role of journalists in order to maintain an understanding of what journalism is and should be in an increasingly complex global society.

1.3. Structure of the dissertation

My dissertation consists of seven chapters. Following this introductory chapter, the second chapter provides theoretical and conceptual foundations for the analysis of global journalists. The third chapter provides a detailed justification of the research methodology chosen. The subsequent three chapters are the empirical parts. All three empirical chapters analyse the presence and absence, the awareness and ignorance, the affordances and limitations of the four cosmopolitan skills among editors. The empirical chapters flow from the level of the individual to the level of the organisation and finally, to the wider effects of globalisation and societal processes on journalism.

The second chapter provides the theoretical foundations needed for the analysis of global journalists. It explores the ways in which journalism is changing through globalisation. Journalism is a key component of societal transformations – both as a cause and effect. Previous journalism research has used a predominantly national frame of reference, but this study suggests that journalism now needs to be studied not only in a national, but also in a global context. In addition to globalisation, three key factors contribute to the present transformation: (1) the role of new technology and in particular digitization; (2) the changing concept of audiences; and (3) the diversification of journalists in terms of gender and ethnicity.

Further, the theory chapter pinpoints four major limitations of previous journalism research, while acknowledging that my research builds on that of predecessors. The chapter discusses the global aspects that have previously been attributed to the work of foreign correspondents. When these insights are combined with the latest debates in the field of globalisation, which are theories of cosmopolitanisation, it is possible to suggest new cosmopolitan skills that all journalists need wherever they are working. The chapter outlines the skills that have traditionally been needed in foreign correspondents’ work. It provides the groundwork for an exploration of whether these skills are now also increasingly required of journalists, who are not foreign correspondents, in global cities such as New York and London.
The third chapter provides context and a justification for the methodology chosen in this study. It discusses the methods available and evaluates how journalists have been studied in the past. It draws lessons from studies that have used surveys, ethnography and interviews to study journalists. Then, it provides a justification for the chosen method - semi-structured in-depth expert interviews - and it explains the limitations of this method and how they have been mostly overcome. Further, it elaborates on the choice of participants, and the collection and analysis of materials. Overall, this chapter places my study within the canon of previous journalism research and justifies the choices that were made with regards to methodology.

The fourth chapter juxtaposes cosmopolitan skills with editors’ identities, such as gender and ethnicity, as well as their organisational and professional identity. It addresses the research sub-question: “To what extent, if any, do journalists have and make use of their cosmopolitan skills and how do these relate to their identities?” This chapter investigates how leading editors perceive themselves, and whether they perceive a broadening of voices within journalistic work. It analyses the ways in which interviewees understand their own identities, their colleagues’ identities and their audiences’ identities. This study argues that journalism research needs to go beyond national categories in its methodology. It debunks the idea that national identities are the most dominant point of identification in our globalised world.

The fifth chapter investigates the extent of editors’ autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills. It addressed the sub-question of “To what extent, if any, do journalists have autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills?” Previous research tended to focus on fast news and thus reduced journalists to the role of news-gatherers, but this thesis focuses on the autonomy editors have in the news making process. This chapter analyses the extent to which editors feel autonomous at work, the way they use their autonomy and the constraints they encounter in wielding their autonomy. It argues that even though editors have a high degree of autonomy, they do not perceive their autonomy to be unbounded, most notably in relation to economic, political and organisational constraints.

The sixth chapter focuses on the interplay between cosmopolitan skills and global societal flows. Globalisation is understood as a process of flows, following Appadurai (1990), instead of rigid structures. Using the concept of global flows this chapter analyses how cosmopolitan skills work, not only inside the media organisations, but also outside them. It focuses on the third research sub-question: “What limitations, if any, do journalists face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the global age?” Due to the increasing uncertainty, anxiety and a sense of transition brought about by
globalisation, the role of the imagination has come to the fore. The notion of the imagination may at first seem a controversial term to apply to journalists. But here it is defined as the “power create mental images and ideas especially of things that have been neither seen nor experienced” (Kenway and Fahey, 2009: 2) and it refers to the ways in which editors think of themselves, their work and audiences, and how they conceive of the continuous changes in their profession. This chapter analyses editors’ ability to have and use cosmopolitan skills at work, not only as individuals or employees in their media organisations, but in relation to the “world-at-large”, which is defined through the concept of global flows.

The seventh and final chapter of this dissertation draws together all the important conclusions that have been discussed in the previous chapters. Additionally, it discusses the theoretical, methodological and empirical implications. It also addresses the practical implications of my research for journalism education. Finally, it outlines ways in which I could take my research further and makes recommendations for further research.
Chapter 2: Theoretical premises for studying global journalists

This study explores the ways in which journalism is changing through the process of globalisation. Globalisation in relation to journalism refers to the “intensification of social interconnections, which allows apprehending the world as a single place, creating a greater awareness of our own place and its relative location within the range of world experience” (Reese, 2010: 344). Journalism, as part of media and communications, is a key component of these social transformations – both as a cause and as an outcome. Previous journalism research has used a predominantly national frame of reference, but this study questions its usefulness and suggests that journalism now needs to be studied not only in a national, but also in a global context.

To address some of the new theoretical challenges of globalisation Sassen has conceptualised and conducted studies of global cities (2000; 2001, 2002, 2009a, 2009b). She has shown (2001), for instance, that New York, Tokyo and London dominate international finance, consulting and the business sector on the international stage. This study explores the similarities and differences among leading editors in London and New York through a transnational research design. As Georgiou (2008: 224) writes, “global cities like London and New York host some of the major media and communications corporations that control significant trends within global information production and distribution”.

The first section of this chapter outlines the changing circumstances in which journalism is performed. It focuses first on the recent changes in journalism and particularly their relation to globalisation. It argues that three other key factors contribute to the present transformation: (1) the role of new technology and in particular digitization; (2) the changing concept of audiences; and (3) the diversification and, in particular, the feminization of journalism.

The second section outlines four important limitations of previous journalism research for the purposes of this project. These limitations are (1) an emphasis on the national frame; (2) a focus on journalistic ideology; (3) a focus on journalists without individual autonomy, and (4) a focus on fast news and news gatherers. Thus, while acknowledging the usefulness of earlier journalism studies for my own project, I suggest that studying journalism in a global age needs to overcome these limitations.

The third section of this chapter shows that, where supra-national influences have previously been researched, this has been through the work of foreign correspondents. It argues that, despite some
definitional issues, research on foreign correspondents has been able to identify global aspects of their work. When this research is combined with the latest theories of globalisation, those of cosmopolitanisation, it is possible to suggest four new cosmopolitan skills that all journalists need wherever they are working. These encompass (1) mobility; (2) the ability to navigate various cultures; (3) the appreciation of difference in identities; and (4) an awareness of diverse audiences, all of which are now demanded from the new global journalists. These features relate both to an understanding of new global journalists’ role and to their competence in performing it. I argue that the circumstances in which foreign correspondents work are now also increasingly present in journalism as a wider profession in global cities such as New York and London.

2.1. Journalism in transition

Journalism has repeatedly been diagnosed as in a state of crisis (see, for instance, Shirky, 2014; Tiffany, 2012; Edmonds, 2009; Picard, 2006). Over the last ten years, for example, the American newspaper industry has lost nearly half of its print readership and over one third of its revenues (Mutter, 2014). According to the American Society of News Editors, employment in US newsrooms has fallen by a third since 2006. The US Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that, for every working journalist in the US, there are now 4.6 Public Relations (PR) professionals, up from 3.2 a decade ago. Journalists earn on average 65 per cent of what their PR peers are paid in the US (Williams, 2014). A recent report on UK journalism found that only 6 per cent of people have paid to access online news content over the last year. Simultaneously, smartphones have become the main way of accessing online news for 26 per cent of people (Newman, Levy and Kleis Nielsen, 2015). The drop in newspaper sales and advertising revenues, the abundance of free information online and the rise of citizen journalism has led many scholars over the last two decades to predict the end of journalism as we know it.

Following gloomy diagnoses of journalism in crisis, scholars have moved on to argue that journalism, instead of being in a crisis, is in a state of transition (see, for instance, Anderson, 2013; Beckett, 2008; 2010; Singer et al., 2011). They have argued that journalism will overcome the present challenges posed by globalisation and digitalisation and that news media companies will develop new and viable business models and practices. Brock argues that the global debate about the future of journalism, while agonized and gloomy, testifies to a wide understanding of the importance of journalism and its role in serving the public (2013: 229). This is why it is important to study individual actors who help to steer journalism through its current transition.
2.1.1. Globalisation and journalism

Global processes have caused an international competitiveness among news providers (de Mateo, Berges and Garnatxe, 2010: 273). Audiences can now access news publications from all over the world online, but whether they actually do is debatable (Gerodimos, 2013: 489). Technological changes have also brought about an abundance of free information online and the rise of citizen journalism. This is why traditional journalism has needed and still needs to reinvent its business model. Cottle writes of the “de-territorializing world that has become increasingly interconnected, interdependent and in flux, that is to say, globalized” (2011: 78). He argues that news events register beyond the porous borders of nation states and require responses from institutions that are transnational in scope. However, these media institutions, including journalistic ones, have yet to receive the reflection and empirical study they require from scholars working in the fields of media and communications and journalism research. This is why this study addresses global aspects of journalistic work empirically.

When scholars write about global media or global journalism, it is often not clear what they mean by “global”. Overall, even outspoken media scholars of international or global communication still struggle with a broad range of paradigms (Kraidy, 2013: 2). Global media have previously been defined as those owned by transnational corporations, and as having a global reach and creating a global culture (Herman and McChesney, 1997: 1-8). But global news content has been also said to remain sparse (Reese, 2010; Hafez, 2007). Some scholars have analysed the global nature of broadcasters such as CNN or BBC World (Cottle and Nolan, 2007; Cottle and Rai, 2008; Cottle, 2009; Robinson, 2002; Volkmer, 1999). In the “CNN Effect” (2002), Robinson examined the relationship between the state and its media in relation to reporting humanitarian interventions in Iraq, Somalia, Bosnia, Kosovo and Rwanda. He argued that sympathetic news coverage on foreign crises can influence the response of Western governments on a global level. Global journalism has received some theoretical consideration in terms of its content and production (Berglez, 2007; 2008; de Beer and Merrill, 2004; Herbert, 2000; Löffelholz and Weaver, 2008, Reese, 2008; 2010), but more evidence is needed. Very few studies have empirically analysed the work of journalists at global publications through interviews with individuals, one such study being Corcoran and Fahy’s research on the Financial Times (2009). By and large, media scholars still conceptualise media systems within the concepts of nation-states (Hallin and Mancini, 2004). Therefore it is not always clear what the “global” means in relation to journalism.
Instead of looking for the "global" as a separate entity, such as global content, it is better to ask whether and how the process of globalisation has added new and multiple layers to the national frame. Weaver conducted a large-scale study, *The Global Journalist* (1998). Although its title refers to the "global" journalist, this book consists of a country-by-country analysis of journalists, according to their nationality. Sociologists have put forward arguments about the need for creative empirical strategies that are appropriate to the global era (Beck, 2006; Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2008; Beck and Sznaider, 2006). Beck (2008: 26) problematizes the fact that social scientists display a tendency to conduct research within the national framework. He coined the term methodological nationalism for this empirical approach and argued it as equating societies with nation-state societies and seeing states and their governments as the cornerstones of social-scientific analysis. Instead, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim advocate a view and analysis based on “border crossing interactions, interconnectedness and intercommunication” (2008: 2). In their view, the nation-bound stance of research prevents social scientists from getting to the heart of the dynamics of globalisation, and they point to the potential of current debates to change the way social scientists conduct research (Beck and Beck Gernsheim: 2008: 7).

In order to observe new ways in which journalists adapt to change, we need to consider how globalisation adds a new transnational logic to existing cultural and national communities (Reese, 2010: 352). This study therefore focuses on individual editors in London and New York, who may, if we move beyond the use of a purely national framework, prove to have more in common with one another than with editors of different kinds of publication in their own countries.

### 2.1.2. Digitalisation and journalism

Globalisation, entangled with technological change, has a significant effect on producers and consumers of journalism alike. Over the last two decades technology has changed journalistic practices dramatically. It has changed the affordances of production and distribution, as well as the content of journalistic work. It has the potential to change the ways in which journalists write news stories and the ways in which audiences access these stories (Gerodimos, 2013: 477). In addition, new technological tools allow journalists to viscerally experience, as well as contribute to, news stories in unprecedented ways (Boczkowski, 2004: 105). New media technologies have connected the world; they have enabled citizen journalists to express themselves on a global stage and thereby to contribute to journalism and interact with and question the work of professional journalists.
(Vobič, 2012: 470). New and traditional media platforms complement one another, and create new ways in which stories are told by journalists as well as received by audiences (Rantanen, 2009: 123). Further, the identities of journalists and audiences have somewhat overlapped through citizen journalism and features of interactivity. The question of who is a journalist and how a journalist defines herself has to be discussed anew.

Due to the increasing proliferation of information online, journalists’ newsgathering practices are changing. No major professional news organisation can now obtain the news any faster than anyone else, professional or not (Stephens, 2014: 67). This has implications for the ways in which editors cover and curate the content of their publications. Reese has argued that even “ostensibly “non-global” media can now track almost instantly newsworthy developments around the world and must react knowing that their audience has had access to them via other media” (2008: 242). Thus, editors need to react to news stories and developments from around the world. They compete with other publications worldwide as well as with non-traditional forms of journalism, such as blogger and vloggers.

One of the central new features of online journalism is the use of multimedia. Deuze (2004: 140) defines multimedia in journalism as “the presentation of a news story package on a website using two or more media formats, such as (but not limited to) spoken and written word, music, moving and still images, graphic animations, including interactive and hyper-textual elements”. Internet-based tools and practices make it possible for journalists to write about ideas, issues, events, and people that were once distant and not easily accessible and that now become closer and seem more familiar than before (Ananny and Russell, 2013: 2). Features of online journalism can help to bring stories to life and provide many ways for readers to vividly and viscerally experience places and people worldwide that they would previously have encountered only if they were highly mobile.

Another central feature of online journalism is the renewed focus on the mining and representation of data. As Shirky (2014) wrote in a widely shared blog post: “The old ‘story accompanied by a chart’ was merely data next to journalism; increasingly data is the journalism.” The question is whether the features of online journalism, such as multimedia and the new focus on data, enhance journalists’ ability to provide through the media a varied vicarious experience of the world (Boczkowski, 2004: 105). In addition, these new features have created a demand for increased “multiskilling” (Deuze, 2004: 146) among journalists. The question is whether these new demands enhance or inhibit the
working autonomy of editors. Chapter 5 of this dissertation focuses on the notion of journalistic autonomy, and the limitations editors perceive to their autonomy.

New technologies have also changed the ways in which foreign news is produced and consumed. Chung (2008: 661) defined interactivity as “a multi-dimensional construct that is on a continuum of medium to human interactivity”. Initially, Deuze found that “69 per cent of these new media professionals agreed to the proposition that a strong interactive relationship with the audience is an essential building block for any news site” (2001). But, subsequently, Domingo (2008: 680) found that there remains strong inertia among journalists from “developing most of the ideals of interactivity, as they do not fit in the standardized news production routines”. Boczkowski (2004: 197) examined three newsrooms and found that organisational structures, work practices and the ways in which journalists viewed their audiences shaped the way they used technology at work. In cases where journalists viewed their audience as technically savvy and in some way as contributors to editorial content, levels of interactivity and the use of multimedia increased (2004: 205-208). Therefore digitalisation has changed the relationship between journalists and audiences, as well as the affordances of their communication with one another.

This proliferation of new technology affects journalists’ work in many ways. Deuze (1999: 380-385) has argued that a new set of journalistic skills for online journalism must include: the creation of non-linear narratives, the mastering of digital language and the layering of content. He also argues that new journalism standards should include: offering hyperlinks to sources, making background material available, and providing additional related and archival content. Journalists are now expected to multitask, due to the push towards “fully integrated multimedia newsrooms where teams of news reporters from print, broadcast and online jointly gather information, mine databases, and plan story packages intended for distribution across media” (Deuze, 2004: 141). Some studies, however, have shown that news publications have chosen to separate their print newsroom from their online newsroom (Broersma and Tameling, 2013). Thus, the ways in which digital media are integrated into print publications are far from straightforward, and this thesis investigates the complex relationship between online and print news, as perceived by journalists.

However, the skills required of journalists today could turn out to be less different than we assume from those required in previous times. Deuze (1999: 374) has admitted that “good reporting online is the same as good reporting in print”, but he adds that “its characteristics are just sometimes completely different and require different skills and standards” (1999: 374). While online journalism
has often been studied through surveys (for example, Fortunati et al., 2009) this study aims to delve deeper by interviewing leading editors in order to explore their views and practices with regard to whether, and if so in what ways, online journalism indeed entails a new set of skills.

2.1.3. Audiences and journalism

Earlier studies have shown that journalists were not previously aware of their audiences. In his study of the BBC, Schlesinger (1978: 106) remarked that there was a “missing link” between BBC journalists and their audience. He wrote that there was “no adequate point of contact with the audience for broadcast news; and there is, therefore, no sense in which one can talk of a communication taking place which is truly alive to the needs of the news audience” (1978: 106). Similarly, Tunstall (1971: 41) pointed out that journalists were “source-oriented”, while the audience hardly featured in their thinking. However, new technology has provided an unprecedented platform for journalists and audiences to be aware of, as well as interact with, one another. This study explores how editors interact with their audiences and what their online encounters reveal about editors’ views of an interest in their audiences.

More recent studies show that, having ignored audience preferences for a long time, journalists are increasingly aware of the characteristics and tastes of their audiences. Journalists can now track audiences on their digital platforms and thereby view the geographical locations from which their publication is accessed and the viewing times, as well as the viewing numbers (MacGregor, 2007: 280). As Quinn and Trench (2002: 5) write, “mass media have traditionally relied on their own judgement of what stories are worth telling, on a very largely one-way mode of communication and on an internalised image of their publics”. The question arises of whether editors form a mental image of their audiences or whether they base their image on evidence taken from tracking data, interactivity or even personal encounters. Some have argued that editors are now becoming, through the use of tracking tools, increasingly aware of their audiences (Lee, Lewis and Powers, 2012: 1; Schlesinger and Doyle, 2015: 319). This study investigates just how aware journalists are of their audiences and whether, if at all, they interact with their audiences.

Journalism scholars have established interactivity as one of the key defining features of online journalism (Deuze, 1999; Dahlgren, 1996; Fenton, 2010). Deuze (1999: 377) argues that online news is interactive and that it thus has the potential to make the reader part of the news experience. He defines interactivity as an audience-related feature: comment sections and the exchange of emails
between journalists and readers. Others have argued characterised developments in journalism as a case of “new media, old values” (O’Sullivan and Ari Heinonen, 2008).

In any case, digitalisation reconfigures the relationship between journalists and their audiences in some way and qualitative research will help to pinpoint and qualify how this happens. Thurman found that some British news websites, such as FT.com or BBC.com, attracted larger audiences than their American competitors (2007: 285). Readers can choose to read publications from any nation provided they speak the language. Various media forms transcend the borders of nations, cultures and continents. Therefore, editors need to consider audiences from a variety of nations beyond their own. This study explores whether editors are indeed aware of and interested in their international and diverse audiences.

2.1.4. Diversification and journalism

In “My Trade: A Short History of British Journalism”, Andrew Marr (2004: 1-2) writes: “In 1980 I joined a world which was overwhelmingly male and lower middle class. The typical journalist seemed to be a cheery middle-aged man having trouble at home, who drank pretty freely, had a constant inch of cigarette jammed between his fingers, the nails of which were blunt and damaged from years of ill-treating typewriters. Now there are regiments of women, snappily dressed, without discernible alcohol problems, well-educated with sharp smiles and sharper elbows.”

Traditionally, and also on the basis of recent studies, the average journalist has been described as “a white man, about 40 years of age” (Raeymaeckers, Paulussen and De Keyser, 2012: 152). Meanwhile 50.8 per cent of the population is female in the UK and the US (The World Bank data, 2015), and 14 per cent of the UK population and 37 per cent of the US population belong to an ethnic minority (Sunak and Rajeswaran, 2014). Thus, there is a striking imbalance between the characteristics of society and the characteristics of most journalists. Recently, some initiatives have been founded to counter this trend. In the UK, the “Creative Access” initiative was founded in 2012 to provide opportunities for paid internships in the media and creative industries for young people from under-represented black, Asian and other minority ethnic backgrounds. This initiative is supported by the UK Commission for Employment & Skills, Creative Skillset and the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills. In the US, the VIDA count has drawn attention to gender imbalances in
journalistic work by counting the book review bylines of female and male journalists.¹ These initiatives draw attention to the need to create a more diverse body of journalists. The diversification of the journalistic profession is important if journalism is to be representative of the audiences it informs and represents.

Deuze argues the role of the media needs to be discussed anew (2005a: 453) because multiculturalism challenges historically embedded views of journalism. As a consequence we need to rethink journalism and the professional role of journalists in order to maintain an understanding, in an increasingly complex society, of what the profession is. The national reference points of journalists have been challenged, but not destroyed, by globalisation and transnational processes. Today, journalists have to develop additional points of reference extending beyond the national level.

In most Western societies the number of women journalists has been rising over the last three decades (Gallagher, O’Connor and Ndangam, 2010; Chambers et al., 2004; Van Zoonen, 1994). This development has led some researchers to argue that the profession is undergoing a global process of “feminization” (van Zoonen, 1998b; Lavie and Lehman-Wilzig, 2003; Marchetti, 2005; Djerf-Pierre, 2007; Saitta, 2013). Van Zoonen has argued that commercial forces in journalism which value “human interest”, audience needs and desires, and emotional investment, have opened up the profession to women (1998b: 41). While being “feminine” was previously at odds with being a good journalist, Van Zoonen (1998b) argues that these new trends in journalism allow women to bring their femininity to work by being “one of the girls” rather than “one of the boys”. This study investigates whether female journalists are indeed encouraged to bring their gender identities to work, or whether being “one of the boys” remains an advantage.

Since the 1990s studies of gender and the journalistic profession have mainly focused on the presence and numbers of female journalists in media organisations (for example, Beasley, 1993). Today this trend continues: The Global Media Monitoring Project found that the percentage of news items reported by women rose from 28 per cent in 1995 to 37 per cent in 2005 (Gallagher, O’Connor and Ndangam, 2010). The Status of Women in the U.S. Media 2014 Report (Fonda, Morgan and Steinem, 2014) found that female journalists make up about one third of staff in the newsroom. In

¹ The VIDA count is an American nonprofit organization. Every year, volunteers count the bylines of book reviews in prestigious American publications (including the New Yorker, Boston Review, The Atlantic, The Paris Review) by gender to reveal the proportion of female and male writers. It was founded with the aim to raise awareness of gender equality in literary culture. Please see http://www.vidaweb.org/new-yorker-2014-vida-count/ 4 April 2015
the UK in 2014, the House of Lords launched an investigation into gender equality entitled “Are there enough women in the media?” Initially, researchers assumed that once women reached a “critical mass” in the newsroom, they would influence story selection and reporting techniques (Mills, 1997), but this assumption needs to be scrutinised.

While studies of the feminization of the journalistic profession are increasing in number, research on journalists from ethnic minorities is still sparse. However this topic has also gained attention over the last two decades. Baines and Chambers (2012) analysed the lack of ethnic diversity in the British media. Focusing on newspapers, they identify reasons for the shortage of individuals from minority-ethnic groups in mainstream journalism and newsroom management, as well as considering the effects of this shortage on the representation of minority groups working in the media. A report by the Society of Editors (Benson, 2004) on the employment of minority-ethnic journalists in newspapers showed that seven per cent of editorial staff members at The Financial Times were from an ethnic minority background and sixteen per cent were non-British white. At The Guardian 4.9 per cent of the editorial staff were from minority-ethnic backgrounds. “To say that there is room for improvement would be an understatement”, concluded the report, which explored the reasons editors cited for the imbalance and the future plans they had developed to address this issue. Across Europe and the U.S., journalists from minority-ethnic backgrounds are also in a minority. In Sweden, Hultén and Graf found that 5.9 per cent of journalists were foreign-born and only two per cent were born in non-European countries (2011: 29). In Germany, Ouaj found that about 2-3 per cent of journalists were from a migration background (1999: 42). In the U.S., Becker et al. found (1999) that race and ethnicity were associated with lower levels of employment among journalists. In addition, an American Society of News Editors report (Gertz, 2013) found that minorities comprised 12-13 per cent of American newsroom staff. These numbers show a profession still dominated by journalists who are male and white. Beck (2006: 53) writes that “in societies where whites are dominant, being white means having the privilege of not noticing that one is white”. This study explores editors’ awareness, views and experiences in relation to this lack of diversity.

Some researchers have suggested that, while women and ethnic minorities are occupying new roles, they are not changing or redefining the roles they now occupy. For example, Chalaby writes: “[I]n the media women and members of ethnic minorities are welcome to occupy new roles and swap existing roles and occupations with others, but are not encouraged to create altogether new roles or even to change or redefine the roles they newly occupy” (1998: 76). One example of this is the fact that women in journalism still tend to cluster around particular subjects, particularly in the lifestyle
and features categories, while remaining under-represented in political reporting, sports journalism and opinion writing (Franks, 2013: 28-33). It is important to investigate whether women and ethnic minorities help to redefine journalistic roles or whether journalistic roles have largely remained the same despite the many changes on a societal level. This study investigates such claims through qualitative and empirical research.

2.2. Limitations of previous journalism research in relation to this study

My study is about editors in London and New York, two leading media capitals of the world. In relation to this study, previous journalism research has four important limitations. These are: (1) the focus on the national frame; (2) the focus on journalistic ideology; (3) the focus on fast news, and (4) the lack of research on editors. The first limitation that has dominated journalism research is the focus on the national frame. In addition, previous studies have focused on journalistic ideology and fast news, at the expense of individual journalistic autonomy in the news-making process. This focus overlooks the importance of individual autonomy and the role of identity and opinion in journalistic work. No difference has been made between journalists and editors, although editors have a relatively high degree of autonomy in determining a publication’s content, style and standpoint. Globalisation and digitalisation have brought new challenges to the journalistic profession, because news stories are now freely available online. This is why the question of how journalists interpret the news is becoming more pertinent and issues of identity and autonomy in the process of news-making need to be investigated by journalism research. This study used the concepts of identity and autonomy to investigate how they influence journalists’ views and practices at work.

2.2.1. Previous journalism research has remained within national frames

Anderson (1983: 62) famously argued that each newspaper “created an imagined community among a specific assemblage of fellow-readers”. Newspapers enabled the inhabitants of diverse localities to imagine themselves as members of one national community. Many journalism studies have focused on the “American” journalist (see, for instance, Johnstone, Slawski and Bowman, 1976; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986; Weaver, Beam and Brownlee, 2006). Comparative studies have analysed national news cultures in order to pinpoint differences between American, German, British, Dutch and Australian journalists (see, for instance, Deuze, 2002; Quandt et al., 2007; Hanusch and Hanitzsch, 2013). Concepts of the nation-state and journalists’ nationalities have thus far provided a dominant frame of reference in journalism research.
Journalists’ values, practices and identities have been analysed and compared, country by country. Scholars have investigated how journalists’ conceptions of their role vary depending on media systems (see, for example, Hallin and Mancini, 2004). Perceived levels of journalistic autonomy have also been analysed by scholars within national frames (see, for example, Johnstone et al., 1976; Weaver and Wilsont, 1986; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996; and more recently, Deuze, 2005a; Ryfe, 2009; Hanitzsch and Mellado, 2011; Anderson, 2011; Mellado and Humanes, 2012; Voltmer and Wasserman, 2014; Skovsgaard, 2014). National frames have thus dominated in previous studies of various aspects of the journalistic profession.

The influence of globalising forces on how journalists across national contexts understand and perform their roles remains relatively unexplored. Newspapers were long seen as an integral part of a system that created and reinforced collective national identities. However, this constellation has been challenged in the age of globalisation. Changes in society make new demands on journalism. Thus, “the central, national and serious role of newspaper journalism is in transition” (Kunelius and Ruusunoksa, 2008: 665) and that needs to be explored. Despite the dominant focus on national frames in journalism research, some studies have sought to define the features of a universal journalism culture (see, for instance, Hanitzsch, 2007). However, Hanitzsch’s study is concerned with proposing a theoretical framework for journalism cultures, rather than conducting an empirical investigation. In contrast, this study addresses the need for empirical evidence in the analysis of journalism in a global context.

2.2.2. Previous journalism research has focused on journalistic ideology

A second limitation on journalism research is that previous studies tended to focus on two different aspects of journalism: journalistic ideology (see, for example, Golding and Elliott, 1979; Soloski, 1990; Hafez, 2002; Zelizer, 2004; Deuze, 2005b) and journalistic cultures (Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Tameling and Broersma, 2013: 23; Ryfe, 2009: 197; Gade and Perry, 2003: 327). Deuze has defined journalistic ideology as “a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular group, including – but not limited to – the general process of the production of meanings and ideas (within that group)” (2005a: 445). This approach has not granted individual journalists a high degree of autonomy. According to Hanitzsch, earlier studies of journalists’ ideology resonate with more recent studies which conceptualise journalistic newsroom cultures (2007: 368). To analyse the various professional values and views of journalists, researchers have created a wide array of concepts, such as “national
news cultures” (Deuze, 2002: 134) or “journalism cultures”. What journalistic ideology and new cultures have in common is that these conceptualisations assume that there is a unifying consensus among journalists. Thus, these concepts still ignore individual autonomy and organisational differences, as well as ignoring the different statuses journalists have at work.

The narrow focus on ideology, mainly viewed in terms of accuracy and of the objectivity norm (Schudson, 2001: 150) overlooks the influence of personal autonomy in the news-production process. Objectivity has been central to the concept of journalists’ ethics, ideology and newsroom culture (Beam, Weaver and Brownlee, 2009: 278). In his seminal study of the BBC, Schlesinger (1978: 163) defined a “news media ideology” containing the notions of objectivity, balance, responsibility, fairness and freedom from bias. Golding and Elliott studied journalists’ “occupational ideology”, which had objectivity and impartiality as its main features (1979: 132; 208). Soloski used the concept of a journalistic “ideology of professionalism” (1989: 210), where objectivity was considered to be the most important professional norm (1989: 213). This study, however, argues that it is necessary to complement studies on ideology and culture, with studies that focus on agency-based concepts of identity and autonomy, and the more subjective aspects of journalistic work.

The notion of objectivity has traditionally stood in contrast to an interpretative kind of journalism. Objectivity is defined as “at once a moral ideal, a set of reporting and editing practices, and an observable pattern of news writing” (Schudson, 2001: 4). As McQuail (1992: 185) writes, “an objective report is one which is highly factual, in the sense of offering as much detailed and checkable, information as possible”. Vos has argued that journalism education has helped to reinforce the value of objectivity (2012: 436). However, an increasingly complex world demands from journalists a more subjective interpretation of facts. This is why this study concentrates on editors who have a degree of autonomy in analysing and interpreting facts in the news making process.

Research into how the “global” influences journalism requires a complementary focus on the choices made by individuals working in the profession. According to Newkirk (2000: 10), “far from being an objective process, news judgment is an outgrowth of the experiences, attitudes, interests, and perceptions of those at the helm of a news organisation”. Therefore, journalists’ identity and professional autonomy not only inform the ways in which they deliberate when they portray the world, but they are the starting points of their deliberations. Previous studies of collective journalistic phenomena such as ideology need to be complemented by an analysis of the ways in
which individual actors deal with processes of societal change. Editors, in particular, have the autonomy to make decisions affecting editorial content, which is why it is important to analyse whether and how their identities play into their decision making process.

2.2.3. Previous journalism research has mainly concentrated on journalists without individual autonomy

A third limitation on journalism research is the lack of focus on the role of editors. While previous studies, which used surveys, have included journalists with different extents of editorial responsibility in their sample (see, for instance, Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 10). But no particular attention was paid to editors as a group within journalism. No pertinent distinction has been drawn between journalists and editors, even though editors hold a special position of power within the profession. A partial reason for this may be the ambiguity around the definition of a “journalist”. Originating from the idea of someone who writes in a journal or diary, the term journalist initially referred to someone who systematically kept a record of certain events within a specified time-frame and who subsequently tended to make that record public (Zelizer, 2004: 21). But today this definition needs to be broadened.

Some previous studies have defined a journalist as “a person who makes decisions directly affecting news content” (Donsbach and Patterson, 2004: 253). But this definition could include both reporters and editors. In some organisations this definition can also include the owner of a publication (Donsbach and Patterson, 2004: 253). As Wyatt (2007: 239) writes, overall, “no one claims to have definitively set out the terms and bounds of the word “journalist”.” In this study all interviewees are journalists.

I have chosen to include many editors in my sample, because they have a high degree of autonomy in making decisions affecting editorial content. Some scholars have divided news workers into two categories: news gatherers (who write and report) and news processors (such as copy editors) (Shoemaker and Vos, 2009: 48) but this divide does not accurately capture the work of interviewees in this study. Instead, I define editors as journalists who have the following three functions: First, editors have a say in defining the editorial line (and therefore, the organisational identity) of their publication. Second, editors can commission stories from writers, both internally as well as freelancers (editorial assistants can make suggestions on who an editor should commission from). Third, editors can write stories themselves. In the case of a photo editor or video editor these
definitions apply to the visual rather than the verbal side of the publication. I have provided descriptions of the role of some of the key interviewees in Appendix 2 to further exemplify this definition.

Thus far, editors have only rarely been studied in journalism research, and no adequate definition of their role has been developed. In the rare situations where editors have been studied, research has tended to focus on newspaper editors (see, for example, Shoemaker and Reese, 1996; Deuze, 2005a; Gade, 2008) rather than magazine editors, with a few notable exceptions (Lepre and Bleske, 2005; Navasky and Cornog, 2012). Editors hold a special position of power in the world of journalism and their views and perspectives help to reshape their profession in the age of globalisation. However, there is no adequate definition of an editor. McKay (2005: 79), for example, writes that “editors check articles before publication for punctuation, accuracy, tone and balance, conscious always of the public interest”. However, this definition is limited. It omits the autonomy editors have in commissioning and publishing pieces, setting the tone of a publication as well as writing their own pieces, which they have the autonomy to assign themselves to write.

The shortcoming of previous research in not recognising the differing status of journalists is also related to the concept of autonomy or a lack of it. As argued in the previous section, newsrooms have been seen as influenced by ideology and cultures. However, journalists have not been entirely without autonomy, which can be defined as the “latitude that a practitioner has in carrying out his or her occupational duties” (Weaver et al., 2007: 70). According to Reich and Hanitzsch (2013: 136), this definition relates to journalists’ latitude within routines of reporting, writing and editing as well as to the greater decision-making structures within the editorial hierarchy. Journalism research has mainly focused on the internal and external constraints on journalists, who consequently lack autonomy. Many earlier studies have analysed journalistic autonomy by analysing the influences and restrictions to which it is subject (Mellado and Humanes, 2012; Plaisance and Deppa, 2009; Beam, 1990) including political, economic, professional, procedural and organisational influences. Hanitzsch et al. (2010) found that journalists perceived procedural influences strongly, while economic and political influences remained relatively subordinate in their minds. This study used the concept of autonomy, and its constraints, in order to analyse in how far editors can make use of their cosmopolitan skills.

Journalistic autonomy is also related to how changes in the journalistic profession are perceived. Deuze (2005a: 449) has argued that the notion of autonomy as a building block of journalists’
professional identity has served as a way of legitimizing resistance to change. However, journalists are now required to share their autonomy through the internal process of team-based multimedia work as well as through the external process of globalisation (Deuze, 2005a: 456-457). Anderson has argued that “the dominant journalistic values of autonomy and “writing for other journalists’ were being encroached upon by a new set of occupational values, a focus on raw audience data, and a “culture of the click” (2011: 555). Current transformations in the journalistic profession have added multiple levels of complexity to journalistic autonomy and how it is perceived. This study analyses the identities of editors as well as the way they perceive the identities of their audiences, in order to investigate current transformations, and the renegotiation of journalistic autonomy, in the journalistic profession.

In order to understand how globalising forces influence the practices of journalism, research needs to focus on the exercise of individual autonomy among journalists. In this study, I analyse the ways in which editors define, use or feel their lack of autonomy, which is defined as their freedom to make choices concerning their work and the content of their publication. This includes their freedom to commission stories from a variety of sources, their freedom to choose from a global network of journalists, their freedom to appeal to and interact with a variety of readers, and their freedom to interpret and analyse facts. Thus, editors may or may not have the autonomy to bring their own identities into the process.

2.2.4. Previous journalism research has focused on fast news and news gatherers

Very valuable research has been conducted on broader issues of media ownership and the concentration of ownership (see, for instance, Tunstall and Palmer, 1991; Chomsky and Herman, 1988). And this study suggests that previous studies need to be complemented by research which focuses on the individuals’ agency-side of media production. With regards to journalism research, there has been a focus on “fast” news media, such as newspapers, rather than slow news publications and on news-gatherers over news-interpreters. Scholars of journalism have tended, and still tend, to focus on newspaper journalists and newsrooms (see, for instance, Patterson and Donsbach, 1996; Armstrong, 2004; Weaver et al., 2006; Gade, 2008, Thurman and Hermida, 2008; Sherwood and Nicholson, 2013). Due to current technological developments, all information can now be gathered online, and journalism is no longer only concerned with gathering information. Stephens (2014: xix) argues that in order to remain relevant in the twenty-first century, journalism needs to shift from the objective to report facts to an explicitly subjective interpretation and analysis.
of facts. The speed with which information appears and is disseminated online makes it impossible for any person or organisation to consume or research all the news stories. However, leading news media publications try to analyse, relay and make sense of all the news there is. Thus, research needs to understand how technological developments influence the whole of journalism, including slow news.

The focus on fast news may explain why journalists have often been reduced to the role of factual news-gatherers, in early as well as recent studies (see, for example, Golding and Elliott, 1979: 102; Tuchman, 1978: 179; McQuail, 2000: 327; Örnebring, 2010: 61). A recent study by the Missouri School of Journalism tried to answer the question: who is a journalist? The study defined a journalist as “someone employed to regularly engage in gathering, processing, and disseminating (activities) news and information (output) to serve the public interest (social role)” (cited in Beaujon, 2013). Stephens (2014: xxvi) argues that while the role of journalists has traditionally focused on collecting facts and providing information, quality journalism in the twenty-first-century does no longer focus on “reporters going places, developing sources, checking and double-checking” – but are instead ratified forms of reporting which are simultaneously “informed, interpretive, explanatory, even opinionated takes on current events.” Thus, the perspective of journalists as news-gatherers no longer captures the essence of journalistic work.

Journalism goes beyond information provision and fast news, and research needs to understand how the “global” influences all journalism, including slow news. Tumber and Prentoulis (2003: 228) write that “as the journalist’s role as an interpreter becomes more pronounced and recognised […] What we may be witnessing is a paradigmatic shift which unsettles even further the public/journalist distinction from involvement, from verification to assertion, from objectivity to subjectivity”. In an age of endless information proliferation, there is a growing need for journalists to filter and package information (Beckett, 2008: 19), rather than just gathering it. Journalists have the power to filter and frame information and, depending on the kind of publication they work for, they also have the power to analyse and interpret information. To account for the current transformations in the journalistic profession, academic research needs to go beyond old frameworks. This is why this study concentrates on editors who work for global publications and who attempt to analyse and to understand the world.

Echoing the previous focus on journalism as newsgathering, much journalism has focused on hard news reporting, while less research has been conducted on cultural journalism, feature journalism
and interpretative journalism. These genres, however, are important areas to consider in relation to current processes of globalisation. Some scholars have addressed cultural, feature and slow news journalism (see, for instance, Steensen, 2009; Hellman and Jakkola, 2011; Navasky and Cornog, 2012), but such studies remain rare, while these forms are becoming more prevalent. Stephens writes that in the current media landscape, “slower news media – weeklies in this age of dailies – survived by occupying more analytical niches in the journalism ecology, as slower media usually do” (2014: 89). As an example he cites The New Yorker, which is one of the publications in my study. “Slow” news publications are characterised by thoughtful analysis and are traditionally thought of as magazine news or feature writing (Ellis and Tett, 2014). All the editors I interviewed for this study work for “slow” news publications aimed at global audiences.

Therefore, this study needs to address four gaps in the literature: firstly, journalism research needs to investigate the “global”; secondly, it needs to complement a shared ideology with a focus on individual actors such as editors and their identities, as well as their views and experiences in order to understand how the “global” is reproduced; thirdly, it needs to investigate the exercise of autonomy by individual journalists, especially editors; and fourthly, it needs to complement previous research on fast news with a focus on slow news in order to capture the global changes to the news ecology.

2.3. An alternative approach: Research on foreign correspondents

In the sections above I identified the shortcomings of previous research for my project. I am not arguing, however, that all previous research is useless for this thesis. This is why the concepts identities and autonomy have been adopted from previous studies. In addition, some aspects of globalisation have previously been studied in terms of the work of foreign correspondents. When this previous research is combined with the latest globalisation theories, which are those of cosmopolitanization, a new approach to analysing the autonomy and identities of global editors is offered in this study.

2.3.1. Previous research on foreign correspondents

Traditionally, research on foreign correspondents has included analysis of the “global” aspects of journalism, often labelled as “international”, as something distinctively separate from the “national”. An analysis that focuses on the “international” remains divided into national categories of the foreign correspondents’ “home” nation and the “foreign” nation of his or her reporting. Foreign
correspondents have received some scholarly attention, largely because of the autonomy, status and perhaps glamour they have had in the profession and their ability to move across national borders (see, for instance, Altmeppen, 2010; Cozma, 2010; Ghorpade, 1984; Hahn and Lönnendonker, 2009; Hamilton, 2009; Hannerz, 2004; Heinrich, 2012; Hess, 1996; Pedelty, 1995; Sutcliffe, Lee and Soderlund, 2005; Willnat and Weaver, 2003; Wu and Hamilton, 2004). The definitions of a foreign correspondent are hard to find and rather fluid (Weaver and Willnat, 2012: 498). They have traditionally been formulated on the basis of “an anachronistic and static model of what foreign correspondence is and who foreign correspondents are” (Hamilton and Jenner, 2004: 302). These distinctions are even harder to draw in the global age.

The definition of a foreign correspondent is malleable, but it is possible to differentiate between traditional full-time correspondents and freelance foreign correspondents. According to Skovsgaard and van Dalen (2015: 69-70) the traditional foreign correspondent conventionally belongs to a large media company. He or she is part of a bureau and resides more or less permanently in the location they report from to gather local knowledge and the ability to gauge the social temperature of the region. However, this model is expensive, and organisations are increasingly switching their foreign news reporting to the latter type – the freelancers (sometimes called stringers) who provide stories to news companies. Freelance reporters are not exclusively attached to any particular organisation. They tend to pay their own expenses and produce material of their own choosing, which they then sell to news providers. They are less likely to have a degree in journalism and have less experience as correspondents. On the other hand, they have a tighter bond with the country than full-timers, argue Skovsgaard and van Dalen, because they are more often located in the country they are reporting about and are less likely to work in English.

Today, the new media environment has changed drastically and so has foreign correspondence. Staffed international bureaus are shrinking while other forms of foreign correspondence are evolving (Hamilton and Jenner, 2004: 302-3). Previously, foreign correspondents have largely been subject to analysis within two national frames, that of their location and that of their publication’s and its audience’s location. But the process of globalisation has reconfigured the relationship between the global and the local, so that the “global” has come to permeate the realm of the national. According to Giddens, globalisation means an intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa (1990: 64). Therefore, new ways to analyse foreign correspondence in a more complex mediascape have to be developed.
Research into the work and lives of foreign correspondents has identified at least four features of their work and their understanding of their role that are shaped by a more global frame of reference. In his study on foreign news, Hannerz (2004: 15-6) found that foreign correspondents had the skills of navigating different cultures. Secondly, they were highly mobile (2004: 82). Thirdly, Hannerz explored the ways in which foreign correspondents appreciate difference and seek to make the vicarious experience of the world through the media a varied one (2004: 36-7). Fourthly, Hannerz (2004: 75-76) showed that some freelance foreign correspondents tended to write for diverse audiences, partly by contributing to more than one publication. This is why foreign correspondents have often been seen to act as intermediaries between the global, the national and the local (Hannerz, 1996: 122). Global journalism challenges the distinction between the “international” and the “national” and this is why this study explores the “global” aspect within the work of editors in London and New York. However, it is important to remember that both of these cities are based in the Anglo-American world (see 7.2. for limitations of this research design).

2.3.2. Foreign correspondents and cosmopolitan skills

The work of Beck (2002, 2003, 2006; also Beck and Sznaider, 2006; Beck and Grande, 2007) has been seminal to the formulation of contemporary theories of globalisation, introducing the concept of cosmopolitanisation. Beck has used the two terms of cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanisation interchangeably, but this study refers to cosmopolitanisation in order to emphasise the aspect of a process that is happening in society. Whenever scholars referred to cosmopolitanism in their arguments, I will refer to cosmopolitanism in that context. But instead of analysing the concepts of cosmopolitanism, cosmopolitanisation or the cosmopolitan identity, this study is concerned with analysing the concept of cosmopolitan skills (see section 2.4.).

The concept of cosmopolitanisation has been one of the recent turn in globalisation debates. The early globalisation theorist Appadurai (1990: 296) proposed an analytical framework to explore the five dimensions of global cultural flows. For Appadurai, individual agency is at the heart of globalisation, which is why he focuses his analysis on what he coins the “grassroots globalisation” (2000: 1). He argues that the way individuals imagine the world is “now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order” (1996: 31). He conceptualised these five flows as (1) ethnoscapes, (2) mediascapes, (3) technoscapes, (4) financescapes, and (5) ideoscapes that affect all forms of agency. Here the suffix scape in indicates
that these are not objective relations but rather “deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors” (1990: 296).

The concept of globalisation informed discussions of “the growing interconnectedness of different parts of the world, a process which gives rise to complex forms of interaction and interdependency” (Thompson, 1995: 149), the concept of cosmopolitanisation has introduced a more agency-based bottom-up perspective. The notion of globalisation was met initially with denial, then with conceptual refinement, and finally was subject to empirical research (Beck interviewed by Rantanen, 2005b: 248). The key characteristic that distinguishes discussion of cosmopolitanisation from that of globalisation, according to Beck, one of the pioneering theorists in the field, is that it shows how global transformations affect the lives of individuals and how this societal change “infiltrates our innermost thoughts and feelings, experiences and expectations” (2006: 73). Thus, cosmopolitanisation is situated at the level of individuals and is “about the globalisation of emotions” (Beck interviewed by Rantanen, 2005b: 260). Rantanen has argued that scholars need to look for instances where individuals have an opportunity to become an agent by making a change within the flows of globalisation (2005a: 158).

Over the last two decades, there have been discussions about the attempt to “internationalise” cultural studies, media and communication and education (Breit, Obijiofor and Fitzgerald, 2013; Chen, 1996; Shome, 2009; Thussu, 2009). In media studies, specifically, there has been a call for de-Westernisation (Curran and Park, 2000). The aim is to deconstruct and move beyond Western-centric logics. This study is concerned with publications that cover stories well beyond the West. However, it needs to be noted that the publications are based in the West, and that interviewees are likely to have been trained in the West, worked in the west as well as having networks that are largely Western. Shome (2009: 704) has previously warned that in a context of “an unequally positioned global traffic of knowledge”, conversations about ‘internationalizing’ tend to remain oriented towards a western consciousness, even when they try to break out of them. Further, he warned that non-western scholars (or in the case of this studies, non-western editors) tend to be fairly privileged compared to their ‘home’ population. Therefore, this study does not claim to represent editors worldwide, but is conscious of the specifically Western locations and histories of its sample publications, even in cases when interviewees have worked in non-Western locations.

In his study of foreign correspondents, Hannerz has argued that foreign correspondents embody the skills of the cosmopolitan (2004: 32-33). As he puts it, the cosmopolitan has “a personal ability to
make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting [...] a built-up skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings and meaningful forms” (1990: 293). Instead of analysing the skills of the cosmopolitan figure, this study uses cosmopolitan skills. While individuals can possess cosmopolitan skills, this does not necessarily guarantee a cosmopolitan identification or identity. But instead cosmopolitan skills can be a professional, social or organisational preference, requirement or repertoire. Hence, in this study on journalism, cosmopolitan skills are seen as professional tools rather than a personal feature.

Personal mobility and transnational networks have been identified as possible trajectories for cosmopolitanisation. However, individuals find themselves within the landscape of five global cultural flows (Appadurai, 1990: 296) which interact with the identities and autonomy individuals have in acquiring and applying their cosmopolitan skills. In this study, I explore how mobile editors are in their work, how they speak about their mobility and how they cover different cultures. In-depth interviews seek to show whether they listen, look and reflect in terms of a multiplicity of cultures, or whether they imagine the world primarily through the lens of only one set of national values, ideas and experiences.

Interestingly, a time of increasing global interconnectedness, foreign correspondents seem to be a disappearing species. Traditional news media in the United States, for example, have reduced the scope of their coverage of the world, not only by closing foreign bureaus, but also by reducing the time and space devoted to international news coverage (Chang et al., 2012: 379). Further, Chang et al. have argued that, in a rapidly changing world, American newspaper editors’ news values have remained the same throughout the last two decades. They observe a homogenisation of the values and views involved in decisions on how foreign news is to be reported, including a domestication of foreign news and a focus on foreign news as a site of disaster and international threat as well as of opportunity (2012: 379). Further, O’Sullivan and Heinonen (2008: 368), who surveyed journalists from 11 European countries, including the UK, found that while journalists appreciate new digital technologies, they still express a preference for the “old” ways of journalism. These empirical findings suggest that the age of globalisation has not increased cosmopolitan skills, an issue that are explored in Chapter 6.

These findings also raise the question of whether forces of globalisation in fact strengthen the importance of national news. Hafez challenged McLuhan’s idea of the “global village” and argued that the media around the world are framed according to their own home-grown narratives (2009:
Douglas insisted that new communication technologies and globalisation have ironically led to an ethnocentric and narcissistic “turn within” in news reporting (2006: 620). She argued that international news coverage has both decreased and become reduced to crisis reporting (2006: 629). While these arguments remain largely theoretical, it is important to consider such questions because it cannot be taken for granted that globalisation automatically increases journalists' cosmopolitan skills. However, Beck and Sznaider (2006: 14) suggested that arguments about cosmopolitanisation follow the “either/or” logic in juxtaposing cosmopolitanisation with nationalism, even if they can co-exist as a “both-and” alternative.

Franks (2006: 99) argued that news from developing countries is too often characterised by “the same diet of war, disaster and poverty”, which “breeds a cliché of these countries and leads to image fatigue amongst audiences,” rather than providing a more nuanced and rounded coverage. This is why it is important to analyse the attitudes, beliefs and cosmopolitan skills of editors, when it comes to covering various cultures and countries, to investigate whether they intend and manage to go beyond cultural clichés, provide stories that complement crisis communication and follow what Beck and Sznaider described as the “both-and” logic in their reporting of the Other.

Further, global technological changes challenge the work of foreign correspondence in various ways. Adams and Ovide (2009) maintain that American newspapers have retreated from writing about foreign affairs in favour of local coverage, because the latter is cheaper and less susceptible to duplication online. Skrubbeltrang (2015) writes that foreign correspondents have increasingly become dependent on local fixers to collect information for stories. Fixers operate as translators, drivers and guides, to lead foreign correspondents through territories that are unfamiliar to them. In his book, entitled Are Foreign Correspondents Redundant? (2010) Sambrook asks the eponymous question. He argues that while audiences in different countries have traditionally perceived events in different ways, globalisation and digitalisation have suddenly enabled them to “see across the fence to how others were reporting the news” (2010: 8). He suggests that this can lead to various outcomes, it can either strengthen national perspectives “through shrill opinion” or, in contrast, it can open up a more global approach to issues as news media companies find new audiences outside of their nation (2010: 8). However, there seems to be no agreement whether technological change has worsened the working conditions of foreign correspondents, Cozma (2010: 678), for example, writes that foreign correspondence has actually improved through the affordances of technology. Thus, the benefits of new technology are also to be studied in this thesis.
Overall globalisation coupled with digitalisation has brought three fundamental changes to foreign correspondence, according to the *New Global Journalism Report* (Niknejad et al. 2014: 1): Firstly, citizens who experience events can tell the world about them directly by using digital technologies, without the need for journalists as intermediaries to report and distribute the news. Secondly, journalists have the ability to report events without physically being there. And thirdly, digital technologies have brought about financial pressures, forcing publications to close their international bureaus. Livingston and Asmolov (2010: 756) observed that “time and space once defined the meaning of foreign correspondence; with the alteration of both, for better or worse, the meaning of the profession has changed. Indeed, the very idea of foreign - not to mention corresponding - has been altered, almost beyond recognition”. Therefore both the nature of international news reporting by foreign correspondents and journalists’ working contexts have changed.

In fact, the “global” is no longer represented by the existence of foreign desks, but is instead present in the very nature of how journalism is performed. Knight (2004: 11) has drawn an important distinction between the international, intercultural and global dimension. While the “international” refers to relationships between and among nations, “intercultural” is used to address the aspects of diversification within countries. Meanwhile, the “global” dimension is used to refer to a worldwide scope. Together, these three terms “give richness both in breadth and depth to the process of internationalization.” (Knight, 2004: 11) In this study, the global refers to the scope of coverage of the three publications. It also refers to the interpenetrating levels of the local, the national and the global in journalistic work. Interviewees in this study are asked to reflect on their views on issues that are both between nations as well as within nations. Further, it remains to be seen whether their interests are wholly global in scope.

As Franks writes, in foreign reporting, the “demarcation between home and abroad is dissolving as never before,” (2006: 100). Domestic and foreign news intersect in an ever more complicated way. Editors now cover news stories from all over the world. Reese (2010: 344) argues that the intensification of interconnections allows people to apprehend the world as a single place, within which each person becomes aware of his or her relative location (2010: 344). Therefore, the global cannot always be separated from the local by confining it to the foreign news section and the work of foreign correspondents anymore.

This is a significant change in journalism transformed by the process of digitalisation. Journalists are now able to report international news stories through information they find on other news media.
platforms and through social media (New Journalism Report, 2014; Sambrook, 2010). Additionally, the process of globalisation has blurred the boundaries between national news and international news (Franks, 2006: 100). Franks argues that proper foreign coverage is vital, because national security depends on well-explained and informed foreign news coverage. Thus, it is increasingly important for editors to possess the skills previously attributed to foreign correspondents.

The process of globalisation and its entanglements with technology and diversification, which are outlined in the next section, have changed the roles of all journalists. In studies on journalists who are not foreign correspondents, the “global” has mainly received theoretical consideration (see, for instance, Reese, 2010; Berglez, 2008). This study argues that all journalists need to be studied within global, rather than only national frames. It analyses whether the skills that are expected of the editors of publications, previously defined in purely national terms, increasingly include those previously identified only with foreign correspondents.

2.4. Cosmopolitan skills defined

First of all, it is important to flesh out the difference between cosmopolitanism (as a set of theories), cosmopolitanisation (a contemporary societal process) and the cosmopolitan (identity). Cosmopolitanism is a set of theories and ideas. In the 18th century, Immanuel Kant (1795) declared cosmopolitanism a moral imperative for perpetual peace. The core idea of cosmopolitanism is that it respects diversity (Beck, 2006: 56; Calhoun, 2002: 873). It grasps the “multiplicity of ways in which the social world is constructed” (Delanty, 2006: 27). In the past two decades, cosmopolitanism has received renewed interest in the academic world. Cosmopolitanism has come to stand for a moral stance of global solidarity in media research (see, for instance, Chouliaraki, 2006; 2008), and a political paradigm for forms of global governance (see, for instance, Held, 2010; Ong 1999). In order to conceptualise the notion of cosmopolitan skills, this study focuses on the cultural understanding of cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2006; Hannerz, 1990; 2004) because this underlies the political and moral strands of cosmopolitanism. Beck argues that cosmopolitanism is perhaps best understood by what it “seeks to avoid at all costs, namely, fascist conformism” (2006: 59). Thus, the concept of cosmopolitanism is best understood as the idea of world citizenship applied to individuals through the appreciation of difference.

The concept of cosmopolitanisation is the latest advance in the analysis of the process of globalisation. The concept of cosmopolitanisation describes a contemporary societal process, which
is viewed as an “internal globalisation” (Beck, 2002: 17). Beck reinvigorated the ancient idea of cosmopolitanism by defining the current societal process of cosmopolitanisation as “a non-linear, dialectical process in which the universal and the particular, the similar and the dissimilar, the global and the local are to be conceived, not as cultural polarities, but as interconnected and reciprocally interpenetrating principles” (2006: 72-73). Martha Nussbaum has characterised cosmopolitanism as a “lonely business” (1996: 15) which stands in binary opposition to nationalism. In contrast, Beck and Sznaider (2006: 14) have argued that, rather than following the logic of “either/or”, the concept of cosmopolitanisation follows the logic of “both/and”. While the process of cultural exchange is not a new one, what is new is “an awareness of it, its self-conscious political affirmation, its reflection and recognition before a global public via the mass media, in the news and in the global social movements of blacks, women and minorities.” (Beck interviewed by Rantanen, 2005b: 252) The work of Beck (2002; 2003; 2006; also Beck and Sznaider, 2006; Beck and Grande, 2007) has been seminal to the formulation of contemporary theories of cosmopolitanisation, but it remains primarily theoretical. However, any culturally valid prediction or explanation of social change must draw on empirical evidence (Kunelius and Ruusunoksa, 2008: 663). This is why this study has conceptualised four cosmopolitan skills which are analysed empirically.

The idea of being a cosmopolitan, a “citizen of the world”, is an ancient one. When asked where he came from, Diogenes of Sinope, in the fourth century BCE, is said to have responded “I am a citizen of the world”. Dictionary.com defines a “cosmopolitan” (noun) as “a person who is free from local, provincial, or national bias or attachment; citizen of the world; cosmopolite.” In darker times of history, the term “rootless cosmopolitan” was used as an insult aimed at Jews as part of a broader anti-Semitic campaign led by Stalin during the Soviet Union. More recently, this idea has been both invigorated and criticised by social scientists from various disciplines. The cosmopolitan identity has been criticised for having a gendered history, whereby the cosmopolitan was seen as an homme du monde in contrast to the mujer en la casa (Tomlinson, 1999: 187). It has also been described as a Western-centric idea, held among academics with “visa-friendly passports and credit cards” (Calhoun, 2002: 872). As Calhoun has pointed out “most of the [9/11] terrorists were Arabs who had spent considerable time studying in the West—even at seemingly cosmopolitan Oxford, in the case of Osama bin Laden. A dark side to globalisation was brought to light.” (2002: 871). Due to such criticisms, among others, the cosmopolitan identity has fallen from grace as a category for research.

---

2 The Stanford Encyclopaedia entry for “cosmopolitanism”: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cosmopolitanism/

In response, scholars have come up with more nuanced concepts, including the “cosmopolitan outlook”, which Beck (2006: 7) defined as on consisting of five principles: (1) awareness of interdependence; (2) recognition of differences in culture and identity; (3) a “perspective-taking” capacity; (4) rejection of both a completely borderless world and a world redrawn according to old boundaries; and (5) recognition of a “mélange,” whereby local, national ethnic, religious and cosmopolitan cultures and traditions intermingle. Hannerz, who has written about cosmopolitans and locals, has famously argued that the cosmopolitan has the “ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting” (1990: 293).

In this project, I use the concept of cosmopolitan skills, instead of the idea of being or becoming a cosmopolitan. So, instead of arguing that the “cosmopolitan” has certain abilities, I argue that people can acquire “cosmopolitan skills”. A skill is defined as “dexterity that is acquired or developed through training or experience.” By combining theories of Hannerz (1990; 2004) and Beck (2006; 2008), I have conceptualised four types of cosmopolitan skills: (1) mobility; (2) the ability to navigate various cultures; (3) the appreciation of difference in identities; and (4) an awareness of diverse perspectives. In the age of globalisation, it is vital for journalists to have these cosmopolitan skills. If journalists have not acquired such skills through experience, they need to be acquired through journalism education or training. In order to explain the complexity of the world, journalists need to be able to understand the ways in which different people, cultures and nations think and feel. Having cosmopolitan skills professionally or otherwise does, however, not make a person a cosmopolitan. I analyse cosmopolitan skills in this study, but whenever I refer to previous studies that have used “cosmopolitanism” or “cosmopolitanisation” in their argument, I am going to use these terms accordingly.

I am going to analyse cosmopolitan skills in relation to the concepts of identity, autonomy and global cultural flows, which have previously been applied to journalists and society, in order to find out whether these concepts work with or against cosmopolitan skills. Analysing these four skills will help to answer the following research sub-questions: (1) To what extent, if any, do journalists have and make use of their cosmopolitan skills and how do these relate to their identities? (2) To what extent, if any, do journalists have autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills? (3) What limitations, if any, do journalists face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the global age?

An interdisciplinary approach to these questions is needed, because the globalisation of journalism occurs through a multitude of processes, actors and places. Reese (2008: 251) argues that researchers need to be creative in identifying case-study sites, concepts, empirical strategies, and relationships appropriate to the global era. He writes with regard to the new global journalists:

The question then becomes: How do they communicate global issues in local settings? How do they interact with other professionals, through what coordinating global and local associations? What are the routinized structures for their interaction within and across specific locations, and how do they adapt to local circumstances? Journalism professionals and media officials are clearly among the globalizing elites who represent an important source of influence and social change. These transnational elites participate in global networks connecting local settings, bypassing official state channels, and introducing their own logic into national spaces, including with local journalistic cultures and media systems. (Reese, 2010: 349)

Reese’s work requires empirical support, but nevertheless, it provides valuable insights for this study. Firstly, he argues that journalism as a social process must navigate between its vertical orientation, aligned with a nation-state, and a horizontal perspective which is a global outlook characterised by cosmopolitan qualities transcending narrow national frameworks (2008: 243). Further, he suggests that we need to ask what “cosmopolitan values” are called upon in order for the mission of journalism to serve non-national and non-local audiences. And finally, he acknowledged that, while it is important to analyse worldwide connections, it is difficult to locate and study those groups, because they are by definition dispersed (Reese, 2008: 251). Thus, editors’ mobility is a crucial concept to be analysed in the empirical chapters of this study.

2.4.1. Navigating different cultures

The cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures includes language skills, knowledge drawn from diverse sources and an understanding of stereotypes and the ability to transcend them. Stereotypes are defined as cognitive structures that contain knowledge, beliefs and expectations about social groups (Van den Bos and Stapel, 2009: 101). The nature of a foreign correspondent’s work depends on their skill in navigating difference. As Hannerz writes, “often in foreign news, features stories can be news of difference, of people thinking, acting, or living in some unfamiliar way” (2004: 32). Chouliaraki writes that the media “can make us imagine the world beyond our own community as a terrain where our actions can make a difference” (2008: 5). Together with Orgad, Chouliaraki coins the notion of the “cosmopolitan imagination”, which is defined as a moral imagination that is based on the notions of empathy, value pluralism, reflexivity and dialogue (2011:...
When foreign correspondents report about far-away locations, there are different ways in which they can report the news. The tendencies of foreign coverage may vary and contradict one another at times, but Hannerz argues that “one can still discern here and there a kind of cosmopolitan turn, an actual desire to make the vicarious experience of the world through the media a richer, more varied one” (2004: 36). There may still be instances, however, where foreign correspondents interact with one another, or with official sources, more than they interact with the local societies.

Developing cosmopolitan skills can be defined as the experience of and willingness to navigate a variety of cultures. As Hannerz puts it, a cosmopolitan has “a personal ability to make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting” (1990: 293). Further, Hannerz conceptualises a “built-up skill in manoeuvring more or less expertly with a particular system of meanings and meaningful forms”; this skill of manoeuvring or navigating within particular systems of meanings are investigated in this study. It involves dealing with cultural clichés, perspective-taking and creating dialogue with groups beyond one’s own reference group.

A person’s mobility and social background can enable him or her to possess cosmopolitan skills. Mobility and the cultural knowledge are core to the framework for empirical analysis proposed by Rantanen (2005a: 124) whereby individuals can attain cosmopolitan qualities through (1) media and communications; (2) by learning another language; (3) living or working abroad or having a family member living abroad; (4) living with a person from another culture; (5) and engaging with foreigners in your locality or across a frontier. Knowledge of various cultures then enables interactions with people from other cultures. In his study of the relationship between multilingualism and cosmopolitanism Gunesch found that, while language skills do not guarantee an open-minded cosmopolitan stance, they surely greatly favour this. He writes “arguably there are limits to an individual’s cosmopolitan development if he or she does not have a set of foreign languages to start with” (2003: 227). Journalists who understand more than one language are able to read international sources and interview people in various languages, even if they are not foreign correspondents but based in a single location.

The skill of navigating cultures includes an understanding of multiple cultures, which requires ways of accessing these cultures. Vertovec and Cohen (2002: 14) write that “like being multilingual, individuals themselves can be multicultural, or develop a personal repertoire that provides them with a multiple cultural competence.” This cultural competence takes language skills as a starting
point and entails knowledge of cultural practices and norms, which may result from experiences of mobility or be the result of possessing cosmopolitan skills. Vertovec and Cohen add that the “opportunities for such exposure, learning and practice – even if initially only by way of a coarse consumerism – present themselves today as never before” (2002: 14). However, these opportunities for exposure do not necessarily translate into the development of cosmopolitan skills. Consumption alone does not suffice to bring about cosmopolitan skills, but it may be a starting point.

2.4.2. Mobility

Mobility has been conceptualised as a central feature of cosmopolitanisation because it has the ability to increase the awareness and understanding of the world as a whole. Over the last two decades, patterns of population mobility have changed drastically. International tourist arrivals increased from 565 million in 1995 to 1 billion in 2010 and are expected to rise to 1.6 billion tourists worldwide by 2020 (World Tourism Organisation, 2013). By any measure, this is a world where mobility “if not an everyday commonplace for the entire population, is an increasingly familiar experience for large numbers of people” (Sparks, 2007b: 134). Many scholars have argued that travelling to and living in different countries is one of the trajectories towards becoming cosmopolitanised (see, for instance, Hannerz, 1990; Szerszynski and Urry, 2006; Germann Molz, 2006; Nowicka and Rovisco, 2011). According to Szerszynski and Urry, cosmopolitans are characterised by their mobility, which expands their awareness of the world and their capacity to compare different places, their curiosity about and capacity for interpretation of different cultures (2006: 113-115).

Mobility is an important factor that may or may not inform the awareness and understanding of the world among journalists. It may not increase awareness and understanding of the world if the mobile person chooses to remain within an enclosed or diasporic circle without interacting much with the societies they enter (Hiebert, 2002: 214), in which case mobility can lead to transnationalism or nationalism. Transnationalism can be defined in terms of the interactions and various “linkages between people, places and institutions crossing nation-state borders and spanning the world” (Vertovec, 2009: 1). These points of connection and interaction add an additional layer to the national level. When it comes to foreign correspondents, mobility has always been required from them and is considered an essential feature of their work. However, mobility and globalisation can also serve to reinforce traditional kinds of social, local and national bonds and
result in a return to one’s roots, which is characterised by the figure of the “homecomer” (Bude and Dürrschmidt, 2010: 481).

So far, mobility has been viewed as a central cosmopolitan skill, because travel can lead to an awareness and openness to the world as a whole. Cosmopolitan skills are often seen in terms of an ability to feel at home in the world. Being at home in the world, being a world citizen, is often encapsulated in the notion of “world-openness” (Vertovec, 2006: 288), which tends to be viewed as a result of mobility. But, in the age of globalisation, professionals who do not travel can also develop cosmopolitan skills. Indeed, some scholars have even questioned whether digitalisation and social media have made foreign correspondents redundant (Sambrook, 2010). Through the media, old and new, people are exposed to other cultures without having to physically cross borders or travel (Rantanen, 2005a: 125). For Hannerz, the cosmopolitan travels widely and is aware of events worldwide, not only those near at hand (2004: 20). But a person can travel without developing cosmopolitan skills and be aware of events worldwide without travelling thanks to the media, and also thanks to the process of diversification through immigration. The question is whether mobility still matters for journalists and how, if at all, it changes their relationship to their work.

It would be hasty, however, to assume that mobility automatically entails a greater awareness and appreciation of difference among journalists. Some scholars have objected to the linear causation between mobility and becoming cosmopolitanised (Roudomentof, 2005). Roudomentof argues that “the degree to which cosmopolitanism is related to the presence or absence of transnational experience is a relationship that can be (and should be) considered an open-ended question” (2005: 121). Experiences of mobility do not guarantee an interest in or understanding of, let alone an appreciation of, foreign cultures. Hannerz argues that mobility “may extend to involve more than just information, it might also involve sentiments and commitments” (Hannerz, 2004: 20), but it may also result in the opposite – fear, rejection of difference and navel-gazing. Beck has also conceded that “the fundamental fact that the experiential space of the individual no longer coincides with national space, but is being subtly altered by the opening to cosmopolitanisation, should not deceive anyone into believing that we are all going to become cosmopolitans” (2002: 29). To think otherwise would be a cosmopolitan fallacy (Beck, 2002: 29). Likewise Sassen warns: “Having studied global finance, it becomes clear that there is no equation between the global and the cosmopolitan – global financial traders are global but that does not make them cosmopolitan traders – though they may develop cosmopolitan tastes for food and cultures.” (2009a: 116) Therefore, a close reading of what is said during interviews is needed in order to extrapolate these issues and questions.
2.4.3. The appreciation of difference in identities

The third cosmopolitan skill is the skill of appreciating differences in identities and cultures. Beck (2006: 7) has defined the “principle of recognition of cosmopolitan differences” as a fundamental part of the “cosmopolitan outlook” He argues that this principle is characterised by a “(limited) curiosity concerning differences of culture and identity” (2006: 7). Curiosity is good, so long as it does not become an obsessive or oppressive attitude towards the Other. As Silverstone (2007: 11-12) argues “the new cosmopolitan is assumed to be free from the trying and oppressive loyalties of the singular community. In the ideal world such a figure is mobile, flexible, open to difference and differences”. Beck’s principle of recognition is intertwined with the notion of tolerance (2006: 166). Tolerance is defined as a “permissive attitude toward those whose opinions, beliefs, practices, racial or ethnic origins, etc., differ from one’s own.” However, tolerance is limited by what Beck describes as “cosmopolitan common sense” (2006: 49) which is a mutual agreement based on the acceptance of basic human rights. Therefore, the cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference is not a relativist attitude to except cultural difference regardless of its content.

Beck’s principle of recognition (2006: 7) and Silverstone’s idea of being flexible and open to difference (2007: 12) are here combined to form the skill of appreciating difference of identities, as well as cultures. This appreciation of difference can be further explained by means of the distinction drawn by Hollinger, who writes that we can “distinguish a universalist will to find common ground from a cosmopolitan will to engage human diversity” (2000: 84). The appreciation of different modes of thought and forms of life is an integral part of cosmopolitanisation. This includes the appreciation of various social identities that are different from one’s own.

Social identity is created and sustained through an individual understanding of oneself as well as through social interaction with others (Gioia, 1998: 19). Tajfel’s definition of social identity as “the individual’s knowledge that he [sic] belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of his group membership” (1972: 292) is useful for analysing in-group and inter-group behaviour. However, Beck explicitly defines identity in the age of cosmopolitanisation as going beyond traditional group identification towards an individualized form of identity. According to Beck (2006: 5), one constructs a model of one’s identity “by dipping freely

---

into the Lego set of globally available identities and building a progressively inclusive self-image”. The social identities of journalists matter in an analysis of their appreciation of difference. Journalists’ experiences and identities influence their news judgments, choice of sources and choice of words (see, for instance, Mahtani, 2005: 300; Newkirk, 2000: 10). This is why the social identities of journalists and their stance towards other social identities need to be investigated.

Journalists’ awareness and appreciation of various social identities influence their news judgments, choice of sources and choice of words. Assuming that journalists’ own identities and their awareness of others do not matter is dangerous on two accounts. Firstly, it neglects an important influence in the news-making process, and secondly, it does not encourage journalists to take a reflexive approach to their own role. A CBS news manager once said: “Our reporters don’t cover stories from their point of view. They are presenting them from nobody’s point of view” (quoted in Mahtani, 2005: 300). But such a statement reveals the fallacy upon which journalism has been based. Mahtani argues: “News stories do not emerge from nowhere. Assuming otherwise alleviates journalists’ responsibility from considering self-reflexive approaches to journalism as well as assuming that journalists’ personal and professional geographies and experiences never mix.” (2005: 300-301). Therefore, journalists’ identity not only informs the ways in which journalists deliberate when they portray the world, but is the starting point of their deliberations.

Processes of globalisation and digitalisation have brought media producers and consumers of various identities to the global digital stage. As a result journalists feel that they are sharing their autonomy in part with their audiences, through online interactivity and multimedia forms (Deuze, 2005a: 456-7; Anderson, 2011: 555). As Boczkowski (2004: 197) found, the ways in which journalists view their audiences shape the way they use technological tools at work. Thus globalisation and digitalisation have brought journalists and their audiences into unprecedented contact. The affordances of the communication between journalists and their audiences, as well as their relationship, have changed as a result. This may or may not increase their awareness of one another’s social identities.

2.4.4. Diverse audience awareness

News stories are now read beyond the confines of any single nation and shared on social media. New media technologies have created new networks and communities at a global level (Castells, 2007 and 2009). The current transformations have been described as the rise of networked journalism (Beckett, 2010; Heinrich, 2012) or the rise of participatory journalism (Singer et al., 2011).
In the context of this new kind of networked journalism, the idea that stories can be contained by nation-states and interpreted through a “national container” (Beck, 2005: 42) is problematic. Instead, journalism is undergoing rapid and dramatic structural changes that affect and will keep affecting its professional practice, as a product and as a profession, as well as the role of audiences (Spyridou et al., 2003).

Giddens created the concept of time-space distanciation (1984: 377) to characterise current processes of globalisation. Time-space distanciation is a process which has lifted out or disembedded social relations from local contexts (1991: 18). In the global age, the level of distanciation is “so extensive, that for the first time in human history, ‘self’ and ‘society’ are interrelated in a global milieu”, writes Giddens (1991: 32). Through media and communications, a variety of identities and societies meet on the global stage. Foreign correspondents, especially freelancers, have traditionally served a variety of publications and audiences. Hannerz interviewed foreign correspondents who served a variety of publications and audiences:

> When it was possible in terms of audience interest, and when his different customers were obviously not in the same market and in competition with one another, he would sell basically the same story to more than one of the publications, a practice that was entirely accepted in the freelance business; at times this might mean that the Calcuttans and the Jewish-Americans, continents apart, would unknowingly share reading matter. (Hannerz, 2004: 75-6)

This quote exemplifies how a foreign correspondent serves a variety of publications and audiences. While he or she might have found various angles to sell his or her story, it was essentially the same story that was read by readers from different locations around the world. Studies have shown that more people in the US read the Guardian than read the LA Times and more than half of the visitors on the BBC News website live outside the UK (Sambrook, 2010: 8) The New York Times receives 30 per cent of its readers from outside the US, compared to 60-70 per cent for The China Times and 90 per cent for the The Jerusalem Post (Thurman, 2007: 6).

Foreign correspondents had to strike a balance between a fresh perspective and local knowledge. While foreign correspondents needed to look for fresh story angles and narratives, “it helps not to lose touch with the audience at home, to retain a sense of its interests, experiences and assumptions”, writes Hannerz (2004: 85). He adds that this may be a difficult balance to strike even when one has a clear sense of what “at home” is. Even if a journalist writes for just one publication, he or she writes for a varied audience and needs to consider what it means to write for audiences in different locations. This balance has become more problematic through globalisation and the fact
that the audience can be anywhere and audiences can compare stories across platforms and national borders.

Prior to more recent processes of globalisation, digitalisation and diversification, journalism research revealed that journalists knew very little about the individuals they were writing for. In his influential work *Deciding What’s News* (1979), Gans showed how journalists knew little about their audience and rejected feedback from it. Similarly, Schlesinger suggested that there was no adequate point of contact between BBC journalists and their audience (1978: 106). Journalists tended to make news judgements based on an internalised image of their audience (Quinn and Trench, 2002: 5). Thus, journalists have traditionally been relatively unaware of their actual audiences.

However, in recent years journalists seem to have become more reflective concerning the characteristics and needs of their audiences. “In the past, newspapers basically gave readers what the newspaper decided was the news, in the way the newspaper decides they should have it. There was no consumer choice. You either took the paper or you didn’t”, explains Gillian Tett, US Managing Editor of the *Financial Times*. “What is changing is people are actually saying: Okay, how are consumers, our readers, actually consuming the news?” (Ellis and Tett, 2014). Thus, technological change may explain why journalists have become more reflective concerning the characteristics and needs of their audiences.

The experience of being a journalist has changed in a variety of ways that need to be investigated. The societal processes of globalisation, digitalisation and diversification pose new challenges to the professional identity and practices of journalists. Globalisation, entangled with technological change, has a significant effect on both media professionals and audiences, which may or may not involve a new link between journalists and their audiences. Journalism has been undergoing a slow process of diversification, and possibly, feminization. However, research still needs to investigate whether these processes entail a qualitative change. Applying the concept of cosmopolitan skills to journalism research results in an investigation of four areas: mobility, the skills needed to make sense of diversity, appreciation of difference and an awareness of diverse audiences. The changing circumstances in which journalism is performed need to be analysed in relation to these four features in order to understand its current state of transition.
2.5. Conclusion: The changing experience of journalism

Processes of globalisation, digitalisation and diversification pose new challenges to journalism as we know it. News stories are now freely available online and audiences can access news from all over the world. Meanwhile advertisers increasingly move to the online space and print publications’ circulations decrease. These changes require new business models for publications and new ways of performing journalism. Editors have the highest degree of autonomy in the process of deciding what news is. Journalists can no longer be viewed as mere news-gatherers. Further, journalistic publications need to move beyond information provision and fast news, to include slow, interpretative and analytical perspectives of news stories. Otherwise they cannot compete with the plethora of materials freely available online. The journalist’s role as an interpreter is becoming more and more pronounced and thus journalism research needs to complement earlier studies of fast news publications with recent studies of slow news publications in the age of globalisation.

This study proposes to analyse the process of embedding the “global” in journalistic practices and awareness. This chapter has shown that, when scholars write about global media or global journalism, it is not clear what they mean by “global”. Instead of looking for the “global” as a separate entity, such as global content, this study asks whether processes of globalisation have already changed the ways in which journalists work. It is no longer sufficient to analyse the work of journalists on a country-by-country basis. Instead, we need to observe how globalisation affects journalists in different locations and how they themselves contribute to it. This study explores the new sets of skills that journalists need in the age of globalisation, by combining Beck and Hannerz’s work. Due to the “global” influence in the changing circumstances of journalism, this study proposes to combine Beck’s theory of cosmopolitanisation (2006 and 2008) with Hannerz’s study of foreign correspondents (1990 and 2004) to conceptualise and empirically analyse cosmopolitan skills.

Four features of cosmopolitan skills are studied in relation to leading editors in two leading global media cities, London and New York. Firstly, I study the ways in which mobility has become a feature of the world of journalism. Secondly, I study whether editors have developed the skills of navigating different cultures and diversity and if so how they use them. Thirdly, cosmopolitan skills entail an appreciative stance towards diversity of culture and social identity and I study whether the editors I interviewed have developed these skills. Fourthly, the awareness of global audiences may or may not have increased among editors. These four features of the individual’s cosmopolitan skills have thus far been attributed to foreign correspondents, and are intertwined with the process of globalisation.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The previous chapter considered the limitations of journalism research in light of on-going fundamental changes in the profession. Core to these changes is the role of globalisation, and in particular, cosmopolitan theory and transformations driven by the interaction between changing requirements, expectations, audiences and technologies with which journalist work. Of clear relevance to understanding the more global dimension is research on foreign correspondents, where four features have been attributed to this group: mobility, the skill of navigating various cultures, the appreciation of difference and an awareness of diverse audiences. This thesis explores the transformation of journalism in a global age through investigating whether these cosmopolitan attributes can now be found amongst journalists. Thus the main research question of this study is: “How do leading journalists perceive themselves, their work and their world in the age of globalisation?”

This research question was investigated through a qualitative research study utilising expert interviews. For this purpose, concepts of identity and concepts of journalistic autonomy were used to analyse whether the four features that have previously been attributed to the work of foreign correspondents now apply to all journalists. The four features tie into theories of cosmopolitanisation because analysing the awareness of, existence of and resistance to these features will help to pinpoint the limitations of cosmopolitan theory. This chapter presents how the study was designed from the identification of the most appropriate method, through to how the study was conducted and the issues that arose from this choice.

The first section contextualises the study by discussing the methods available and evaluates the ways in which journalists have been studied in the past. It draws lessons from studies that have used surveys, ethnography and interviews to study journalists. Then, it provides a justification for the chosen method, semi-structured in-depth expert interviews, and it explains the limitations of this method and how they have been overcome. The second section elaborates on the choice of participants. The third section explains how materials were collected, and consequently analysed. The fourth section discusses ethical considerations. The literature on expert interviewing is discussed and considerations and issues that arise from expert interviewing are developed, including issues of access and rapport, as well as power relations in the interviewing situation. Ethical considerations, such as informed consent are discussed. Issues of reflexivity such as the researcher’s position as both an insider and an outsider are explained in detail. Overall, this chapter places my study within
other studies that have previously been conducted on journalists and explains the choices that were made with regards to methodology.

3.1. Choice of method

There are numerous ways in which journalists have been studied in the fields of media studies, anthropology, sociology and political communication. Many studies have used (1) surveys (see Lichter and Rothman, 1986; Rosten, 1937; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986; and more recently van Dalen et al., 2011) to assess journalists backgrounds and attitudes to specific issues. (2) Ethnography (see, for example, Erjavec and Kovacic, 2010, Gans, 1979; Golding and Elliott, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978; Tuchman, 1978) was used to observe practices in newsrooms. (3) Interviews (see, for example, Blaagaard, 2013; Deuze, 2005 and 2007; Hanusch and Hanitzsch, 2013; Huey, Nisenholtz and Sagan, 2013; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2012; Kim, 2012; Kunelius and Ruusunoksa, 2008; Meadows et al, 2009; Willis, 2010) have been used to assess journalists views, practices and perceptions of themselves and their work. Many studies on journalists have also implemented a combination of research methodologies (see, for example, Hannerz, 2004; Hess, 1981). The following section provides examples of seminal journalism studies and their results, which have implemented surveys, ethnographies and interviews. It shows why interviews are the most appropriate method to answer the research question of this study.

3.1.1. How journalists have been studied before: Methodological lessons

Surveys

Surveys have been conducted to assess journalists’ backgrounds and attitudes to specific issues (see Chan and Lee, 2011; Granado, 2011; Hanitzsch and Hanusch, 2012; Kedellas et al., 2014; Van Dalen et al. 2011). An early study which used surveys to research journalists and influenced subsequent studies is Rosten’s study of Washington correspondents (1937). Rosten found that the majority of reporters found that “it is almost impossible to be objective” (137: 351) and that they are driven to slant their stories. Weaver conducted a series of large-scale studies on the demographics, education, socialisation, professional attitudes and working conditions of the “American journalist” (Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986 and 1996) as well as cross-national studies on the “Global Journalist” (Weaver and Willnat, 2012). Hess (1981: 2-5) used a combination of surveys and interviews to explore the main reasons for disagreement among reporters and editors and found that issues of autonomy are one of the main reasons. More recently, Plaisance et al. (2012: 646) used surveys to explore the ethical
orientations of journalists in 18 countries. Their findings concluded that journalists’ ethical outlooks are related to a larger structural system and influenced by a hierarchy of ideological, cultural and societal influences. Hanitzsch and Mellado (2011: 404) conducted a large-scale study and found that political and economic factors are the largest denominators of cross-national differences in journalists’ perceptions of influences on their work. Surveys are useful for the purposes of quantitative analysis. The research question of this study, however, requires a qualitative inquiry.

One of the key strengths of the survey methodology is that the information collected can be representative and is suitable for statistical analysis. Empirical data can be used to support, test or negate hypotheses or questions or it can provide information on patterns of behaviour and on whether they are changing (Negrine and Newbold, 1998: 225). Among the weaknesses of the methodology is that surveys do not reveal the different underlying motivations of interviewees or their interpretations of processes. Further, surveys are said to “assume a static system in equilibrium, and they encourage the interpretation of a statistical association between two variables as evidence of a causal relationship from one variable to another” (Williams et al. 1988: 35), which means that they can oversimplify complex relationships for the sake of establishing direct causal relationships between variables. If one is interested in finding out how people make sense of their world, in-depth interviews would be of greater use (Negrine and Newbold, 1998:233). This study is concerned with personal attitudes and views. Surveys, however, do not unearth the personal attitudes and experiences of interviewees. Thus, surveys are not an appropriate method to address the research question of how editors perceive themselves, the world and their work in the age of globalisation. This is why surveys were rejected as a methodology for this study.

**Ethnography**

In contrast to surveys, ethnography provides a qualitative lens through which actual practices are observed and captured. Ethnography has its origins in anthropology, where researchers immerse themselves in a setting in order to obtain “thick” descriptions (Geertz, 1973: 17). As a qualitative research method, it gives anthropologists the chance to conduct “social and cultural analysis in a particular setting, based on extensive first-hand research” (Alasuutari, 2003: 331). The researcher finds himself in an alienated position, he or she observes from a distance, with the “unmethodological” opening question “What the hell is going on here?” (Lüders, 2004: 225). While ethnography evokes the picture of traditionally being conducted in remote rural communities, it is nowadays increasingly used to study urban and postmodern phenomena (Alasuutari, 2003: 331). In the 70s and 80s, a variety of journalism studies research was conducted with by means of
ethnography (see, for example Epstein, 1973; Gans, 1979; Golding and Elliott, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978; Tuchman, 1973). However, most of these observational studies were substituted with interviews. While ethnography is useful for analysing dynamics and practices in newsrooms, this method does not help to answer issues of identity and autonomy from the editors’ individual viewpoints, which is the focus of this study.

Ethnography as a methodology is useful in to practices and how they are perceived (Lüders, 2004: 225) and the culture of a group (Patton, 2002: 81). In journalism studies ethnographies involve observing the daily work of journalists. Cottle (2000: 19) has suggested that the “first wave” of newsroom ethnographies (such as the studies of Epstein, 1973; Fishman, 1980; Gans, 1979; Golding and Elliott, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978; Soloski, 1989; Tuchman, 1973) explored the cultural milieu and professional domains of journalists. In their cross-national study on news values, Golding and Elliott concluded that the news production process is a “highly regulated and routine process of manufacturing a cultural product on an electronic production line” (1979: 119). In her seminal study, “Making news: a study in the construction of reality” (1978), Tuchman observed newsrooms to study why some issues and events are newsworthy while others are not. More recently, ethnographic studies have studies the consequences of online journalism on newsroom practice (see, for example, Domingo and Paterson, 2011; Tameling and Broersma, 2013). Tameling and Broersma found that, in contrast to theories of convergence, the Dutch newspaper *de Volkskrant* created separate newsrooms for print and online journalists, due to the lack of a solid business model in combination with cultural resistance in the newsroom. But the research question of this study is concerned with the personal views and experiences of editors, and these cannot be unearthed by simply observing what goes on in their newsroom.

The ethnographic method does not help to answer the research question of this study for the following reasons. Firstly, I study editors rather than newsrooms, and secondly, this study is concerned with ideas rather than working processes and practices. Patton argues “we cannot observe how people have organised the world and the meanings they attach to what goes on in the world. We have to ask people questions about those things.” (2002: 341) Hence, ideas, attitudes and experiences are better expressed through in-depth conversations rather than observation. These limitations are taken further by the fact that new technologies are increasingly present in newsrooms and offices. Journalists spend a lot of time writing emails or communicating via Twitter, hence their communication is less visible than it was when Golding and Elliott (1979) conducted their early studies on journalists. But this study is concerned with the minds of editors. Observing editors reveals their practices at work, but it does not reveal their thoughts and attitudes. It would not
suffice to observe editors at work to answer the research question and the issues of identity, autonomy and cosmopolitanisation that are integral to this study. Therefore, ethnography was rejected as a research methodology.

Interviews

While conversations are part of ethnographic methodologies, they do not provide the consistency and structure that interviews provide. Burgess’s term “conversations with a purpose” (1984: 102) captures the essence of the qualitative research interview very well. Interviews are interactional exchanges of dialogue (Mason, 2002: 62). They operate on the assumption that knowledge is situated and contextual. Thus, the task of the interview is to “ensure that the relevant contexts are brought into focus so that that situated knowledge can be produced” (Mason, 2002: 62). The aim is to “get inside the heads” of particular interviewees (Silverman, 2013: 201). Interviews may involve one-to-one interactions or group interviews. Interviews can be tightly structured, unstructured or semi-structured. This section provides an overview over the different types of interviews. If offers examples of previous studies and their findings, which have used interviews with journalists (such as Blaagaard, 2013; Deuze, 2005 and 2007; Hanusch and Hanitzsch, 2013; Huey, Kunelius and Ruusunoksa, 2008; Nisenholtz and Sagan, 2013; Willis, 2010). The following section explains why group interviews and unstructured interviews were not chosen for the purposes of this study, and concludes with providing a justification of the chosen method as the most appropriate method to address the research question.

Group interviews

One way of interviewing interviewees is in a group setting through group interviews, also called focus groups (see, for example, Blaagaard, 2013; Lynch and McGoldrick, 2012; Meadows et al, 2009). Blaagegard (2013: 1076) used group interviews to examine the relationship between citizen journalism and professional journalism. Lynch and McGoldrick (2012: 1041) gathered views on different types of television news through focus groups. However, Blaagegard’s focus groups consisted of journalism students and Lynch and McGoldrick’s study focused on audiences rather than media professionals. Group interviews are well suited to study the general opinions of audiences or the perceptions of big groups of people. This study, in contrast, focuses on the views of a select group of experts.

The aim of group interviews is to stimulate its participants to have a deliberative conversation, to compare and contrast experiences and to react and respond to what other interviewees in the group
say. Group interviews give an insight into group dynamics and how decisions are elaborated in a collective. This could be a very useful method if this study was to explore the structural implications or culture of media organisations. Group interviews could then shed light and allows us to access “the ways in which people arrive at social knowledge through interaction with their peers” (Green and Hart, 1999: 21). The ways in which media professionals influence each other and evaluate the work of each other could be explored, seeing as studies have found that journalists mainly receive feedback from each other (see Lichter and Rothman, 1986). But the research question of this study is concerned with the individual experiences and views of editors, and group interviews do provide the right setting to explore these questions.

Group interviews are inappropriate to answer the research question for four reasons: Firstly, focus groups produce collective interaction and are “not ideal for collecting individual-level information” (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 138) which is the focus of this research. While the group context is suitable for identifying “community norms and social-cultural behaviours” (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 138), it does not reveal personal beliefs and attitudes as in-depth interviews might do. Secondly, seeing as this research deals with sensitive topics concerning individual attitudes and beliefs, a high degree of confidentiality and trust must be ensured between the interviewer and interviewee, which could not be guaranteed in a group setting. Thirdly, it is very difficult to get access to leading journalists to begin with and it is neither likely nor productive (in terms of yielding more information) to have them interviewed in a group setting, but it would rather take away from the richness and depth one personal interview with an expert would yield. Fourthly, journalists might argue for the sake of self-representation or in order to influence or impress each other in a group setting compared to individual interviews. For all these reasons, group interviews do not help to respond to the research questions and they have thus been rejected as the methodology in this study.

Unstructured interviews

The unstructured interview or “informal conversational interview’ relies on “the spontaneous generation of questions in the natural flow of an interaction [...] persons being talked with may not even realize they are being interviewed” (Patton, 2002: 342). Scholars use unstructured interviews to explore the views and perceptions of interviewees. Doyle (2006: 451) conducted unstructured interviews with London-based financial journalists to explore their circumstances and constraints at work. Pintak and Ginges (2008: 197) conducted sixty unstructured interviews with Arab journalists to examine their views on U.S. policy. However, both studies substituted the unstructured interviews
with another methodology; structured interviews in the case of Doyle’s study and surveys in Pintak and Ginges’ study. The previous section has rejected ethnography as an appropriate method to address the research question, and unstructured interviews by themselves would not suffice, because this study has a specific conceptual framework that is analysed through the research question.

The advantage of unstructured interviews is that interviewees can freely talk about the research topic in “their own terms, their won vocabulary and frame of reference” (Deacon et al. 1999: 290). Hence, researchers use unstructured interviews to “understand the complex behaviour of members of society without imposing any a priori categorisation that may limit the field of inquiry” (Fontana and Frey, 2005: 706). This characteristic is the strength but also weakness of unstructured interviews. Structured interviews resemble surveys because they consist of a set of precisely worded questions “arranged with the intention of taking each interviewee through the same sequence and asking each interviewee the same questions with essentially the same words” (Patton, 2002: 342). However, seeing as fully structured interviews are scripted, they face the same disadvantages as surveys. Unstructured interviews do not allow for in-depth responses, flexibility and probing. Unstructured interviews are best suited for exploratory or preliminary studies (see, for example, Doyle, 2006; Pintak and Ginges, 2008). For a systematic and thematic inquiry, however, unstructured interviews do not provide the necessary boundaries and constraints. The research question in this study requires boundaries and constraints that are not given in an unstructured interviewing approach.

Early ethnographic studies have traditionally been supplemented with unstructured interviews (see, for example, Malinowski, 1932; Mead, 1930). It has previously been mentioned that ethnographers conduct studies by observing participants in a specific setting. Once they have observed a behaviour, process, practice, ritual or tradition, ethnographers go on to select key informants for their study. These key informants can provide information and explanations on the processes or practices that have previously been observed (DiCicco-Bloom and Crabtree, 2006: 315). Thus, the interviewer can elicit information about the meaning of some observed behaviour or interaction to learn about the setting or group under investigation. While unstructured interviews are useful to gain insights on practices that can openly be observed, this study is concerned with inner thought processes. Thought processes cannot be observed but need to be excavated and extrapolated through purposeful conversations. This study focuses on concepts of identity, journalistic autonomy and cosmopolitan skills. Therefore it is confined to a selection of topics. Unstructured interviews do not have the necessary structure to capture editors’ views and experiences in relation to the research
question of this study. This is why unstructured interviews have been rejected as a methodology for this study.

3.1.2. Chosen method and its limitations: Semi-structured interviews

Finally, semi-structured interviews were chosen over the unstructured interviews of an ethnographic approach, because they provide consistency and structure. They give access to the stated experiences and beliefs others wish to share within a particular interactional context. There are numerous accounts on semi-structured interviews (see, for example Birch and Miller, 2000; Deacon et al. 1999; Fontana and Frey, 2005; Flick, 2009; Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011; Kvale, 1996; Mason, 2002; Patton, 2002; Targum, 2011; Weiss, 1994). Semi-structured interviews involve gathering information and facts (Targum, 2011: 40), eliciting stories (Birch and Miller, 2000: 192) and learning about interviewees’ experiences, relationships and emotions (Weiss, 1994: 1). Therefore, semi-structured interviews are often described as “conversations with a purpose” (Burgess, 1984: 102; Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 109; Mason, 2002: 62-63). The purpose of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the views and experiences of editors in London and New York and to examine the way they imagine themselves, their work and their world. Thus, semi-structured interviews are highly appropriate for this study.

Researchers have previously used semi-structured in-depth interviews to interview journalists on various aspects of their identity and work practices (see, for example, Agarwal and Barthel, 2015; Harries and Wahl-Jorgensen, 2007; Örnebring, 2013; Sherwood and Nicholson, 2013; Voltmer and Wasserman, 2014; Wallace, 2013). Harries and Wahl-Jorgensen used semi-structured in-depth interviews to examine the self-image of arts journalists in the UK and found that while arts journalists see themselves as part of the larger category of journalists, they also lay claim to an arts exceptionalism (2007: 612). Agarwal and Barthel used semi-structured in-depth interviews to investigate the professional identities of online journalists and found that they are creating new norms, emphasising transparency, individualism and risk taking (2015: 376). Örnebring used the same methodology to explore how journalists perceive their work compared to the work of citizen journalists and found that journalists differentiate themselves from amateurs by way of expertise and duty (2013: 135). These are some examples of how scholars have captured the ways in which journalists characterise their experiences and views.
Semi-structured interviews are conducted on the basis of “a loose structure consisting of open ended questions that define the area to be explored, at least initially, from which the interviewer or interviewee may diverge in order to pursue an idea in more detail” (Britten, 1995: 251). Semi-structured interviews therefore provide a framework which allows for flexibility. A successful in-depth interview involves the following four steps according to Hennink, Hutter and Bailey (2011: 109):

1. Using a *semi-structured interview guide* to prompt the data collection;
2. Establishing *rapport* (a trust relationship) between the interviewer and interviewee;
3. Asking questions in an *open, empathic way*;
4. *Motivating* the interviewee to tell their story by *probing*.

Semi-structured in-depth interviews are an appropriate methodology for the research question of this study for the following four key reasons: Firstly, they are appropriate because the semi-structured interviewing approach involves an interview guide (see Appendix 1). The guide outlines “a set of issues that are to be explored with each interviewee before interviewing begins” (Patton, 2002: 342). In this study, the guide covers the key topics identity, autonomy and cosmopolitan skills. These broader topics include trajectories on editors’ personal, educational and professional background, their mobility and experiences of various cultures, their perceptions of the journalistic role and its transformations, as well as their perceived freedom and boundaries of journalistic work. An interview guide helps to ground the study in theory, without restricting it to a limited amount of questions.

Secondly, the premise that semi-structured interviews are based on an interview guide, allows for flexibility and depth, while simultaneously capturing “precise data of a codable nature so as to explain behaviour within pre-established categories” (Fontana and Frey, 2005: 706). This allows the researcher to capture interviewees’ perspectives in detail and at the same time it provides materials which are suitable for comparison. Comparing the responses and emergent topics of interviewees allows for a rich and in-depth qualitative analysis. However, outlying responses or themes can also inform the analysis, because interviews are not restricted to a limited amount of questions or topics.

Thirdly, qualitative interviews enable the researcher to “get inside the heads” of interviewees and to explore issues from their “point of view” (Silverman, 2013: 201). By asking questions in an open and empathetic way, the researcher gains insights beyond processes and procedures, into interviewees’
observations, experiences and views. Further, unlike group interviews semi-structured interviews are suitable for questions concerning attitudes and beliefs (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 131). In addition to providing an open-ended yet systematic inquiry, semi-structured interviews are useful to obtain in-depth information, which makes them highly suitable for this study.

Fourthly, semi-structured interviews allow the interviewer to probe and clarify ambiguities. Useful short prompting questions include “Why is that?”, “Can you explain?”, “Tell me more” and “How come?” (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 129). Interviewers have to “think on their feet” and react to interviewees in a way that is quick, effective, coherent and consistent with the research questions (Mason, 2002: 67). Probing strategies include reflecting on remarks made by the interviewee and probing ideas expressed earlier in the interview (Britten, 1995: 253). By probing and motivating interviewees to elaborate on issues, ambiguities can be clarified and a greater depth of information can be obtained. This aspect is a huge advantage, because the analysis of views and experiences in the complex topics of identity, autonomy and cosmopolitan skills, requires opportunities for clarification and the request for more detail.

Further, Gubrium and Holstein have argued that the interviewer and interviewee participate in the “joint construction of meaning” during interviews (2002: 17). To research interviewees’ experiences and understandings of their identity and work, those articulations need to be understood as “constructed and reconstructed” during interviews (Mason, 2002: 64). Further, the interview depends on interviewees’ abilities to verbalise, interact, remember and conceptualise events and experiences. Mason warns that it is important not to treat information generated through interviews, as if it directly reflects understandings “already existing” outside of the interview” (2002: 64). Rather than being excavated facts, information gained through interviews was viewed as constructed. This characteristic, among others, of the semi-structured in-depth interviewing approach, poses limitations which are discussed in the next section.

Because semi-structured in-depth interviews result from a joint construction to some extent, they rely on a good report between interviewer and interviewee. Individual in-depth interviews are the most effective method for creating “an environment conducive to the production of the range and complexity of meanings” (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997: 123). The researcher needs to convey his or her seriousness to the interviewees (Zuckerman, 1972: 164) and “project a positive impression in order to gain their respect” (Harvey, 2011: 434). Richards suggests that having an in-depth knowledge of the individual’s social background and career is of value (1996: 202). Whenever it was
possible, I researched interviewees’ professional backgrounds. Because interviews involve a joint construction of meaning, not only a good rapport is essential, but issues of reflexivity need to be considered as well (see section 3.4.2.)

Limitations of the chosen method

When people are asked to characterise an experience or state how they act, their response most certainly involves a degree of inconsistency or at least variation across time and situations. While semi-structured in-depth interviews provide a great depth of information, they are not without problems. As Buckingham has argued “talk is an exceptionally slippery medium. In interviews such as these, individual speakers will often prove to be incoherent, inconsistent or downright contradictory.” (2000: 63) Rather than viewing interviewees’ responses as the objective “truth” about journalism, I treated them as social constructs, which reveal their views and opinions at the present moment, in the way they wished to share them with me. I was constantly watchful not to take what was said at face value (see, for example, Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 132; Mason, 2002: 64) but rather, tried to take all influences and limitations I know of into account. My interviewees’ responses can thus not serve as an unmediated picture of the journalistic profession. In addition to this general limitation, I outline four further limitations that are characteristic of interviewing below.

Firstly, the responses of interviewees can be inconsistent due to various factors. These factors include interviewees’ mood on the day of the interview, the amount of time they have to express their views, their willingness to share their views and their ability to put those views into words. Thus, interviewees are unlikely to provide a fully representative or coherent account of their experiences, even if they wanted to. “They will proclaim one thing at one moment, only to deny it at another.” (Buckingham, 2000: 63) To somewhat mitigate the inconsistences of interviewees’ responses, I asked interviewees to draw on specific examples and stories to illustrate their points. This way interviewees were less likely to make points that are too general, invent material or veer too far off topic. Further, I assumed an active interviewing position, following Holstein and Gubrium (1997). I consistently probed, questioned and challenged interviewees’ replies. The way in which I conducted the interviews was at times probing and at times confrontational. “I am not ready for this!” commented one editor during her interview, and another editor described my interview as “very searching”. 

Secondly, interviews never take place in an influence-neutral vacuum, which needs to be considered. It is impossible to “strip the interview of all but the most neutral, impersonal stimuli” (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997: 123) Instead, I reflected on personal influences during interviews, which are outlined in the final section of this chapter. I considered the fact that interviewees might have a certain agenda in presenting their version of events. I also considered the positions of interviewees within their publications hierarchy – whether they are at the top of the hierarchy, whether they express an interest in staying with the organisation or whether they plan a career change. I considered whether they have worked at other publications or in other professions before and how this might influence their current views and position. I am aware that interviewees’ responses do not represent stable features of individuals or indeed of the setting at the publication.

The third challenge is to find the right sample size for the study to be somewhat representative. While the literature on expert interviews provides an insight into the timeframe, it often remains vague on the number of interviews needed. There is no consensus or agreed number on how many interviewees need to be interviewed for qualitative research. In qualitative research there comes “a point of diminishing returns where increasing the sample size no longer contributes new evidence” (Ritchie, Lewis and Elam, 2003: 83). The concept of saturation was introduced to qualitative research by Glaser and Strauss (1967: 61) to refer to the point of data collection when no new data is found in relation to the research topic. Mason (2010) conducted a study on the sample size of five hundred and sixty PhD dissertations which use qualitative interviews. He found that the most common sample sizes were twenty and thirty. The median and mean were twenty-eight and thirty-one interviewees respectively. A large proportion of the samples (80 per cent) adhered to the principle of fifteen being the smallest number of interviewees needed for a qualitative study. Guest, Bunce and Johnson (2006: 78) found that saturation can be reached between six and twelve interviews. Their findings are relevant to this study, because I chose a sample of about ten interviewees at each publication, amounting to thirty-one interviewees overall. Therefore, my impression that my interviewees’ views and statements are likely to be indicative of a broader group of leading editors is justified.

Critics of the saturation concept suggest that instead, the sample should be chosen by richness of information and appropriateness. Samples should consist of participants who best represent the research topic (Morse et al., 2002). Sampling should most of all be concerned with richness of information (Kuzel, 1992), appropriateness and adequacy (Bowen, 2008; Marshall, 1996; Morse and Field, 1995). The sample in this study consists of thirty-one leading editors who are all highly
appropriate and for the analysis of the topic of this study. Therefore, this study fits the criteria of those who are in support of the concept of saturation as well as those who challenge it and propose alternative measure for sample size instead – the present study fulfils the requirements of both.

The fourth challenge is that interviewees in this study are experts and they are part of an elite group, which by definition is a small group. Interviewing experts is methodologically different from interviewing non-experts (Desmond, 2004; Harvey 2010; Mikecz, 2012; Shenton and Hayter, 2004; Smith, 2006). I use the terms “experts” and “elite” interchangeably because many scholars have argued that elite interviews differ from non-elite interviews in that the interviewee possesses expertise (see, for example, Dexter, 1970; Flick, 2009; Harvey, 2011; Kezar, 2003; Marshall and Rossman, 2011). Further, the materials experts provide go beyond their own work and experience, because interviewees are “integrated into the study not as a single case but as representing a group of specific experts” (Flick, 2009: 165). The difficulty with interviewing editors is that they are proficient at interviewing. For this reason a number of interviewing techniques have been considered, in addition to the previously mentioned active interviewing position and probing techniques. Marshall and Rossman argue that elites respond well “to inquiries about broad areas of content and to open-ended questions that allow them the freedom to use their knowledge and imagination” (2011: 156). The researcher needs to allow an expert interviewee to “stress his or her definition of, structure, and relevant data related to a situation” (Kezar, 2003: 397). Further issues arise from the nature of elite interviewing, such as the issue of reflexivity, which are discussed in section 3.4.

3.1.3. Interview Guide

Before any semi-structured interviews can be conducted, the interviewer has to develop a theoretical framework and an interview guide in order to ensure that all areas relevant to the study will be covered (Patton, 2002: 343-4). The guide serves as a checklist to ensure that all topics relevant to the study are covered in the course of the interview. It ensures that all interviewees are asked the same questions, so that their responses can be compared across the study. The key topics in this study are identity, autonomy and cosmopolitan skills, which are explored to analyse the ways in which editors perceive themselves, their world, and their work in the age of globalisation. While the questions are not strictly structured, the interview guide ensures that these topics are covered during interviews. The interview guide helps the researcher to conduct a systematic and comprehensive inquiry, which leaves room for flexibility, probing and clarification.
The questions that are asked throughout the interviews are based on the interview guide. To that effect, Patton’s categorisation of questions (2002: 349-351) is implemented: (1) experience and behaviour questions to inquire about procedures, (2) opinion and value questions which seek to understand the interpretive and cognitive processes of interviewees, (3) knowledge questions which inquire about interviewees’ factual information, as well as (4) background and demographic questions to identify the interviewees’ characteristics. The questions in this study addressed issues of personal background, professional role, mobility, imagined readership, nationhood and empathy, creativity and perceived restrictions of freedom. It is important for the researcher to be able to “follow up initial questions and responses, to encourage the interviewee to explore a topic or issue in its various ramifications” (Deacon et al., 1999: 289). While interviews are limited in that they rely on what is being said by interviewees, an appropriate interview guide ensures that the research is conducted systematically and critically.

3.2. Choice of participants

In the past, studies of journalism have often focused on foreign correspondents see, for example, Willnat and Weaver, 2003; Hahn and Lönnendonker, 2009; Archetti, 2013; Hannerz, 2004; Sambrook, 2010) and financial journalists (see, for example, Manning, 2013; Pardue, 2014; Ragas and Tran, 2014) or newsroom values (Gans, 1979; Golding and Elliott, 1979; Tameling and Broersma, 2013; Tuchman, 1978). Studies on slow news editors remain rare, with a few exceptions, such as studies on arts journalists (see, for example, Golin and Cardoso, 2009; Harries and Wahl-Jorgensen, 2007; Hellman and Jaakkola, 2011; Kristensen, 2010) and more specifically, music journalists (Forde, 2003; Jones, 2002; Klein, 2005) as well as explorations of feature journalism (see, for example, Steensen, 2009). Hellman and Jaakkola suggest that this “in itself may be evidence of the distinctive nature of cultural journalism: it has not been studied because it has been considered an ““unrepresentative case” of journalism” (2011: 784). However, this study is concerned with slow news publications that include a spectrum of topics, including culture journalism. Focusing on slow news publications makes sense because the role of journalists as news-gatherers has been challenged and in part replaced by the proliferation of information online.

While the publications in this sample are characterised as “slow” news publications, that does not encapsulate all of their output. All three publications have online platforms, social media channels, as well as multimedia components and therefore, journalists need to work on a daily and hourly,
rolling news-cycle to some extent. The balance and the weight of these two components will be discussed in relation to the deployment of resources and organisational arrangements in relation to the slow and fast aspects of news production.

There is a large body of academic work on newspapers, but, magazines have largely been neglected, with a few exceptions. Whenever magazines have been researched, studies have mainly focused on women’s magazines in relation to anti-feminism, post-feminism, sexuality and health (Brewis and Warren, 2011; Dixon et al. 2011; Gill, 2009; Hensman Kettrey and Emery, 2010; Machin and Thornborrow; 2003) as well as men’s magazines in relation to problematic representations of masculinity, sexuality and health (Boni, 2002; Cortese and Ling, 2011; Draper, 2014; Schneider, Cockcroft and Hook, 2008). It makes sense that issues of femininity and masculinity, which are more often than not distorted in lifestyle magazines, have come to the forefront of academic research. However, this study focuses on general interest magazines. Rather than singling out gender as the main focus, it analyses the role of gender within the bigger picture of the identity, autonomy, diversification and awareness of gender among editors.

Scholars have previously studied editors of a certain kind, and on very specific questions, usually with the help of surveys. Editors have been analysed in relation to their views on journalism education. Pardue found that business editors find journalism graduates unprepared (2014: 49). Lepre and Bleske found that there is little common ground among magazine editors and professors who were surveyed on journalism curriculum (2005: 190). Most research has focused on newspaper editors (see, for example, Deuze, 2005a; Gade, 2008; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996) rather than magazine editors or editors of “slow news” publications, with a few notable exceptions (Lepre and Bleske, 2005; Navasky and Cornog, 2012). This research, however, studies leading editors of slow news publications. Editors were chosen due to their position of power within the hierarchy of journalism, and slow news publications were chosen because they provide interpretative news stories, which are increasingly needed in a world of information overflow.

Participants were chosen at three publications, based in two locations. The publications are based in London and New York, which allows for a transnational analysis. This approach was chosen in order to avoid a focus on national frames. Rather than comparing journalists from two different countries, this study focuses on editors in London and New York. This research design has two explicit objectives. Firstly, it helps to take the study beyond the confines of methodological nationalism (see, for example, Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, 2008: 26; Chernilo, 2011: 112). Secondly, it considers the
role of global media cities (see, for example, Castells, 2009: 445; Currid, 2006: 333; Sassen, 2009b: 185). This is how the limitation of previous journalistic studies that have focused on the national frame, is overcome.

Three publications were chosen for the sample of this study: The Economist, The Intelligent Life Magazine and The New Yorker. Two out of three publications refer to themselves as magazines; The Economist prefers to refer to itself as a newspaper, even though it has the characteristics of a magazine. A magazine can be defined as “a periodical publication containing articles and illustrations, often on a particular subject or aimed at a particular readership” (Oxford Dictionary, 2014). In this study, all three publications are partly considered as “slow news” publications. Slow news are characterised as thoughtful analysis pieces and are traditionally thought of as magazine news or feature writing. The characteristics of the publications, such as the frequency of their print publication, their circulation, establishment date, head office location, editor-in-chief and website information can be found in table 1.

Table 1: Publications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The Economist</th>
<th>The New Yorker</th>
<th>Intelligent Life Magazine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of print</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>47 per year (weekly, apart from 5 issues which cover two-week spans)</td>
<td>Bi-monthly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>publication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation</td>
<td>1,574,803 (print); 100,000 (paid digital subscribers)</td>
<td>1,055,542 (print) and an audience of 4,476,000 online</td>
<td>175,000 (print) and a bigger digital audience (no paywall)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head office location</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor-in-chief</td>
<td>John Micklethwait (from 2015, Zanny Minton Beddoes)</td>
<td>David Remnick</td>
<td>Tim de Lisle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.economist.com">www.economist.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.newyorker.com">www.newyorker.com</a></td>
<td><a href="http://www.moreintelligentlife.co.uk">www.moreintelligentlife.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, I propose the following key differences between the attributes of a newspaper publication and tabloid/glossy fashion magazine – or the kind of slow news publication that I explored in this study. Key features of my three sample publications include: (1) All three publications go beyond news reporting; they focus on analysis, commentary and narrative (no
“churnalism”); (2) While all three magazines are updated online daily, their printed editions appear weekly (The Economist and The New Yorker) and bi-monthly in the case of the Intelligent Life Magazine; (3) No celebrity gossip, dieting advice, no native advertising; (4) No direct affiliation with one party or political group but a political line based on issues (The Economist is “socially left-wing and fiscally right-wing”, the Intelligent life Magazine focuses on culture, The New Yorker is broadly liberal and has supported the Democratic party in recent years); (5) Wide use of contributors, including many established authors; (6) Narrative, story-telling, literary forms of journalism; (6) Visualisation: a big emphasis on photography at the Intelligent Life Magazine, charts and graphs and the cover picture at The Economist and photography and cartoons at The New Yorker).

Pilot Interviews

Two pilot interviews were conducted to fine-tune the questions outlined in the interview guide. The pilot interviews were conducted with journalists: The first interviewee was a Canadian broadcast journalist and the second interviewee was an editorial intern at the Guardian newspaper in London. Both interviews were very useful in indicating how to make the interview questions clearer and how to better the flow of the conversation. However, the range of experiences of pilot interviewees was different from those of the interviewees, because of the difference in publication type and the kind of journalism (broadcast and investigative reporting respectively). Nevertheless, the pilot interviews helped to fine-tune in my research design and helped me prepare for the intensity and sheer amount of information that my interviews proved to subsequently provide.

3.3. Collection of materials

The aim of this study is to gain an in-depth understanding of the views and experiences of editors in London and New York. In total, I conducted thirty-one interviews with editors at The Economist, Intelligent Life Magazine and The New Yorker. All three organisations include both a print publishing and an online component. Out of thirty-one interviewees: twenty-two interviewees were editors in senior positions, (editor-in-chief, editor of a section, or deputy editor), four interviewees were assistant editors, and five interviewees had a specific role on the team of a senior editor. Further, two of these editors were from the fact-checking departments, four were online editors and six were journalists whose work focuses on the visual aspects of journalism (video journalists, photo editors and multi-media editors). Seventeen participants were men, and fourteen were women. Thirteen of the participants were between the ages of 25-35, four were between the ages of 35-45, and
fourteen were 45 years of age and older. In terms of years spent in the journalistic profession, five interviewees had up to 5 years of experience, eight had between 5-10 years, five had 15-20 years, two had 20-25 years, five had 25-30, and six had over 30 years of experience. Only few of my interviewees had a formal journalism undergraduate or postgraduate degree; out of these interviewees, two were senior editors who had dropped out of graduate degrees in journalism and writing programmes at Columbia University. All interviewees had at least one undergraduate degree in subjects ranging from English literature, sociology, philosophy, Latin and Greek, French and Arabic to engineering and economics. In order to anonymize interviewees in this study, I assigned one or more numbers to each interviewee. These numbers are cited after quotations, together with the location. I chose to assign more than one number in cases where combining all quotations by one interviewee could easily reveal his or her identity. Only the examiners of this thesis are going to receive a list of all the names and corresponding numbers.

Access

Researchers have offered some strategies to gain access. “With elite individuals particularly,” write Marshall and Rossman, “the interviewer may have to rely on sponsorship, recommendations, and introductions for assistance in making appointments” (2011: 156). Strategies offered by Shenton and Haytor include citing support from an “authority” which is supporting the research (2004: 224). Being a PhD student from the London School of Economics was beneficial and having the recommendation from senior editors opened the door for further interviews. Interviewees were selected through snowballing, whereby initial contacts are asked to suggest further contacts (Bryman, 2012: 427). Initially, my existing professional contacts were recruited, and these interviewees were asked to suggest further editors in their field. The selection criteria were that interviewees work at one of the three sample publications and hold a degree of editorial responsibility at their publication. Participants were initially contacted by email asking their willingness to be interviewed for this study. They were given a brief description of the study and background of the researcher. Interviewees who expressed an interest in participating in the study and had further questions were given more information in person about the purpose of this study, how materials would be collected and how the study would be disseminated.

The issue of access was a source of uncertainty in the initial phases of my fieldwork in both London and New York. It required prolonged negotiation: Editors first verified my request by contacting colleagues I had previously interviewed, before agreeing to be interviewed. This process of
verification took time and burdened the busy work schedule of those I had already interviewed who had recommended me. At various points I was asked where my findings will be published. On several occasions I was also asked for reassurance that my interviews are part of an academic study, rather than part of an investigative journalistic inquiry.

One particular episode suggested that my various efforts had paid off: After conducting one of my interviews at an editor’s office, I introduced myself to another editor whose desk was nearby. We had a conversation and he agreed to be interviewed a few days later. When we sat down in the cafeteria of the Condé Nast Building, he said to me: “How did you manage to get here?” He was genuinely surprised, and explained that editors at The New Yorker do not usually consent to be interviewed.

Fieldwork in London and New York

There were two main phases of my interviewing fieldwork: the first phase took place in London from April 2013 – August 2013 and the second phase took place in New York from February 2014 – April 2014. During the first phase of interviews in London I received an invitation and funding to be a visiting scholar at Columbia University the following year. So I decided to extend my study into a comparative transnational study, to include New York as the second location. I mentioned to some of my London-based interviewees that I was going to Columbia and they kindly offered to put me in touch with editors they knew at The New Yorker. These contacts served as consenting gatekeepers. Researchers (see, for example, Hertz and Imber, 1993; Mikecz, 2012; Shenton and Hayter, 2004; Welch et al., 2002) discuss how gatekeepers, who are concerned with their organisation’s reputation, can hinder access to the staff members of an organisation. It is understandable that such eminent and powerful publications as the ones I researched have concerns about letting a researcher interview their staff.

I conducted semi-structured face-to-face interviews that lasted between thirty and ninety minutes. The literature on expert interviews cites the length of an expert interview to vary between forty-five minutes to an hour and a half (Harvey, 2011; Ostrander, 1993; Stephens, 2007). An in-depth interview typically does not last longer than ninety minutes (Hennink, Hutter and Bailey, 2011: 130). Harvey warns that “asking for too much time might lead to interviewees refusing to participate, but asking for too little time might lead to serious limitations in the quality and quantity of data provided by interviewees” (Harvey, 2011: 436). All interviewees were asked a similar set of questions.
Journalists whose work includes the visual aspects of journalism (video journalists, photo editors and multi-media editors) were asked additional questions due to the different nature of their work practices. The semi-structured in-depth interviews included questions about personal, educational and professional background, experiences of mobility and a variety of cultures, perceived readership, journalistic sources and networks, the role of empathy and the role of the nation/city in journalism, as well as freedom and boundaries at work.

All interviews were recorded using at least two devices, in case one of them ran out of battery or failed to record the interview for another reason. The two devices were usually a smartphone and an MP3 recorder. All interviews were conducted in person and in English. I transcribed some of the interviews but due to the sheer volume of work, a professional transcription service was used. Transcriptions have been checked against the recordings, and at times corrections were subsequently made. There were several occasions, where a name or a term was misheard by the person transcribing the interview and thus, it was necessary for me to double check the transcripts. The benefit of proof reading the transcripts was an added layer of familiarisation with the interviewing materials I gained.

3.3.1. Analysis

Given the decision to focus on the individual views and experiences of journalists and to employ a transnational comparative study, thematic analysis was chosen as the most appropriate method to interpret the interviewing materials. Thematic analysis is sometimes referred to as qualitative content analysis (Hsieh and Shannon, 2005; Mayring, 2000; Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009). It is described as “a research method for the subjective interpretation of the content of text data through the systematic classification process of coding and identifying themes or patterns.” (Hsieh & Shannon, 2005: 1278) It is concerned with materials which are “expressions from subjects reflecting how they view the social world” (Zhang and Wildemuth, 2009: 309). Therefore, it is an attempt to identify (without quantifying) core consistencies, similarities and differences in themes across a big set of materials. Thematic analysis was chosen as a method of analysis because it focuses on the emergence of themes in addition to building on the themes that have been pinned down in the interview guide.

Thematic analysis is employed to organise and describe a set of materials, as well as to interpret various facets of the data (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 79). Wolcott describes the fundamental elements
of thematic analysis as: (1) ensuring systematic procedures, (2) fleshing out the analytical framework which guided data collection and (3) identifying patterned regularities in the data (1994: 32-33). The interview guide helped to ensure that the same topic areas were covered in all interviews. Therefore, interviews could be analysed systematically and within comparable categories. Boyatzis identifies stages of thematic analysis including: (1) sensing of themes, (2) development of codes and (3) interpretation of information and themes in the context of a theory or conceptual framework (1998: 11). All interviews were transcribed and the texts were uploaded to NVivo 10, which is a tool for the analysis of qualitative materials, including textual materials such as interview transcripts.

My analysis implemented the six phases of thematic analysis as conceptualised by Braun and Clarke (2006: 350) presented in Table 2:

Table 2: Phases of Thematic Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description of the process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Familiarising yourself with your data:</td>
<td>Transcribing data (if necessary), reading and rereading the data, noting down initial ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Generating initial codes:</td>
<td>Coding interesting features of the data in a systematic fashion across the entire data set, collating data relevant to each code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Searching for themes:</td>
<td>Collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reviewing themes:</td>
<td>Checking in the themes work in relation to the coded extracts (Level 1) and the entire data set (Level 2), generating a thematic “map” of the analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Defining and naming themes:</td>
<td>Ongoing analysis to refine the specifics of each theme, and the overall story the analysis tells; generating clear definitions and names for each theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Producing the report:</td>
<td>The final opportunity for analysis. Selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, final analysis of selected extracts, relating back of the analysis to the research question and literature, producing a scholarly report of the analysis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I took notes during interviews as well as writing down noteworthy instances and examples straight after conducting an interview. In order to further familiarise myself with the data, I reread interview transcripts many times, as well as writing memos in NVivo 10 during that process. Memos provide a record of ideas and thoughts that occur throughout the coding process. They are a useful tool to capture reflections during the data analysis process, and they can provide a great source for reflection on methodology and the research design.

For the second phase, I generated initial codes to identify specific features in my data, which appeared interesting. This step is illustrated in Table 3. Boyatzis referred to these initial codes as “the most basic segment, or element, of the raw data or information that can be assessed in a meaningful way regarding the phenomenon” (1998: 63). These codes can refer to words, sentences, and paragraphs. One coding unit is “a word or group of words that could be coded under one criterion category” (Schamber, 2000: 739). One the one hand, I looked for codes that reflect the analytical framework of this study which guided the process of materials collection. On the other hand, I accounted for new and emerging codes throughout the analysis of materials. Patton explains that the analyst can either use categories developed by interviewees or become aware of categories which interviewees did not spell out or label specifically and thus pinpoint these with a code or label (1990: 390). An ongoing list of codes was created to capture emerging codes. As new codes emerged, previously coded texts were revisited and recoded, if necessary.

Table 3: Data extract, with codes applied (Braun and Clarke, 2006: 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Extract</th>
<th>Coded for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“I think I never have enough space; This week I had a Leader on Snowden, and it was very densely written to get into 62 lines. It was very frustrating because I wanted to get in huge amounts of stuff, and I could have easily done 108 lines. And then in the end we didn’t run it anyway, because I think the editor said that it’s too short a space. Yes, you’re limited by time, by space, sometimes by money. I quite often think is it really worth blowing £2,000 of The Economist’s money to fly you to America for this? And money’s limited, and in the end once you’ve spent on one thing you can’t spend it on another, so I think time, money and occasionally, you bump up with The Economist line and I’m a bit less secular… The Economist sometimes takes a slightly dismissive attitude to religion, which slightly bothers me.”</td>
<td>Space (limitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Editor’s opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Budget (limitation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ideology (limitation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second step, I identified consistencies, similarities and patterns across codes, which were then categorised into themes. In this part of the analysis, I combined codes into overarching themes. For instance, codes that referred to constraints in relation to “visas”, “regulations”, “censorship” and
“governments” were combined to create the “political constraints” theme. Codes that referred to limitations of “space”, “time” and “format” were collated to create the “procedural constraints” theme.

Further, I created an axis that broadly represented national, transnational and cosmopolitan themes (Gerner, 2013). This axis encompassed codes such as: family, friends, locals, London, New York, nation, in translation, work abroad, mobility, networks, cultural clichés, cultural comparisons, immersion, conversation, empathy and foreign correspondence. This axis gave me the opportunity to approach my interview materials with an open mind with regards to themes of nationalism, transnationalism and cosmopolitanisation. Some of these codes were derived from my conceptual framework and other codes emerged during the analysis of my interviews. In addition, themes that emerge but are not related to the research questions were identified. The observation of patterns enables the researcher to pinpoint emerging major themes (Patton, 2002: 453) in addition those themes that have been part of the analysis from the outset.

In the fourth step themes were reviewed, and some themes and codes which did not emerge frequently or significantly enough were eliminated. The use of NVivo 10 allowed for an efficient handling of the large amount of materials collected. NVivo allows the researcher to categorise materials in a systematic way and in order to conduct a fine-grained thematic analysis. It allows creating different types of codes called “nodes” and organising them in different folders. These nodes can be changed and re-arranged during the course of the analysis.

In the fifth step I generated clear definitions and names for each theme and grouped them together under four “global themes” following Attride-Stirling (2001: 397) which constitute the four cosmopolitan skills. Attride-Stirling (2001: 397) argued that organising themes should be grouped into global themes which represent the “claim, proposition, argument, assertion or assumption that the Organising Themes are about”. Global themes represent the principal metaphor of the theme and in this study the global themes represent the four main cosmopolitan themes identified in the theory chapter. In the sixth step, vivid examples were chosen to illustrate the complexities of each cosmopolitan skill.
3.4. Ethical considerations

3.4.1. Informed consent

Just as in any other academic research interview, ethical considerations play an important role in expert interviews. Smith explains how some researchers have used two codes of conduct, one for “researching up” and one for “researching down” (2006: 649). In his study on the US Military Academy at West Point, Spencer (2003) for instance, consciously deceived several elite participants. Spencer argued, because researchers face conditions of suspicion and hostility when researching experts, the reciprocal alliances between the researcher and the researched do not exist (2003: 41). While researchers should have flexibility rather than rigid guidelines in conducting interviews, it is unethical to claim that researchers have no responsibility to respect the researcher-interviewee relationship in expert interviews because they are likely to face hostility and suspicion themselves.

Similarly, Bradshaw writes that as researchers “we cannot work with two codes, one for researching up and one for researching down. An absolutist ethic of avoiding any harm to research participants must be applied” (2001: 204-205). Further, Smith’s argument that power is dynamic, complex and difficult to interpret leads her to conclude that “it becomes harder to argue that it may be justifiable to be guided by different codes of ethics when researching particular groups of people” (2006: 650). An imbalance of power is far from obvious in the interviewing situation (see section 3.4.4.), and thus a lax ethical framework cannot be justified as a rebalancing mechanism for unequal power relations. This study followed the ethics code of the LSE Research Ethics Policy and Procedures issued in 2012 and general ethical guidelines in the conduct of media and communications research. The Research Ethics Review Questionnaire was completed prior to the collection of materials.

3.4.2. Issues of reflexivity

Issues of reflexivity are vital for any kind of qualitative research. Reflexivity means “the ability of the researcher to stand outside the research process and critically reflect on that process” (O’Leary, 2004: 11). Examinations of how the interviewer’s identity influences the interviewing situation helps in presenting the research as transparent, public and nuanced to the reader’s eye as possible. Discussing the identity of the researcher makes public the ways in which both the collection of materials as well as its interpretation might have been influenced. Discussions of reflexivity acknowledge the dynamics between the self and others in fieldwork situations (Stoeltje et al., 1999).
This is why the role and identity of the interviewer has become a central part of qualitative research, both in terms of ethical considerations as well as the coherence and validity of the study. The characteristics of each researcher who chooses interviewing as a research methodology must be examined because “the biographical journeys of researchers greatly influence their values, their research questions, and the knowledge they construct” (Banks, 1998: 4). It is important to consider how the researcher is perceived by interviewees thought characteristics such as gender, age and social distance to the interviewee (Britten, 1995: 252). Reflexivity helps to understand how knowledge comes into existence (Hertz, 1997) and thus, its discussion offers a valuable insight into this study.

3.4.3. The insider/outsider position

The notion of an insider/outsider position is understood to mean “the degree to which a researcher is located either within or outside a group being researched, because of her or his common lived experience or status as a member of that group.” (Gair, 2011: 137). Evered and Louis first introduced the terminology of an “inquiry from the inside and inquiry from the outside” in 1981, to capture critical characteristics of the stance of a researcher (according to Louis and Bartunek, 1992: 101). Social scientists have ever since debated the advantages and disadvantages of being an insider or outsider. It has traditionally been argued that being an insider can be advantageous because the researcher holds a shared sense of belonging to interviewees which helps to create trust (Hill-Collins 1991; Puwar, 1997). At the same time being an outsider can be advantageous because not belonging to the investigated group can create a stronger sense of objectivity and might enable the researcher to observe behaviour better (Hill Collins, 1991: 35). However, it has since been argued that a researcher can be both and insider and outsider at the same time (Harvey, 2010: 198). In this study, I am both a PhD student and a freelance journalist.

The advantage of my position is that it enabled me to gain access to my interviewees. The disadvantage is that I am possibly too close to the journalistic profession to observe it from a distance. However, I made it very clear to interviewees that I was conducting this study as a researcher, and structured my interview guide as rooted in my conceptual framework. In addition, discussions of the insider/outsider positions have moved from a dichotomy to various combinations of the status. As Takeda aptly writes it is “not static or fixed, both insider and outsider status between researchers and the researched are not always clearly detached. Presumed advantage and disadvantaged attached to these statuses, therefore, needs to be scrutinized carefully.” (2013: 285) Breen has argued that this dichotomy is too simplistic and that the distinction does not adequately
capture the role of all researchers (2007: 165) and Gair argues that we might further infer that all researchers are insiders because we are all human (2011: 138). Thus, it can be concluded that the insider and outsider status are not antithetical but indeed compatible. With this in mind I tried to combine the best parts of being and insider and outsider at the same time.

3.4.4. Issues of power

Ostrander has argued that researchers can be intimidated or overwhelmed by impressive offices and surroundings of their expert interviewees (1993: 20). To counter such a situation she suggests a variety of ways in which researchers can reclaim control over the interviewing situation. These strategies include not behaving like a guest if the interview is conducted in the interviewee’s social space and choosing public spaces as a setting for interviews. I conducted interviews at the interviewees’ offices, as well as in public spaces and I recorded objects and maps in their offices as well as details about the public spaces that served as interview settings for my research.

Addressing the power relationship between interviewer and interviewee has become one of the key topics among scholars writing on expert interviewing (Desmond, 2004; Harvey, 2010; Mikecz, 2012; Smith, 2006). Feminist geographers prominently debate the issue of reflexivity in interviews in relation to gender and whether it is possible to position and disclose the characteristics of the researcher as well as the effects these will have on the interviewing situation. McDowell writes “we must recognize and take account of our own position, as well as that of our research participants, and write this into our research practice” (1992: 409). Thus the notion of positionality assumes that through conscious analysis the situation or position of the researcher is seen as transparent and visibly available for analysis, and that thereby nothing remains hidden (Rose, 1997: 309). However, it has since been argued that it is not possible for a researcher to be completely transparent and to fully reflect on his or her position (Rose, 1997; Sabot, 1999; Smith, 2006). There is agreement that the character traits of the researcher and the researched are likely to have an effect on the conversation, but it is difficult to pinpoint just what exactly this effect entails. That is because the interviewer and the interviewee are “multiply positioned and do not have one single identity” (Smith, 2006: 647). In my experience, my identity as the interviewer prevailed during interviews over my identity as a woman. While gender factors may influence interviews (McDowell, 1992; Sabot, 1999), my experience supports Sabot’s claim that “it becomes secondary to other positional factors” (1999: 329), such as being a PhD student.
The fact that I am doing a PhD at a young age has also served me as an advantage rather than anything else. In many ways I agree with Beatrice Webb, pioneer of the sociological interview and co-founder of the LSE, who argued that “the less formal the conditions of the interview the better” (cited in Deacon et al., 1999: 289), because a conversational interview allows for a high degree of flexibility. Flexibility is often pointed out as the key element in structuring elite interviews (Richards, 1996: 202). The more flexibility the researcher has when interviewing the interviewee, the more confrontational, creative and spontaneous he or she can be in the interviewing situation. Such a flexible interviewing approach helps to alleviate tensions in the interviewing situation as well as what some scholars perceive as imbalances in power relations. Ostrander argues (1993: 9) that conducting research with leading professionals is not so much obstructed by issues of access as by the challenge of penetrating a class culture sufficiently to expose the real viewpoints and concerns of interviewees. For exactly this reason the insider part of my status was useful. It enabled me to create a conversational and reciprocal interviewing situation where I was also able to probe and ask difficult questions during interviews. Interviewees felt comfortable to answer my question with another question, and almost all interviewees continued the conversation with me after I had finished the interview.

3.5. Conclusion

There is a gap in our understanding of the more global aspects and current changes of journalism. I designed a research project to addresses this gap and overcomes the limitations of previous journalism research. Semi-structured in-depth expert interviews are a highly appropriate method for investigating the research question of this study on how editors perceive themselves, their work and the world in the age of globalisation. Interviews are the most appropriate methodology to answer this research question because they give access to the stated experiences and beliefs others wish to share within a particular interactional context. Because this study is interested in how editors characterise journalism from their point of view, rather than an objective “truth” about journalism, interviews are a suitable methodology. However, there are limitations to this methodology, and in this chapter, I sought to unmask the issues that arise from my choice of methodology, and how I tried to overcome these challenges.

In the first section, I provided an evaluation of the various ways in which journalists have previously been analysed. Then, I explained and justified my choice of semi-structured in-depth expert interviews as my material collection method, specifically focusing on the limitations of the method
and how I attempted to overcome them. In the second section I elaborated on my choice of participants. Editors at slow news publications were chosen to explore the ways in which identity, autonomy and cosmopolitan skills are used and experienced in journalistic work. These editors hold a relatively powerful position within the hierarchy of their news publications and their views and experiences influence the course of journalistic work as a whole. In the third section I explained how materials were collected, and consequently analysed. The fourth section demonstrated that semi-structured in-depth expert interviews raise specific issues. These issues have been addressed with help of the literature on expert interviews. Expert interviews are complicated by relations of power, ethical considerations and issues of reflexivity, which have been discussed. My position as an insider and outsider has been discussed in detail, elaborating on the advantages and challenges my position entails.

Despite all limitations, the chosen method has enabled me to address my research questions in this study. A sufficient number of editors agreed to be interviewed for this study, and their interviews have provided me with a rich and in-depth set of interesting materials. Interviewees were generous with their time and showed a great degree of reflexivity and willingness to engage with my questions, provide examples and respond to my probes. The analysis of this rich set of materials has been discussed. The data interpretation processes had been explained, elaborating on the advantaged of thematic analysis as well as the use of the NVivo 10 in the coding process. The limitations of the both the data collection and the data interpretation methodologies have been discussed.

To recap, this section has argued that scholars have previously focused on newsroom values and newspaper journalists and news reporting. This study, however, analyses leading editors at three slow news publications in London and New York. The chosen research methodology was semi-structured in-depth interviews with editors at three eminent publications and the main method for analysis was thematic analysis. This methodology has certain limitations which have been discussed. But nonetheless, it allowed me to gather and analyse data in an appropriate manner to address the research question and sub-questions. The next chapter is the first of three chapters containing the empirical findings of this study.
Chapter 4: The cosmopolitan skills and identities of editors

Introduction

The overall research question of this thesis is “How do leading journalists perceive themselves, their audience, their work and their world in the age of globalisation?” The particular sub-question this chapter focuses on is: “To what extent, if any, do journalists have and make use of their cosmopolitan skills and how do they relate to their identities?” It is important to study the ways in which editors make sense of their identities, work practices and perceptions, because the journalistic profession is undergoing a process of fundamental transformation.

The theory chapter identified four features that have been previously attributed to foreign correspondents. Based on the theories of Beck (2002 and 2006) and Hannerz (1990 and 2004) I used these features to define the four cosmopolitan skills. They are (1) mobility; (2) the skills to navigate various cultures; (3) the appreciation of difference; and (4) an awareness of diverse audiences. These circumstances, within which foreign correspondents work, have now become present in the transformations that journalism as a profession is experiencing. According to Giddens, globalisation has linked distant localities “in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa” (1990: 64). This chapter analyses the challenges and opportunities which these transformations pose for the cosmopolitan skills and identities of journalists.

The question of how leading editors perceive themselves, and whether they view a change of identities within journalistic work, was investigated through semi-structured in-depth expert interviews with thirty-one editors at three publications in London and New York. To recap, seventeen participants were men, and fourteen were women. Thirteen of the participants were between the ages of 25-35, four were between the ages of 35-45, and fourteen were 45 of age and older. In terms of years spent in the journalistic profession, five interviewees had up to 5 years of experience, eight had between 5-10 years, five had 15-20 years, two had 20-25 years, five had 25-30, and six had over 30 years of experience. Therefore, interviewees of different gender and ages were included in both research locations.

Interviews set out with basic background questions about age, nationality and language skills. Then, interviewees were asked to talk about their educational background and career. Some questions were particularly related to gender differences, and the way they imagine their readers. Particular attention is given to the discussion of gender in section 4.3. While diversity has been addressed in
previous journalism research, gender has been a largely absent category in theories of cosmopolitanisation. Here the issue of gender was explicitly part of the question catalogue, but it also appeared throughout other parts of the interviews. As a result, gender is discussed at length in section 4.3.

Definitions: Cosmopolitan skills and the three types of identity

This chapter considers the awareness and prevalence of the four cosmopolitan skills among editors in relation to issues of identity, including social, organisational and professional identity. Social identity arises and it is sustained through individual understandings of oneself as well as social interaction with others (Stets and Burke, 2000: 225). Social identity is created through a “general, if individualized, framework for understanding oneself that is formed and sustained via social interaction” (Gioia, 1998: 19). Tajfel’s seminal definition of social identity as “the individual’s knowledge that he [sic] belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of his group membership” (1972: 292) is useful for analysing in-group and inter-group behaviour. Journalists need to be analysed on various levels of identity, on the personal, organisational and inter-organisational level. In addition, their identities cannot be viewed as static entities.

Further identities are not fixed or stable. As Hall writes, identities are “more a process of becoming than being” (1996: 4). Identities are not self-contained but are formed through the interaction of the self with societal structures. Castells argues that identity is constructed, and that “people create a cultural construct in referring to something that lies beyond them as individuals but which also defines them as such” (2006: 63). This could refer to categories such as gender and ethnicity as well as to peoples’ profession. According to Giddens “the level of time-space distanciation introduced by high modernity is so extensive that, for the first time in human history, “self” and “society” are interrelated in a global milieu” (1991: 32). Due to globalisation, identities have become more complex and fluid, as individuals can construct the meaning of their identity from a global array of social, cultural and professional building blocks. Thus, changes in peoples’ identities cannot be explained by only considering the individual level, but have to be considered on various levels.

Social identity includes categories such as nationality, gender, class, rural/urban, class, ethnicity and territory (De Bruin, 2000a: 2). However, Beck explicitly defines identity in the age of
cosmopolitanisation as going beyond traditional group identification towards an individualized form of identity. According to Beck (2006: 5) one constructs a model of one’s identity “by dipping freely into the Lego set of globally available identities and building a progressively inclusive self-image”. Thus, social identity in this study is understood as an individual, discursive and at times collective way of understanding oneself. This study analyses the ways in which interviewees understand their own identities, their colleagues’ identities and their audiences’ identities. This analysis reveals whether and to what extent editors appreciate diversity and difference among their own members of staff. Or whether traditional elites within organisations (white males) work to recreate themselves in order to retain their power (see, for instance, Hall, Cullen and Slack, 1989). Further, journalists’ experiences and identities influence their news judgements, choice of sources and choice of words (see, for instance, Mahtani, 2005: 300; Newkirk, 2000: 10). Van Zoonen (1998a: 139) argued that journalists’ subjectivity and identities need to be acknowledged as a core element of contemporary journalism. This is why the social identities of journalists and their stance towards themselves and their audiences’ identities need to be investigated.

While social identity traditionally encompasses national identity and journalists’ national identity has been used as a starting point in many studies, references to “American journalists” or “British journalists” only rarely surfaced during interviews in relation to interviewees’ social identity. This is one of the key findings of this study – journalists themselves do not predominantly use national categories to define themselves, but researchers tend to predominantly analyse journalists within national categories. The fact that national identity did not surface as a defining category supports Castells’ argument that in the age of globalisation people construct their identities from building materials from history, geography, biology, institutions, collective memory, personal fantasies, power apparatuses and religious revelations, rather than the previously dominant national building blocks (1997: 7).

Organisational identity is defined as “the shared understanding among the members of an organisation of “who-we-are”, of what makes the organisation distinctive from other organisations” (De Bruin, 2000b: 229). Interviewees in this study work for The Economist, The Intelligent Life Magazine and The New Yorker. Members of the same organisation are united by common interests, experiences and a sense of solidarity, according to Taylor and Whittier (1992: 105). Albert and Whetten (1985: 264) characterised organisational identity as: (1) what is taken by organisation members to be central to the organisation; (2) what makes the organisation distinctive from other organisations (in the eyes of the members) and (3) what do members perceive as the enduring
features of the organisation linking its past with its future. Thus, organisational identity is defined as a self-referential concept and requires evidence based on the interviews with members of an organisation. It includes the central attributes of an organisation, the characteristics which distinguish the organisation from others, as well as an organisation’s enduring features which remain stable in the long run. Organisational identity was perceived as the most important identification among interviewees, and subsequent sections in this chapter elaborate on this point.

Finally, professional identity is based on “an individual’s cognitive, moral and emotional connection with a broader community, category, practice, or institution” (Polletta and Jasper, 2001: 285). While organisational identity in this context is often confined to a particular publication, the professional identity of editors can stretch across organisational identities. As de Bruin writes, moving out of a particular organisation does not usually imply the ending of the professional identity (2004: 6). Professional identity “refers to a wider frame of reference – an ideology – not so much carried by the members of a clearly identifiable organisation, but rather by a virtual community” (de Bruin, 2004: 6). The theory chapter has pointed out that there is no adequate definition or investigation of the role of editors in journalism. This study argues that editors hold a special position of power in the world of journalism and their views and perspectives help to reshape their profession in the age of globalisation. They have a degree of autonomy in the current transition phase of journalism. Therefore, their professional identities merit specific consideration.

In relation to journalists, Deuze defines journalistic ideology as “a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular group, including – but not limited to – the general process of the production of meanings and ideas (within that group)” (2005a: 445). In contrast, Ibarra defined professional identity as a person’s relatively stable and enduring constellation of attributes, beliefs, values, motives, and experiences through which people define themselves in a professional role (1999: 764-5). Professional identity thus encapsulates the values, role conceptions of the profession of journalists as a whole. As a result, journalists who switch between media companies and between roles within a company can sustain an enduring constellation of beliefs and values about their profession as journalists. National identity did not emerge as a dominant category in this analysis. Instead leading editors in London and New York share values and have more in common with each other than with their local journalistic compatriots. This supports Reese’s argument that an emerging class of cosmopolitan journalists shares a common standard and understanding of journalism (2001: 176). For this reason interviewees from London and New York were not analysed separately but treated as one group in this study. The editors in this group work in different locations and for different media
organisations, but share some aspects of their identities, even though scholars have previously treated them as representatives primarily of their national identity.

In summary, this section presents the findings that resulted from the thematic analysis on the aspect of editors’ cosmopolitan skills and in relation to their identities. It answers the question: “To what extent, if any, do journalists have and make use of their cosmopolitan skills and how do they relate to their identities?” Each of the four sections in this chapter relates to one global theme, and is supported and explained through its supporting organising themes, as presented in Table 4.
Table 4: Cosmopolitan skills and three types of identity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmopolitan skill</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Skills to navigate different cultures** | • Editors speak multiple languages  
• They state the importance of speaking other languages, to understand a variety of cultural contexts  
• They want readers to be able to navigate different cultures  
• They read various sources, in various languages  
• They see it as part of their professional identity to fight clichés and stereotypes  
• They want to speak on behalf of those who might be hindered by language, and reduce people’s fear of each other | • Social identity  
• Organisational identity  
• Organisational identity  
• Professional identity  
• Professional identity  
| **Mobility** | • Some editors have migration background/ dual citizenship  
• Many interviewees have been foreign correspondents for a few years | • Social identity  
• Organisational identity |
| **Appreciation of difference** | • Female editors perceive specific gender differences between their male colleagues and themselves in relation to work practices, skills and preferences, while most male editors do not  
• Segmentation among gender lines is particularly evident with writing about feminism  
• Diversification of editorial staff is seen as a necessary and desired feature | • Social identity  
• Social identity  
• Professional identity |
| **Diverse audience awareness** | • They think of “psychographic” rather than demographic of their audience as part of their organisational identity  
• Some editors are aware of different audiences worldwide | • Organisational identity  
• Professional identity |
4.1. Skills to navigate different cultures and identities

The particular skills needed to navigate different cultures include language skills, knowledge drawn from diverse sources and an understanding of stereotypes. Individuals whose social identity is characterised by a migration background, ethnic minority background or experiences of mobility, are more likely to have these skills to navigate different cultures. However, individuals of any social identification are capable of possessing these skills. This study found that about one third of interviewees were not straightforwardly British in London or American in New York. Some interviewees have dual citizenship. However, the most common kind of foreign national is the American in London and the Brit in New York. Thus, most foreign language skills have been acquired at school and undergraduate and postgraduate level, as well as professional training. This section shows how the combination of interviewees’ social identity, having studied foreign languages, and their organisational identity, their company’s encouragement to study foreign languages, supports their knowledge of languages.

This study found that editors tend to speak multiple languages, whereby older editors know more foreign languages than younger editors. Out of thirty-one editors only four speak English and no other language. Roughly one third of editors speak one language in addition to English, which tends to be French or Spanish. Thirteen editors speak two to three languages and four editors speak four or more languages. Overall, the older generation speaks more foreign languages, whereby all editors who are in their 20s speak one foreign language. This finding supports previous studies, such as that of Hess (1996: 80) who found that younger foreign correspondents are less likely than their older colleagues to have a knowledge of many languages. Similarly, Wu and Hamilton (2004: 523) found that 81 percent of US foreign correspondents speak at least one foreign language, whereas Hess reported that 97.5 percent of correspondents speak a foreign language. This suggests a possible decline in foreign language proficiency. The languages spoken include German, Italian, Portuguese, Thai, Greek, Czech, Arabic, Polish, Persian, Chinese, Russian and Swahili. The most frequently spoken foreign languages are French, German and Spanish, followed by Italian and Portuguese. It is worth noting that European languages are the primary foreign languages interviewees can speak.

Several studies have related language skills to the cosmopolitanisation of an individual. For instance, Rantanen’s framework for the empirical analysis of cosmopolitan qualities in individuals includes learning another language (2005: 124). In his study of the relationship between multilingualism and cosmopolitanism, Gunesch found that while language skills do not guarantee an open-minded
cosmopolitan stance, they surely help a great deal in the process. He writes “arguably there are limits to an individual’s cosmopolitan development if he or she does not have a set of foreign languages to start with” (2003: 227). Journalists who understand more than one language are able to read international sources and interview people in various languages, even if they are not foreign correspondents, but based in one location. This gives them a non-physical, but intellectual and emotional mobility that allows them to navigate different cultures. Both their social and organisational identities support this kind of mobility, but it is uncertain whether this emotional mobility enough to enable editors to navigate different culture.

Editors stated the importance of speaking other languages in order to understand a variety of cultures. This finding echoes Vertovec and Cohen’s argument that (2002: 14): “Like being multilingual, individuals themselves can be multicultural, or develop a personal repertoire that provides them with a multiple cultural competence.” These two quotes illustrate this point:

“I like languages. I like... not just the languages themselves, but the sensibility that is involved in speaking a different language, the ability to see the world through a different lens, of a different language, and the, sort of, mental discipline.” (16, NY)

“It’s very important to speak the language... I didn’t have to limit myself to the people who spoke English or German, which... for some correspondents who never really feel at home in the vernacular language of the country they’re in – I think that’s a pity. [...] It builds up all sorts of new pathways; I think it makes you speak your own language better.” (17, Lon)

Both these quotes stem from editors of the older generation who exhibit a deep appreciation of foreign languages and cultures. The quotes show that editors’ cultural competence takes language skills as a starting point. Language skills are seen to entail knowledge of cultural practices and norms. Vertovec and Cohen have argued that due to current processes of globalisation, opportunities for exposure to and learning about other cultures present themselves today as never before (2002: 14). Languages are key to understanding social identities and cultures, and it is also essential. According to Beck (2006: 93) language skills are one key indicator for the process of cosmopolitanisation. Although language skills do not guarantee a genuine interest or understanding of other cultures, they can serve as doors to understanding other languages. However, since interviewees only rarely speak non-European languages, foreign languages from other continents are missing.

Another central contention shared among editors was that they desire to speak on behalf of those who might be hindered by language, in order to “reduce people’s fear of each other”. Thus,
interviewees try to leave their own social, professional and organisational identities behind in order to speak on behalf of their subjects. This theme echoes arguments made by Berglez (2007: 151) who argued that global journalism ought to be the kind of journalistic practice which “makes it into an everyday routine to investigate how people and their actions, practices, problems, life conditions etc. in different parts of the world are interrelated.” In this study, editors saw it as part of their role to not only investigate people’s lives in different parts of the world, but also to act as a mediator and interpreter between people who do not directly speak to each other. Thus, editors share a universal perception of the role of journalists, regardless of their location. This finding relates to the professional identities of journalists, which have been defined as their moral and emotional connection with a broader community (Polletta and Jasper, 2001: 285). When asked about their motivations for being journalists and the role of journalism overall, interviewees described the role of journalists in the following way:

“...telling the plight of the mine worker; that the mine worker wouldn’t be able to tell. Because of language and labour, and all sorts of hindrances.” (21, NY)

“...ease away people’s fear of each other, and fear of things that are either unknown or difficult to understand.” (MF, Lon)

This theme echoes Hannerz’s analysis of the work of foreign correspondents, when he writes that, “often in foreign news, features stories can be news of difference, of people thinking, acting, or living in some unfamiliar way” (2004: 32). In this study, editors who are not foreign correspondents perceived it to be part of their role to write stories about difference and the ways in which different people live in different ways. This theme also echoes Beck’s concept of the “perspective-taking’ (2006: 7) which is a central aspect within a person’s cosmopolitan skill to navigate different cultures. For Beck, this skill meant the capacity to imagine the “interchangeability of situations (as both an opportunity and a threat)” (2006: 7). In this study, editors tended to emphasize the opportunity of “perspective-taking” as illustrated in the above two quotes, and the potential for mutual understanding that comes with it. However, it is impossible to say to what extent editors apply this skill in their daily work. While this skill is part of editors’ professional identity, it might be limited by their organisational identity, if their media companies’ style focuses on some continents while neglecting others, or does not have the resources to explore some issues in-depth. Thus, organisational identity challenges professional identities, which may be more idealistic than the requirements posed by organisational identities.
Editors in this study said that they occasionally read and listen to a variety of sources, including sources that are published and broadcast in languages other than English. However, it was not possible to verify the frequency of this action. This included books and newspapers in German and French, French-speaking radio and articles in Eastern European languages found through Google alerts. The quote below illustrates that editors value non-English speaking sources for their different perspective or spin on events. In addition, consuming sources in other languages helps them to practice their foreign language skills:

“I find that quite useful, particularly kind of things like Francophone Africa, they tell you what's going on in a way that the BBC might not necessarily, or MPR, probably wouldn't. [...] I listen to it partly to keep my French going. I used to be a Brazil correspondent in São Paulo, and when I get the time I like to listen to Brazilian news on the radio, because again it's a slightly different spin on things, and it's good for the language practice.” (14, Lon)

“I actually like Al Jazeera a lot because you get more of an international perspective.” (9, Lon)

“...internet radio, or Kommersant FM... I spend quite a lot of time using Google News, which I've fine-tuned, and particularly what I like is using Google News Alerts... I’m quite interested in Bulgarian-Macedonian relations at the moment, which have been quite bad. So would google News Alert for any news story which has Bulgarian-Macedonian relations, and this pops up with the most surprising things... I also have Google Alerts in other languages.” (28, Lon)

These quotes support the claim that editors follow non-English sources. Similar to this, Reese has conceptualised that newsgathering practices across national boundaries are a central feature of global journalism, “ostensibly “non-global” media can now track almost instantly newsworthy developments around the world and must react knowing that their audience has had access to them via other media” (2008: 242). But on the whole, the media that were most often mentioned were almost exclusively Western. The sources editors said they were reading, listening to and watching on a daily and weekly basis include the New York Times, Financial Times, the Guardian, BBC news, BBC World Service, New Yorker, The Economist, The Times, Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, International Herald Tribune, Mother Jones, Buzzfeed, GQ, The Atlantic, Haaretz, Al Jazeera and also Le Figaro, Der Spiegel and Neue Zuericher Zeitung. Thus, Western sources remain the dominant ones. Contrasting these two findings leads to the conclusion that there is a desire and awareness to reach beyond Western media sources, but Western media sources still dominate editors’ media diet.

Interviewees use mainly Western sources and sources found through social media and Google alerts. This use of sources indicates that interviewees tend to stay inside their professional identities and mainly talk to people who share the same professional values. Previous studies have shown that
people’s social media networks remain largely homogenous and inward-looking (Pariser, 2012; Zuckerman, 2014). Professional elites interact with other professional elites. Therefore, organisational and professional identities are potentially stronger than individuals’ cosmopolitan skills to navigate different cultures. Even though interviewees speak a variety of languages, the publications they have mentioned are predominantly Western. The only non-Western publications mentioned were Al Jazeera, Haaretz, Francophone Africa radio and Kommersant FM. However, news consumption among the publications’ stringers and long-term foreign correspondents is likely to be less Western-centric.

In addition, this study found that editors view it as part of their work to enable readers to navigate different cultures. Anderson (1983: 62) famously argued that journalists help their readers to imagine the national community. In contrast, editors in this study expressed their desire to help their audiences imagine the global community. This kind of new morality is part of editors’ professional identity. Beck wrote on the social treatment of difference and explained that to live in proximity with difference, often means living with the “Huntingtonian fear” which is the belief that ethnic differences would spell the decline of the West and that ethnic differences can never be bridged (2006: 51-2). However, interviewees expressed their intention to move beyond the politics of fear.

This intention forms part of a new professional identity among journalists. Instead of creating and recreating fear of difference, interviewees favour the cosmopolitan skill of navigating cultures. This mirrors Hannerz’s formulation of the cosmopolitan ability to “make one’s way into other cultures, through listening, looking, intuiting and reflecting” (1990: 293). In this study, editors see it as part of their work to expose their readers to other cultures through their work. This is demonstrated through the following three quotes:

“Our job is to be mind-expanding and to help to open up horizons for people, to help them see possibilities and have insights that they would not have had before. I do think it’s to open up a sense of possibility in the world.” (10, Lon)

“If you presented somebody who knew nothing about the world beyond their own country with a copy of The Economist, they would be able to get why this stuff matters, from the articles.” (25, Lon)

[About the imagined reader:] “I’m, most of the time thinking, in both activities [writing and editing], of a reasonably well-informed American, and therefore somebody who isn’t, day-to-day, following exactly what’s going on in Berlin or Paris, or somewhere like that, but has
a broad knowledge of how things work, but wants to know some of the political and economic dynamics in these places.” (19, Lon)

The above quotes show the intentions of editors to be “mind-expanding” and to explain the world by opening up “a sense of possibility”. One additional theme that emerged within the global theme of the skill to navigate different cultures is the explicit intention of editors to fight cultural stereotypes and clichés in their work. One aspect of the cosmopolitan skill to navigate cultures is an understanding of stereotypes and the willingness to move beyond them. According to Dagnino (2015: 158) effective immersion in the cultures, languages and geographies of the Other is vital for a transcultural mode of being, this includes stepping beyond the clichés, stereotypes, and prejudices that are still widely present today. The following quotes show the ways in which editors try to avoid both clichés of thought and visualisation:

“We all tend to view the world as stereotypes, and the purpose of journalism is to find humanity beneath them and broaden the empathy of the reader and of us.” (4, NY)

“...the editor’s job is to be receptive to all of the ways in which your preconceptions are wrong. And nothing makes a story more interesting than to discover that the world is different from the way you thought it was. And to try... give readers a framework to recognise how the world’s changing.” (10, Lon)

[About the need to go beyond clichés:] “I’ll give you an example – that in The Gulf, there’s more money than brains. That everybody is corrupt. That they’re just trying to big themselves up in some way rather than looking at how they should perhaps be trying to benefit their populations in thirty years-time” (35, Lon)

The above three quotes illustrate a shared contention among the majority of editors, that a central aspect of their work is to go beyond cultural clichés and stereotypes. They are aware of what Beck referred to as the “prison error of identity” which is a world view that conforms to the either/or logic of nations and the associated stereotypes (2006: 25). This finding supports the view of Beck who argued that due to the growing turmoil of globalised lifestyles, the imaginary world of self-enclosed cultural totalities fails to capture the real circumstances of the world in a global age (2006: 26). Further, Franks has argued that if journalists are only able to “present the simplest of stories or pander to stereotypes, eventually we are all at risk” (2006: 100). Interviewees in this study explicitly express their intention to avoid stereotypes and clichés. However, with the methodology of this study it is impossible to fully verify whether the above quotes are merely idealistic intentions or
whether they practically translate into the work of editors. Interviewees stated that they try to avoid stereotyping both in their writing, and also visually, as demonstrated by the following quote:

“Whether you’re shooting a person in London, or New York, or Mumbai, or Beijing, it’s really about connecting with the person, and just kind of trying to draw out something about them and their culture rather than just relying on kind of lazy visual clichés.” (4, Lon)

When prodded about how exactly it is that he avoids visual clichés, the interviewee explained:

“I always try to... avoid clichés... even the National Geographic shot itself has become a bit of a cliché... It’s hard to put into words... too many specifics, but I guarantee if you sit down and type Maasai tribesmen into Google images, and look at the images that come up... It should be easy to avoid visual clichés, because all you need to do is type a word into Google images and you’ll get 500 very similar looking images.” (4, Lon)

This method of avoiding certain hackneyed images that are typically associated with a certain culture shows a very explicit willingness to unmask clichés and stereotypes. This method can be compared to those exercises suggested by Van Ginneken (1998: 213-227) who has offered ways for journalism students to learn to be aware of and avoid cultural stereotypes and Western-centrism. Van Ginneken urges scholars to “stop pretending that objective and neutral news reporting can easily be realized by just applying a few rules of thumb” (1998: 214). He argues that it is important to admit that “news often implies views” (1998: 214) and that there is usually more than one truth that counts, especially in international news. He suggests that journalists should not limit their reporting about other cultures to disasters, but find more ways to understand and identify with ordinary people living under entirely different circumstances. His arguments have been echoed by the quotes of interviewees in this study, however, interviews do not provide the necessary means to verify and measure the extent to which these intentions are translated into practice.

4.2. Mobility and identities

Globalisation is viewed as having eroded cultures and identities, which are presumed to have previously been seen as fixed or homogenous (Pratt Ewing, 2004: 117). Official policies related to ethnic and racial identities help to solidify the idea that primordial or natural ethnicity is what separates “minorities” from members of the “majority” (Pratt Ewing, 2004: 117). Instead of focusing on fixed identities, Gilroy has focused on “affinities” and “affiliations” as ways of belonging among migrants (1993: 2). As an individual moves from one place to the next, his or her identity shifts as a consequence.
Mobility has been conceptualised as a central cosmopolitan skill, because it provides the possibility of developing an awareness and understanding of various cultures. Over the last two decades mobility has increasingly become a feature for a big part of the population, as international tourist arrivals increased from 565 million in 1995 to 1 billion in 2010 and are expected to rise to 1.6 billion tourists worldwide by 2020 (World Tourism Organisation, 2013). Scholars have argued that travelling to and living in different countries is one of the actions that develops cosmopolitan skills (see, for instance, Germann Molz, 2006; Hannerz, 1990; Nowicka and Rovisco, 2011; Szerszynski and Urry, 2006). The feature or skill of mobility can refer to migrants (see, for instance Werbner, 1999) or professionals with dual citizenship or transnational forms of life (Beck, 2006: 84; Vertovec, 2009: 1). As a result, mobility captures a temporary and long-term movement of people within and beyond nation states.

Social identity includes categories such as nationality, ethnicity and territory (De Bruin, 2000a: 2). Beck has argued that in the age of cosmopolitanisation, modes of identification have shifted from traditional group identification towards an individualized form of identity. One constructs a model of one’s identity “by dipping freely into the Lego set of globally available identities and building a progressively inclusive self-image” (2006: 5). This study found that the overwhelming majority of interviewees are straightforwardly British or American. About one third of the group has some kind of migration background, minority ethnicity and dual citizenship. However, the biggest groups are journalists with British citizenship who work in New York, and editors with American citizenship who work in London. But many editors who a more complex background, illustrated by these three quotes:

“I was born in Kenya. My father was Italian, my mother is French. I have dual French-Kenyan citizenship.” (35, Lon)

“I married a Scotsman at that time and they said, well, you can be Brit or you can be a German, but you can’t be both. So, I became a Brit because I was going to live here and I had a few kids and it was obviously easier to be the same nationality... When the question first came up, Britain wasn’t even in the European Union, and so, it just seemed easier.” (11, Lon)

“I’m half Jamaican and half English, but I’ve always lived here. So I suppose I’m mixed race in that sense and there aren’t many of us in this industry, so I suppose that makes me a bit different in that sense.” (2, Lon)
These quotes illustrate the complex ways in which editors define their identity in relation to a variety of nation states. Editors draw on the place they were born in, the places they grew up in, their current location as well as their family ties. Not only an editor’s mobility plays a role but also the mobility, citizenship and ethnicity of her parents, spouse and children. This finding supports Beck’s concept of “place-polygamy (2006: 43). He writes that personal biographies are influenced by processes of globalisation because people are free to choose among and live in numerous places.

Further, out of the interviewees in this study nine have previously worked as foreign correspondents for a few years at the publication they are currently working for. And an additional nine interviewees have previously worked abroad in another capacity, as freelance journalists and writers, or in another profession. This means that almost two thirds of interviewees have at one point in their career worked in a different country, reported from a different country. This finding illustrates how interviewees’ social, professional and organisational identities converge. Interviewees move across countries for their professional experience, they find themselves as migrants in a foreign place, and their organisation encourages them to continue shifting their identity by being mobile in this way. This point is demonstrated in the following quote:

“The Economist has this quite unusual system where they like to send everybody overseas for a bit, if possible... part of the reason for that is that, it does help you to understand your own country a bit better and helps you understand the world better if you had a bit of experience in a completely different region.” (13, Lon)

Further, interviewees internalize their organisational requirement to be mobile, and see it as part of their professional identity to live in different countries and to maximize diversity, if possible:

“If you’re writing about global issue, or in my case about European issues, I think it’s very important to have lived out of the country for a time. My experience is not... terribly exciting because Washington and Brussels... they’re not hardship places. It’s not quite like being based in Delhi or Latin America or somewhere like that, but you definitely get a different perspective by being around there.” (23, Lon)

*The Economist* rotates its correspondence every three years or so, but it also has a network of long-time correspondents and stringers. This practice is seen as part of the company’s organisational identity, the shared understanding among the members of an organisation of who they are and of what makes the organisation distinctive from other organisations (De Bruin, 2000b: 229). The practice of mobility and international experience is seen as a central feature of the organisational identity, as well as an enduring and distinctive feature (Albert and Whetten, 1985: 264).
Further, interviewees who are not mobile express how their emotional and intellectual mobility influences both their professional and social identities. This is demonstrated in the following quote:

“I think the idea that one is always thinking about what might make a good story shifts the way one views the world, and whether you’re reading something else, or watching TV, or overhearing a conversation, or you come across a book or an article, and just thinking, oh, that’s like a little corner of the world that I want to know something more about, I think that actually cultivates a creative personality, in a way.” (7, NY)

The social identities of journalists become a valuable asset because their professional identities make use of interviewees’ personal experiences. This finding supports Van Ginneken’s argument (1998: 214) that we need to stop pretending that news reporting is neutral. Instead, we need to admit that “news often implies views” (1998: 214). This is why media companies need to broaden their recruitment of journalists to encompass a range of nationalities, ethnicities, classes, gender and languages. In order to explain the news, editors in this study have emphasized the need for opinions and perspective. However, when it comes to the two different locations, London and New York, interviewees largely voiced similar opinions on mobility, and the role of their social identity.

Editors in London and New York shared the central features of their professional identities, while differences were related to organisational identities rather than location. Nygren and Stigbrand argued that globalisation and technological developments “have brought a sharing of techniques and formats, as well as professional attitudes” (2014: 842). They argue that the question remains whether this is homogenisation or whether ideals look similar on the surface, but their interpretation and the way they are fulfilled differs according to journalists’ location and culture (de Burgh, 2005). One British editor who works in New York explained that journalists still hold cultural clichés about each other:

“What’s not quite helpful is that journalists from England bumptiously assume that Americans are just kind of rather dry, sort of puritanical, by-the-rules people who don’t have much flair. And with equal myopia and partial-sightedness, Americans assume that English journalists are kind of gobby, glib, witty-but-superficial people without intellectual curiosity.” (13, NY)

However, it should be noted that the interviewee is a British editor who works in New York, which is why he does not fit into a fixed national category, but his identity has shifted over time. He has a
heightened awareness of mutual clichés and he does not take them too seriously. Further, he came to the conclusion the digital developments have diminished perceived cultural differences:

“...one of the good things about the online situation is that the cultures meet a bit more than they used to... Particularly think of The Guardian US outfit. As readers are reading across publications... for instance, if I’m looking at my Facebook feed on my Twitter in the morning, the things that my English friends are recommending are the same as the things that my American friends are recommending. And their little comment... would be the same. So, in that sense, I think the readership’s probably ahead of the institutional clichés that persist to some extent.” (13, NY)

This quote supports Reese’s argument that “ultimately, it may be more useful to recognise that globalising media and journalism simply mean that the creators, objects, and consumers of news are less likely to share the same nation-state frame of reference” (2010: 348). The nation-state was a frame of reference in the analysis of one of the three levels of identity analysed in this chapter: (1) Nationality was not a major theme in relation to editors’ social identities; (2) Nationality was not usually invoked in relation to professional identity and professional values were similar among editors in London and New York in this study; (3) Nationality was invoked as a frame of reference in relation to organisational identity, as editors explained the origins and style of their publications (this point is discussed in chapter 6). However, The New Yorker was more often described as city-based – its name reveals its organisational identity. And The Economist and Intelligent Life Magazine have elements of British-ness (in terms of its spelling, language, humour and place) and were often described as global (in terms of its outlook, interest and reach) which will be discussed in chapter 6.

4.3. The appreciation of difference and identities

Borrowing from Beck’s principle of recognition (2006: 7) and Silverstone (2007: 11-12) who argued that “the new cosmopolitan is assumed to be free from the trying and oppressive loyalties of the singular community. In the ideal world such a figure is mobile, flexible, open to difference and differences”, this study has conceptualised the cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference. This appreciation of difference can be further explained by means of the distinction drawn by Hollinger, who writes that we can “distinguish a universalist will to find common ground from a cosmopolitan will to engage human diversity” (2000: 84). In the context of this study, it is journalists’ appreciation of the diversity of those practicing the profession as well as the diversity of their audiences. Diversity refers to a variety of social identities with regard to nationality, ethnicity and gender. Appreciating diversity means the desire and intention to include various voices in journalism. An inclusion of
different voices could make intercultural communication a standard element in the journalistic repertoire (Van Ginneken, 1998: 214).

This study found that editors view the diversification of social identities among their editorial staff as a necessary and desired feature. Beck has argued that the process of cosmopolitanisation has brought about an internal globalisation (2002: 17) which brings with it an increased awareness of diversity. Similarly, in this study a central sentiment shared among editors is that a more varied pool of voices is needed. This finding has different elements illustrated in the following quotes:

“Obviously we would like our staff to be more diverse than it is both with more women and more non-whites... and actually we had a bit of a demographic problem in that we had too many old people.” (38, Lon)

This quote demonstrated the power of organisational identity. While the interviewee expresses a desire for a more diverse range of staff members, there is an established group of people who still dominate the organisation at large. In the following quote an interviewee speaks out against the dominant voice of journalism:

“I am really allergic to like these alpha male, conceit stories... where the middle-aged male writer comes up with an idea for a story and they’re so good at writing stories that they execute the concept perfectly with like totally air-tight prose and it’s done and I read it and I’m like, oh, fuck this, this is so boring to me.” (15, NY)

Another interviewee traces the slow process of diversification that has taken place over the last five years:

“I think things have changed in the last, maybe, five, or six years... I think there is more diversity, but still at sort of a senior level there isn’t... the media is still very representative of a very certain person... well educated, upper class white men really. So often the opinion you get in newspapers and the media is one opinion. It’s not a working-class opinion. It’s not an opinion by someone who was an immigrant; it’s a very specific opinion... there are some great writers now who have different opinions. But, it’s taken a long time to get there.” (40, Lon)

A greater representation of women and minorities is desired among interviewees, but the quotes also reveal that the process of editorial diversification has been a rather slow one over the last five years. Scholars have argued that the journalistic profession is undergoing a global process of “feminization” (Djerf-Pierre, 2007; Lavie and Lehman-Wilzig, 2003; Saitta, 2013; van Zoonen, 1998b). At first, researchers thought that once women reach a “critical mass” as journalists, they will be able
to influence story selection and reporting techniques (Mills, 1997). But, De Bruin and Ross have criticised this research approach they call the “body count” (2004: vii) which focuses on the numbers of women in journalism, as too narrow. In her article on the VIDA project, which counts bylines of female and male journalists, Miriam Markowitz wrote in The Nation: “Counting is crucial, but it is not a conversation; it’s arithmetic.” (2013)6. This is why this study analyses the perceptions and actors of individual actors in relation to gender and diversification.

Previous studies have found that men lack self-consciousness about gender, because male journalists never needed to choose between gender sensibility and professional sensibility (Steiner, 1998: 159). The findings in this study confirm that male journalists do not reflect on their own gender identity in the editorial process, while women tend to reflect on their gender. However, some male editors in this study exhibit a degree of reflexivity on gender imbalance and female gender identities. Thematic analysis revealed that while a key narrative shared by research participants is on the increasing awareness for the need of editorial diversity, female interviewees are able to qualify and support this need with arguments. In particular, female editors perceive specific gender differences between their male colleagues and themselves in relation to work practices, skills and preferences, while most male editors not. My question catalogue for interviews included direct questions about gender, which varied slightly depending on the exact role of the editor. When interviewees were asked whether there are any issues they write about that their male/female colleagues do not write about, or whether there are any issues they are interested in, that their female/male colleagues are not interested in, female editors were more likely to notice a difference as demonstrated in the following three quotes:

“I enjoy picking out debut novelists, whereas, many fiction reviewers would only pull out the kind of established prizewinning authors. So I quite like to pull out the good new ones; I think that’s more of a... female staff do that.” (8, Lon)

“I’ve written a lot about gay rights, transgender rights, intersex rights” (21, NY)

“And there are books that I choose from time to time, that probably wouldn’t get chosen, if the books editor was a man.” (30, Lon)

6 http://www.thenation.com/article/177269/heres-everybody?page=0,0 19 November 2013
Both female and male editors expressed a desire to have a greater representation of both women and minorities in journalism. However, women qualified the differences between female and male editors, while male editors did not. There are differences between how male and female editors perceive their work and working practices in terms of sourcing, access and topic preferences. Female editors were more likely to characterise their work as a function of promoting diversity by sourcing and accessing non-majority source. When I asked male editors whether there are any differences between them and their female colleagues, the majority of male interviewees responded in very few words, saying: “No” (17, Lon), “No, I don’t think so. No, not at all” (18, Lon), “I don’t know” (1, Lon), “No, not really.” (15, NY) It might be the case that male interviewees responded in this way because they did not want to be seen as making a difference between themselves and their female colleagues which could be interpreted in a negative or discriminatory way. Especially considering the fact that they faced a female interviewer, me. But, it might also be the case that female editors are simply more perceptive to what it is that makes them different, because it concerns them more than their male counterparts. In any case, social identity is still perceived as a defining category among editors.

While women had to previously distance themselves from notions of feminism (Steiner, 1998: 156), feminist issues have now become a mainstream topic in journalistic debate, and the women in this study are keen to contribute. Van Zoonen has previously posed two important questions (1998b: 34): Firstly, she questioned whether journalists have sufficient autonomy in their day-to-day work to perform in a uniquely individual (and in this case gendered) manner, and this study has shown some of the ways in which female editors have the autonomy to express their gender identity. Secondly, van Zoonen asked whether female journalists are distinguished by their gender more than by any other dimension of their identity, such as professionalism or ethnicity (1998b: 34). This study found the female journalists are primarily distinguished by their profession than by their gender, but they still feel that their gender gives them a particular set of skills and viewpoint. This finding complements and supports previous studies, which employed content analysis and revealed that women journalists differ from men in their sourcing strategies, for instance, by using female sources of their stories (see, for instance, Armstrong, 2004; Sutcliffe, Lee and Soderlund, 2005).

Thematic analysis revealed that gender emerged as a theme at different points throughout the interviews of female editors. It emerged as a result of questions on career backgrounds, mobility and future plans. Female editors were more likely to comment on the choices they make in relation to
their work-life balance and family life, as well as the choices they have made or are likely to make in the course of their career, as illustrated in the quotes below:

“I’d noticed that the only women in senior management on the paper, so anything higher than a desk editor, were those who had stay at home husbands, this is women with children or didn’t have children at all, I saw that and took that on board. But I did manage to keep the career ticking over while I was away, while I was at home, as I said, by writing, editing, doing as much freelance work as I could get my hands on, that worked really well.” (5, Lon)

“I think I’m very unlikely to live anywhere else but London now for the rest of my life. Yes, and I mean the children are at school in London, so it’s not very likely.” (36, Lon)

[On the topic of travel:] “Not so much, because my daughter is still at home, finishing school this year. So I try not to be away too often, too long. But you can’t do what I do and not get out there and go and see what’s on and hear people talking about things.” (31, Lon)

Such sentiments were echoed among female editors with families. Franks has previously argued that the thing that so often determines whether women are reaching senior posts in journalism is whether they have family responsibilities (2013: vii). In addition, Franks stated that female journalists in senior positions are far less likely to have children compared to their male counterparts. The above quotes illustrate how female editors, who are both in very senior positions and who do have children, have gone through a considerable effort, and have made conscious choices to be able to combine their work with their private life.

When it comes to the topics journalists tend to cover, some scholars have argued women tend to cover topics which can be seen as an extension of their domestic responsibility (Van Zoonen, 1998b: 34). Topics characterised as “feminine” (or of particular appeal to women) include children, women’s health, workplace equity, consumer affairs, reproductive rights, education, poverty, minority affairs, family life, women’s sports, fashion and social protest (Beam and DiCicco, 2010: 395). In contrast, political, business and financial reporting have historically been considered male subjects (Franks, 2013: 29).
Van Zoonen has argued that commercial forces in journalism which value “human interest”, audience needs and desires, and emotional investment, may open up the profession to women journalists (1998b: 41). While being “feminine” was previously at odds with being a good journalist, Van Zoonen argues that this new kind of journalism allows women to bring their femininity to work. She concludes that being “one of the girls” might simply be enough. However, she concedes that the contempt for market-driven journalism among serious journalists, expresses that the things women do or like, are still not valued very highly. This argument was echoed by one female editor in this study who said:

“I think there still remains…a sort of, casual – in a sense that it’s thoughtless – sense that there are women subjects that are less important than men subjects […] There are still ultra-female things that I probably wouldn’t cover, teenage romantic, what used to be bodice rippers… but that’s because I know that most of our readers are men.” (30, Lon)

There are two noteworthy aspects in the above quote. First of all, the editor is conscious of a hierarchy of male versus female subjects. But secondly, she views her role in relation to these topics as somewhat independent. This feeling was echoed by another female editor who said:

“I think, in some magazines and websites, you see women writing about family oriented subjects, but I don’t think that really holds true here… It’s more about being – keenly observing something and getting at it that way.” (10, NY)

Editors may feel that “female” subjects are valued less than “male” subjects. But the editors themselves view their role as part of their professional and organisational identity. Thus, organisational and professional identity overrides gender identity, which echoes De Bruin’s finding (2004: 13) that the identification with professional and organisational identities among female journalists overrides social identification, especially in male-led newsrooms.

Both The Economist and The New Yorker are male-led newsrooms. The Economist’s media directory reveals that out of ninety-seven members of staff listed online, seventy-three are male and twenty-four are female. It is important to note The Economist recently appointed its first female editor, Zanny Minton Beddoes in January 2015, which received wide media coverage. However Franks cautions that the achievement of a few exceptional individuals does not necessarily mean that the landscape for women’s advancement in journalism has been transformed (2013: 36). She suggests that the entry of a few women in very senior positions is only the beginning of the solution and
warns that unless effort is continuously applied, very little will change in the long term. *The New Yorker* does not reveal the composition of its staff members online and individual editors did not provide any conclusive numbers either, but the Vida Count reveals that out of eight hundred and forty-three by-lines in 2014, five hundred and sixty-three were written by men and two hundred and eighty were written by women.

Thus, this study supports de Bruin’s argument that (2004: 13) that the identification with professional and organisational identities overrides social identification, especially among female journalists in male-led newsrooms. Within publications, however, gender divisions by subject are not definitive, since female editors also cover “male” subjects, such as politics, if that is part of their publication’s repertoire. Female editors referred to their social gender identity with reference to sourcing strategies which revealed an explicit intent for diversification. But when it came to topics, they viewed themselves as part of agents assimilating to an organisational identity of “who we are” as a news media company.

Similarly, Franks found that gender divisions by subject areas are not always so predictable. Despite cultural assumptions some parts of the political, financial and business news media, have a surprisingly balanced gender divide. As an example, Franks cites the *Financial Times*, which had the second highest number of female by-lines and employed more female journalists than any other UK national paper in 2011 (2013: 29). However, this study found that there is one subject where segmentation among gender lines is particularly evident. It is with writing on the subject of feminism and the changing circumstances of women, as the following three quotes demonstrate:

> “I think I write a considerable amount about feminism, and what I would call... I think that I am very interested in issues of marginality. And that’s probably what motivates most of my writing. That’s, intellectually, that’s what sort of drives me... Certainly men do write about that, but... I probably write more about that, than men do.” (21, NY)

> “The last one [piece] I’ve written was about women in work and the enormous changes that have taken place in the workplace, because women are coming in, and what that has meant for the economy and society and so forth.” (11, Lon)

> “I think that's probably another of the reasons why, potentially, male journalists are less likely to write about gender-based stories, because when we say gender-based they are often about women, and it's hard, it can be harder for men... to get access to write those kinds of stories.” (20, Lon)
These three quotes illustrate the reasons for why female editors are more likely to thematize issues of feminism in their work: an interest in issues of marginality, an interest in the changing circumstances for women at work, and the issue of access. Similar to the previous finding which illustrated that female editors are aware of gender differences in relation to sourcing strategies, this finding shows that female editors are aware of their particular interest in feminism and the changing circumstances within which women find themselves in the age of globalisation.

Gender is only one of a number of examples of disproportionality in the demographics of journalists. Across Europe and the U.S. journalists from minority ethnic backgrounds remain in the minority. In Sweden, Hultén and Graf found that 5.9 percent of journalists are foreign-born and only 2 percent are born in non-European countries (2011: 29). In Germany, Ouaj found that about 2-3 percent of journalists are from a migration background (1999: 42). In addition, a recent “American Society of News Editors” (Gertz, 2013) found that minorities compromise 12-13 per cent of American newsrooms. In the UK, Baines and Chambers published “Race matters: Widening ethnic diversity in journalism” (2012) to address the lack of ethnic diversity in the British newspaper industry. The “Society of Editors” (Benson, 2004) published a report on the employment of minority ethnic journalists in newspapers: Its findings include that 7 percent of editorial staff at the Financial Times are from an ethnic minority background and 16 percent are non-British white. At The Guardian 4.9 percent of the editorial staff are from minority ethnic backgrounds. “To say that there is room for improvement would be an understatement,” concluded the report.

In this study, one interviewee is from a mixed race background, she is a female senior editor. The fact, that only one interviewee in this study is not white, is telling. This is partly due to the sampling strategy but also somewhat representative of the relative lack of diversity. In the course of her career in the media, she has encountered many instances of discrimination in relation to both ethnicity and gender: “I’ve been handed people’s coats at events, thinking I’m a maid” and during job interviews “I’ve had people saying this can’t be your CV”. She was consistently told that she would never get an editorial job “because you’re too young and you’re a woman”. Once she had a job as an editor, she was at times mistaken for her only other colleague who was also a woman with a mixed race background.

This supports previous research, which argued that female journalists from ethnic minorities face a double jeopardy (Coleman Broussard, 2004; Volz and Lee, 2013) because they are made to carry the
burden of both racial and gender discrimination in the professional world. The interviewee explained that she faced challenges based on her gender as well as her ethnicity, and she had to display immense grit and persistence in order to achieve her current positions. In interviews with interviewees from non-minority backgrounds, ethnicity rarely featured as a theme. The interview guide included a question on ethnicity in the background questions section, but unlike education or language skills, this category did not usually lead to further discussion among other editors. If I had formulated the interview questions differently, results might have been more conclusive.

Previous studies have argued that journalists from a minority background experience their work differently from journalists from a majority background. Slay and Smith argued that African American journalists have few role models in their organisation to emulate (2011: 86). Newkirk suggested that journalists from minority backgrounds have a special sensitivity when covering stories about subjects unlike themselves (2000: 7). Coleman (2011: 578) found out that minority journalists do not show a preference to story subjects of their own race. While this study cannot claim to be representative of editors from non-majority backgrounds, views and experiences of the interviewee in this study confirm the findings of previous studies, as illustrated by the following quotes:

“I definitely think in this country journalists look a certain way. They tend to be middle-class white people. So no one really was that convinced [that she would succeed as a journalist].” (2, Lon)

“I’ve always found it in an advantage to be a bit different, because often I’m commissioning all over the world. And I think people… when you go to shoots they want to kind of get to know you, people kind of relax a bit, because often the people you’re commissioning are different. They stood out in some way, which is why you’re actually paying attention to them.” (2, Lon)

“But I have had some older men who just haven’t really… [it has] taken them a long time to believe I’m any good.” (2, Lon)

Among the majority of editors, however, there was little reflection on this topic among non-minorities. This finding supports Beck’s argument that “in societies where whites are dominant, being white means having the privilege of not noticing that one is white” (2006: 53). Further, it is interesting to note that “difference” is felt by editors who look differently, rather than editors who have a migration background or dual citizenship, more generally. A similar sentiment was echoed by
The Times journalist Sathnam Sanghera (2005) who argued that the way we understand diversity in journalism is flawed because it is often perceived in terms of race and looks rather than geographical background and mobility. This finding echoes Beck’s notion of the “prison error of identity” (2006: 25). To explain this notion, Beck-Gernsheim has aptly provided an example from the German context: A person with an unusual name and dark skin colour might face the “where-are-you-from-originally” dialogue (2004: 171) simply because he or she looks differently, albeit being from the same country as the enquirer.

Van Zoonen has previously questioned whether women journalists are distinguished more by their gender than by other dimensions of identity such as their specialization or ethnicity (1998b: 34). This study found that organisational identification was the most dominant frame of reference among interviewees. At all three publications editors spoke of the distinctive “voice” of their publication. At The Economist journalists write anonymously and they write in one voice, under one banner and guided by The Economist’s “style guide”. Stories are the result of a “collaborative effort” they are usually written by one or two journalists, and subsequently, further journalists edit, rewrite and develop each other’s texts. Editors at The Economist described its organisational identity as “a product of a liberal society”, defined by a set of fundamental ideas and beliefs which are “socially liberal” and economically “free market” and “small government” oriented. It takes a “macro” view and it has an outlook which has been described by one male senior editor as “a very international outlook; there’s nowhere that we’re not interested in”. In terms of the language one interviewee said:

“The language has gotten a bit more global and a bit less British in the time I’ve been at the Economist but we still use English spelling... there is a certain emotional restraint that goes into writing for the Economist that’s somehow British.” (16, Lon)

The New Yorker also has a distinctive “voice and tone”. One female junior editor explained: “the thing that defines The New Yorker is complaining about New York”. It subscribes to a form of literary journalism, here described as “narrativised reporting”, which sets it apart from other publications and constructs its “DNA”, as one interviewee said:

“The thing that The New Yorker does, of narrativised reporting, isn’t something that everyone subscribes to. Michael Kinsley, you may know, has an almost ideological objection to it. He thinks that it’s essentially just a fake way. You know, if you’ve got an opinion and a bunch of facts you want to relay, why not write like a news article? Why look for a main character? Why are you pursuing this strange, artificial hybrid that thinks it’s literature, but in all but a few cases probably isn’t? And, you know, that’s a completely
reasonable point of view. That was probably just as well he didn’t become the editor of the magazine, as he almost did, because he would have wanted to change its DNA very deeply.” (1, NY)

He added: “I think there’s a limit to how many times you’d want to be, like, standing in the pulpit telling people things. I think we want to be engaging them, questioning them, amusing them, pushing them, surprising them.” Similarly, an editor from The Economist explained the organisational identity of her publication by relating that surprise is an important consideration:

“in a sense of, you thought XYZ, actually ABC is true, I’m going to show you a different way of looking at something that you thought you knew about” (20, Lon)

Therefore both The New Yorker and The Economist put particular emphasis on the way in which they interpret and narrate stories. The Intelligent Life Magazine was characterised as “long-form journalism” that can “get under the skin of a subject” at the same time it is “visually sophisticated”. It was founded in 2007; one editor explained the considerations that arose in the beginning:

“We took as our starting point an Economist reader when they weren’t reading The Economist. So, we imagined people, intelligent, sceptical, interested in the world, not parochial, you know, people with a global view, open minded. Politically we just left that open, you know, we didn’t want to have politics. We weren’t going to cover politics so we left the politics out of it. We didn’t imagine that they would be male or women but we thought very probably, at least to start off, they would be mostly men because that’s The Economist readership, more skewed towards men than women.” (41, Lon)

The Intelligent Life Magazine was described as having “a British voice and a global outlook”. This British voice was characterised as “a bit of quiet elegance, I think” and “we don’t write very much in the first person”. All three publications place a high value on their distinctive voices. While journalists at The Economist write anonymously in one distinctive voice, the other two publications run by-lines where authors can display a wide range of voices. This finding affirms and illustrates previous conceptualisations of interpretative journalism (Salgado and Strömbäck, 2011: 149) as going beyond descriptive, fact-based or source-driven journalism; entailing greater journalistic control over news content and a more prominent journalistic voice.
Overall, editors in this study displayed a high degree of satisfaction related to their organisational and professional identities. Clashes between these two identities were more likely to occur among young junior editors, who felt constrained by either specific senior editor’s autonomy or the organisational identity. One junior editor said:

“Sometimes I want to get weird, you know, and it’s hard to get weird here but I also have so much respect for, like, the institution of the magazine so I’ll defer to that. But eventually I’ll get weird somewhere else maybe.” (5, NY)

Another editor explained that his social identity clashes with his organisational identity on the topic of religion:

“Occasionally, you bump up with The Economist line and I’m a bit less secular than the... I think The Economist sometimes takes a slightly dismissive attitude to religion, which slightly bothers me. And I thought our line on gay marriage was... well, I basically support gay marriage; I thought they didn’t take sufficient account of the sincerely held sort of religious beliefs of those who oppose it. So, yes... there’s always a little bit of tension between me trying to persuade colleagues and going to editorial meetings, saying, come, we need to change our line on this, it’s not working. And sometimes I win, sometimes I lose.” (17, Lon)

This quote demonstrates a clash between the interviewee’s social and organisational identities. However, the interviewee also perceives to have an amount of autonomy in shaping his organisation’s identity. Pollard (1995) found that journalists were more satisfied with their jobs if they had more professional control, which is characterised as autonomy, authority and control over their work. Autonomy has been established as one of the main determinants of journalists’ job satisfaction in previous research (Beam, 2006; Chan, Pan and Lee, 2004; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1996). The issue of autonomy will be explored in detail in chapter 5.

To conclude, I showed that interviewees expressed a desire to have a greater representation of both women and minorities in journalism. However, women qualified the differences between female and male editors, while male editors did not. Only one editor in this study was from an ethnic minority. While there is increasing awareness of gender, there is reason to believe ethnicity is still an overlooked aspect of journalists’ identities. While editors say they appreciate diversity, to some extent, the process of the diversification of social identities in journalism remains a very slow one.
4.4. Diverse audience awareness and identities

In his influential work *Deciding what’s News* (1979), Gans described that journalists know little about their audience and reject feedback from it. Similarly, Schlesinger suggested a “missing link” between BBC journalists and their audience, he wrote there is “no adequate point of contact with the audience for broadcast news; and there is, therefore, no sense in which one can talk of a communication taking place which is truly alive to the needs of the news audience” (1978: 106). However, the processes of globalisation and digitalisation have changed both the identities of audiences as well as editors’ awareness of them.

Diverse audience awareness is here defined as editors’ awareness of their diverse audiences, which is expressed imagining audiences characteristics and interacting and meeting with real audience members. Jovchelovitch writes that the work of representation is “not a mirror of the world outside” but it is rather “a symbolic labour that springs out of the interrelation between self, other and the object-world” (2007: 10). She argues that the new “subject of modernity confronts the world from the outside; his location is his own internal world, a new inner space, from which he draws the tools and procedures to confront the world outside” (2007: 17). This insight from social psychology helps to explain how editors’ identities relate to their diverse audience awareness. Editors who have experiences of different cultures are more likely to manifest a sense of diversity in relation to their audiences as well as their professional and organisational identities.

Additionally, the proliferation of online tracking tools means that editors have more information about their audiences than ever before. Further, their organisations encourage editors to get to know and engage with their audiences (see *New York Times Innovation Report*, Sulzberger, 2014). Thus, diverse audience awareness has become a feature of editors’ organisational identity. English-speaking audiences are increasingly scattered around the globe, and digital technologies have extended publications reach, exposure and relevance far beyond the communities of location. In order to remain in touch with their audiences, editors need to develop an acute awareness of their diverse audiences.

Foreign correspondents, especially freelancers, have traditionally served a great variety of audiences. Hannerz who interviewed foreign correspondents, described how foreign correspondent Eric Silver would write one story with the intention of selling it to different publications and
audiences across continents (2004: 75). This way, audience members who were continents apart would read the same articles. Thus, some foreign correspondents have tended to write for an audience of diverse social identities. This section analyses to what extent, if at all, editors are aware of the diverse social identities of their audiences.

One finding in this study is that there does not appear to be segmentation among gender lines when it comes to editors’ audience awareness. Previous studies have suggested that needs and desires of the audience are more important to women editors than to their male counterparts (Haworth, 2000; Lavie and Lehman-Wilzig, 2005; Weaver, 1997; Van Zoonen, 1998b). But, in this study both female and male editors were likely to express an interest in audience needs and desires, as demonstrated in the following quote by a male editor:

“I would love to think very specifically about what, let's say, a female readership would like to read... I do tend to think more broadly, this is a very personal thing, just about what might or might not interest people.” (7, NY)

Both male and female journalists displayed an interest in audience needs, characteristics and desires. This study found that about half of the group of editors interviewed are aware of and imagine their readers in various ways, including thinking of different audiences worldwide. About one third of correspondents think of themselves, their colleagues or their editor as the reader or as being similar to the reader.

“It’s myself, I think. Certainly, as a writer, I never put in a phrase that isn’t germane to me.” (13, NY)

The remaining four editors, all of whom are based in New York, don’t think of the reader at all. Those editors, who do imagine their readers (beyond themselves, their colleagues and their editor) think of their readers as certain groups of people, a certain type of person, which is illustrated in the following four quotes:

“I don’t think we’re aiming at an age demographic or a class demographic or a race demographic or a national demographic. I think we’re aiming at the demographic of the curious as defined by intellectual attributes rather than anything else.” (16, Lon)

“I think probably not so much based on their nationality as based on the idea of an Economist reader, who is somebody who is short on time, well-informed” (20, Lon)

“...it’s a retired dentist from the Midwest who’s interested in world affairs, maybe he’s investing a bit of money and... or maybe someone who’s a corporate treasurer at a big
company in Hong Kong, somebody who’s a bond trader in Dubai, maybe a law professor at a university in Germany.” (28, Lon)

“I think they’re overwhelmingly male, sort of age 40 and above, on average; they’re... over half of our readership is in America, and the rest is all over the world.” (8, Lon)

This is a significant difference to earlier studies which found that journalists know very little about their audience and have no interest in it either (Gans, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978). According to Quinn and Trench (2002: 5) the mass media have traditionally relied on their own judgement of newsworthiness, and a largely one-way mode of communication. Instead, this study shows that editors increasingly aware of the characteristics and tastes of their audiences. Not only are they aware of their audience, which is a shift from earlier studies (see, for instance, Schlesinger, 1978) but they are specifically conscious of their audiences diverse nationalities and locations.

Some scholars have argued that editors are becoming more aware of their audiences due to digitalisation and the new provision of tracking data (see, for instance, MacGregor, 2007: 280). Processes of globalisation and digitalisation have given new visibility to both journalists and editors on a global stage. Editors have spoken about their encounters with their audiences online, as illustrated by the following quote:

“My colleague, [name], for example... covered German politics for a while and he wrote something or another and someone said, oh, you can tell it’s some English idiot who’s written this. And he is in fact German so he then popped up in the comments in German and said, actually, I’m German – what do you disagree with? So, yes, being able to, sort of, de-cloak and confound stereo types where possible is a good thing, I think” (38, Lon)

This quote shows that one way in which they meet is in the comment sections of publications. Thus, the publication’s comment sections are perceived as a platform for interaction between editors and their audiences. In this particular instance, it was possible to unmask one reader’s cultural presumption and showcase the publication’s internal diversity.

Another finding that emerged as a core feature of the organisational identity among the London-based group of editors is to think of their audiences’ identity in terms of what they describe as a “psychographic” rather than a demographic. The idea of a psychographic was shared among editors at The Economist and is thus part of their organisational identity. Nonetheless, some editors stated that they think of their readers as being predominantly male. The general idea of trying to look
The above quotes demonstrate how processes of globalisation have changed the ways in which editors who are based in one location think of their audiences. They explicitly imagined their audiences as being interested in global affairs. On a more abstract level, this finding feeds back to Giddens’ quotes of time-space distanciation (1984: 377). Giddens argued that social relations have been lifted out from local contexts to the extent that “self” and “society” meet in a global milieu (1991: 32). The transformations that time-space distanciation has brought to the media and journalism, affect the ways in which editors are aware of their diverse audience, imagine their audiences in a global manner and make an effort to meet and interact with their audiences, in a thus far unprecedented way. The identities of journalists are becoming more diverse in a slow process. Meanwhile the diversity of their audiences has rapidly been brought to the fore through digital technologies, and editors’ try to reach out to new audiences in a difficult time of transition.
4.5. Conclusion

This chapter analysed cosmopolitan skills as defined in the previous chapter in relation to identities (social, organisational and professional). It explores the complex interplay of identities and their relation to cosmopolitan skills in the lives of the interviewees. The first section showed that editors tend to speak multiple languages and that they stated the importance of multilingualism in understanding a variety of cultural contexts. This is, particularly true of the older generation of editors.

In addition, interviewees expressed their wish to overcome their own social identities in their reporting and speak on behalf of those who are hindered by language. Editors read a range of sources, including non-English sources. However, the majority of their sources remain Western-centric. Therefore, editors’ skills to navigate different cultures are somewhat constraint by structural and organisational norms. Further, editors have an emotional and intellectual ability to navigate different cultures and unmask cultural clichés, but it is hard to verify to what extent they actually make use of this skill.

One third of editors have a migration background or dual citizenship. Nine out of thirty-one interviewees have previously worked as foreign correspondents for a few years at the publication they are currently working for. An additional nine of interviewees have previously worked abroad in another capacity, as freelance journalists and writers, or in another profession. This means that almost two thirds of correspondents have at one point in their career worked in a different country, experienced and reported from a different country. Therefore, editors have various experiences of mobility.

Diversification of editorial staff is also seen as a necessary and desired feature among editors, but the actual process of diversification has been a slow one. Female editors perceive specific gender differences between their male colleagues and themselves in relation to work practices, skills and preferences, while most male editors do not. Further segmentation among gender lines is particularly evident with writing about feminism. Only one interviewee in this study identified as mixed race, and the issue of ethnicity has largely remained undiscussed.

An awareness of and interest in their audiences has become commonplace among both male and female editors. Half of the group of editors interviewed are aware of and imagine their readers in various ways, including thinking of different audiences worldwide. About one third of interviewees
think of themselves, their colleagues or their editor as the reader or as being similar to the reader. The remaining four editors, all of whom are based in New York, don’t think of the reader at all. Overall, editors’ organisations encourage them to cultivate an awareness of their audiences.

As a result, in this chapter I found that editors’ organisational identities encourage them to make use of their cosmopolitan skills. Editors know how to navigate different cultures and they are physically, emotionally and intellectually mobile. When it comes to appreciating difference within their organisations, there is an increasing awareness of gender, but the issue of ethnicity remains neglected. Female journalists emphasize their organisational identity over the gender identity, whereas male journalists are largely unaware of gender identity. In his interviews with foreign correspondents, Hannerz concluded that the news publication was perceived to be more important than any individual correspondent (2004: 82). Similarly, organisational identity still trumps concerns of social and professional identities. When social or professional values clash with organisational identity, editors tend to align with the values of their organisational identity.

Another major finding of this chapter is that journalists do not predominantly use this category of nationality in defining themselves, whereas researchers of journalism predominantly do. The fact that national identity did not surface as a defining category, which supports Castells’ argument that people construct their identities from various sources in the global age (1997: 7). Whenever the notion of nationality played a role, it was with regards to organisational identity, which will further be discussed in chapter 6. The next empirical chapter analyses editors’ cosmopolitan skill in relation to their autonomy.
Introduction

The previous chapter analysed editors’ social identities, such as gender and ethnicity, as well as their organisational and professional identity. This chapter focuses on editors’ perceived autonomy and addresses the sub-question of “To what extent, if any, do journalists have autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills?” Previous research tended to focus on fast news and thus reduced journalists to the role of news-gatherers (see, for example, McQuail, 2000: 327; Örnebring, 2010: 61). A journalist has been defined as someone employed to engage in gathering, processing, and disseminating news and information to serve the public interest (Beaujon, 2013). However, such definitions omit the crucial autonomy the editors in this study have in the news-making process.

In journalism research, autonomy has been defined as the degree of judgment or ability to make personal decisions without being affected by external or internal constraints (Beam, 1990; Mellado and Humanes, 2012; Plaisance and Deppa, 2009). Autonomy is widely seen as a fundamental requirement and a strong ideal for professional journalistic practice (see, for instance, Althaus, 2003; Bourdieu, 2005; Deuze, 2005a; McDevitt, 2003; Weaver et al. 2007). Deuze has previously argued: “Reporters across the globe feel that their work can only thrive and flourish in a society that protects its media from censorship; in a company that saves its journalists from the marketers; in a newsroom where journalists are not merely the lackeys of their editors” (2005a: 448-9). However, journalists face a number of internal and external constraints on their autonomy at work, as previous studies have shown (see, for example, Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013; Shoemaker and Reese, 1996; Weaver et al. 2007).

Ideally, autonomy allows journalists to take a critical stance (Althaus, 2003: 382) and is widely seen as a fundamental requirement and a strong ideal for professional journalistic practice (see, for example, Althaus, 2003; Bourdieu, 2005; Deuze, 2005a; McDevitt, 2003; Weaver et al. 2007). The literature has analysed journalists’ autonomy and the constraints they face on three general levels. The first level relates to the societal and political autonomy of the press. It analyses the extent to which journalists are protected from governments, political parties, regulation, censorship and legislation (see, for example, Hallin and Mancini, 2004; Freedom House, 2014; Reporters without Borders, 2014). The second level relates to organisational autonomy such as issues of ownership (Picard and Van Weezel, 2008). The third level relates to the level of the individual and it analyses the extent to which journalists can make decisions free from internal factors such as higher editors and external pressures such as commercial factors (Gans, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978; Weaver and
This study concentrates on the level of the individual. It analyses in-depth interviews with editors to investigate their autonomy and the constraints to their autonomy in relation to internal and external factors. Reich and Hanitzsch have pointed out that the level of the individual journalist is a less studied area of autonomy (2013: 135) and this study makes a contribution to this particular literature on journalism.

This chapter analyses the findings related to the sub-question of the extent of autonomy editors perceive to have at work, the way they use their autonomy and the constraints they encounter in using their autonomy. Six domains of perceived constraints are analysed, as outlined in the next section on definitions. Interviewees were asked to talk about the freedoms and limitations they perceive to have at work, but themes of autonomy emerged at various times throughout interviews. Some interviewing questions were specifically aimed to address the issue of autonomy. In addition, interviewees addressed issues of autonomy when responding to questions of their role, career background, future plans, experiences of mobility, and questions relating to the perception of their audiences. Throughout the interview, I encouraged interviewees to provide examples and details to support what they were describing.

**Definitions of journalistic autonomy and its constraints**

Journalistic autonomy has been defined as the “latitude that a practitioner has in carrying out his or her occupational duties” (Weaver et al. 2007: 70). According to Reich and Hanitzsch (2013: 136) this definition incorporates two important facets. The first facet relates to journalists’ latitude within the routines of reporting. It encompasses issues such as the extent to which journalists are free to make decisions about stories they cover or edit, including the choice of story angles, sources, narratives and frames. The second facet relates to decision-making structures within the editorial hierarchy. It captures the extent to which journalists can influence decisions that affect their work beyond procedures of reporting, writing and editing. These facets reveal that this definition of autonomy includes both external as well as internal constraints. It is the most useful definition of autonomy for this chapter because it focuses on the extent to which practitioners are free to make decisions on which stories to cover and how to cover them.

However, it is important to note that autonomy is never absolute or unlimited. The autonomy of the individual professional in society and organisations is always restricted by internal and external constraints. In relation to the autonomy of journalists, Shoemaker and Reese (1996: 64) have proposed a hierarchical model of individual constraints on media content. Their model consists of
concentric circles, whereby the individual level (including the backgrounds, experiences and attitudes of individuals) is at the centre, followed by four further layers in the following order: (1) media routines level (including sources and audience orientations), (2) organisational level (including the organisation’s goals, economic constraints and ownership), (3) extra-media level (including the journalistic-source relationship, other media organisations, regulation and community relations) and (4) the ideological level (referring to the (changing) values of the industry). This chapter mainly concentrates on the level of the individual. This is why in-depth interviews have been chosen as the methodology. It helps to uncover the ways in which editors perceive their autonomy and its restrictions and constraints. Based on the analysis of their interviews, it is impossible, however, to say what the objective or representative restrictions to editors’ autonomy are. Instead, this chapter offers an analysis and an insight into editors’ individual perceptions.

One of the first large-scale international studies to analyse journalists’ perception of constraints on their work was conducted by Hanitzsch et al. (2010). Their findings indicate six domains of perceived influence: (1) political constraints (i.e. government, politicians and censorship), (2) economic constraints (i.e. profit expectations, need for advertisers, implications of audience research), (3) professional constraints (i.e. conventions and customs of the profession, conventions of specific newsrooms), (4) procedural constraints (i.e. resources of time and space), (5) organisational constraints (i.e. higher editors and ownership), as well as (6) reference groups (colleagues in other media, competing news organisations, audiences, friends and family). They found that journalists perceive the latter four constraints strongly, while economic and political constraints remain relatively subordinate in the minds of journalists. This categorisation is useful for my study because it captures the main themes that emerged in the analysis of the interviews. For this reason I am using these categories in the analysis of this chapter. It is important to emphasise that autonomy and its constraints are two sides of the same coin – it is impossible to study one without the other. Analysing the constraints editors face shows us where their autonomy lies.

Hanitzsch et al (2010: 15) have defined procedural constraints to include various operational constraints faced by the journalists in their everyday work. These constraints largely come about in the form of limited resources in terms of time and space. Another important aspect of procedural constraints is that news production is a highly a routinized process, and journalists have to deal with these procedures and the limitations these procedures impose on their work. The most frequently raised perceived constraints of editors on their autonomy in this study fall into the category of economic and political constraints, but other constraints were raised too.
In summary, this chapter presents the findings that resulted from the thematic analysis of editors’ perceived autonomy and the political, economic, professional, procedural, organisational and referential constraints to their autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills. The question of “To what extent, if any, do journalists have autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills?” is answered in four sections. Each section relates to one global theme, represented by one of the four cosmopolitan skills, and is supported and explained through its supporting organising themes, as presented in Table 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmopolitan skill</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Autonomy and constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Skills of navigating different cultures                | • Editors feel very autonomous; they are aware of having internalized organisational identity  
• Editors know how to navigate the laws and regulations of various countries  
• Social media gives them space to cover niche foreign coverage – example of the Mexico story | • Professional  
• Political (domestic and international)  
• Procedural |
| Mobility                                               | • They still value physical mobility over mediated mobility in their reporting  
• Many interviewees have been foreign correspondents for a few years and this informs their work now | • Economic  
• Professional  
• Reference |
| Appreciation of difference                            | • Editors emphasise the need to speak to a variety of people and go beyond official sources  
• Editors are able to commission from various sources depending on their tastes  
• Those journalists they send to report about a place usually have ties/insight to that place  
• Editors value being an “outsider”  
• Editors have the ability to express their opinions | • Professional  
• Organisational |
| Diverse audience awareness                            | • Some editors have the chance to meet their readers, have conducted focus groups  
• Editors place this awareness of different audiences at the core of their work as editors. | • Reference |

Table 5: Cosmopolitan skills and six kinds of autonomy and its constraints
5.1. The skill of navigating different cultures

5.1.1. Professional autonomy and its constraints

Previous studies have shown that the newsroom is strongly conditioning news work (Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013; Weaver et al. 2007). Once journalists internalise their news organisation’s “line” or “attitude”, they tend to reproduce it continuously and “almost unconsciously” (Preston and Metykova, 2009: 72). In his study of US men’s lifestyle magazine editors, Draper (2014: 1126) also discovered that there is a gap between how editors in his study perceive their autonomy (as unbounded) and how their agency actually is (bounded). He introduced the concept of “discerned savvy” to describe the knowledge that results from editors’ attempts “to informally gauge the limits of acceptable creativity by coming to understand and adopt the perceived expectations of their superiors” (2014: 1126). The previous chapter has shown that editors possess the skills of navigating different cultures. This chapter analyses in how far editors can use these skills and what the constraints they encounter.

In this study editors are aware of the boundaries set to their autonomy. This, however, does not neglect the fact that they internalize the kind of knowledge described by Draper (2014: 1126). Editors expressed a familiarity with the established norms of their workplace, as well as perceiving to holding a relatively high degree of autonomy within these norms. When I asked one editor whether she feels completely free or limited by anything in her work, she explained:

“I think this is probably as good as it gets in terms of being able to say what you like. I think it probably wouldn’t terribly work terribly well if you wanted to argue for very regulated markets and a huge state providing welfare services, because we are quite free-market and we are, in principle, in favour of a smaller state. But all with reservations; it’s still got to work. For instance, we believe that the National Health Service is a good thing, even though it is part of a state provided health system; we think, for instance, it works better than in the United States where a large part of it is private, but it consumes a huge amount of the gross domestic product. So... yes, up to a point, you have to sort of understand that you’re working for a free market paper. But in terms of actual truth, I would be appalled and astonished to find that – if I came up with something that I had verified and wanted to print and it was a reasonable point and interesting - if any editor on this Paper wanted to prevent it being published for any sort of ideological reasons.”(11, Lon)

The above quote illustrates that while editors follow the editorial line, they have internalised these values consciously and they actively think about and question these values, rather than internalising them unconsciously. This finding contrasts previous findings by Draper (2014: 1127) who argued that
editors internalise their organisational values and leading editor’s tastes unconsciously. When I asked another female senior editor whether she feels limited by anything in her work, she said:

“I’m not sure that I have written anything very controversial, because I don’t think it’s quite my role on the magazine. It’s never really been tested. So it may happen yet, but I would guess they would be pretty supportive, yes.” (36, Lon)

This quotation shows the limitations set by the particular responsibilities or “role” of the editor, but it also supports previous findings by Skovsgaard (2014: 358) who found that the relationship between journalists and their superiors is better characterised by consensus and agreement than conflict. Most editors in this study expressed that they are happy to raise topics with their colleagues and superiors.

The findings of this study support previous arguments that news environments strongly condition news work (Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013: 135). Preston and Metykova (2009: 72) have argued that once journalists internalise their news organisation’s “line” or “attitude”, they tend to reproduce it continuously and “almost unconsciously”. While this study supports the first part of their argument, it found evidence to disagree with the fact that editors reproduce their organisation’s line “unconsciously”. In contrast, the editors in this study were well aware of their organisation’s line, style or outlook and described the limitations they perceive as a result. Thus, the findings in this study differ from Draper’s study (2014: 1126) in that editors do not perceive their autonomy as unbounded. Instead, editors perceive many constraints to their autonomy, some of which stem from the amount of tasks, and the uncertainty over these tasks, they face:

“I think we’re always constrained by time, in the sense that more and more is demanded of us. Because there’s such a hurricane going through our industry, so we’re trying different things all the time. For instance – should we run a book club, should we do more videos, should we do more audio, should we have more books, should we have fewer book? Should we run international, global best seller lists? Should we interview authors? There’s still only 24 hours in the day. And everything has to be done well, it takes time.” (21, Lon)

This quote demonstrates that a broad range of constraints including economic constraints, organisational constraints due to uncertainty, create new pressures for editors. The professional autonomy of editors is perceived to be challenged by digital change and this aspect is further discussed in chapter 6.
5.1.2. Political autonomy and its constraints

Previous studies have analysed the extent to which journalists are protected from governments, political parties, regulation, censorship and legislation (see, for example, Hallin and Mancini, 2004; Freedom House, 2014; Reporters without Borders, 2014). Some studies have found that political constraints do not feature in journalists’ perception of their autonomy (Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Mellado and Humanes, 2012). It is important to state that journalists’ freedom from political constraints largely depends on the political system they operate in. In this study, all three publications are part of the Anglo-American media and thus, are often categorised as enjoying a high degree of freedom to operate without governmental control within their societies.

London-based editors expressed that they encounter constraints imposed by governments, politicians and censorship regulations when reporting in countries where the media is more under the control of the government. One editor explained that during his time as a foreign correspondent for his publication he used various stringers because of political constraints:

“There are various stringers that we’ve used in the region, including in Cuba, which is a difficult place for journalists to cover because you need a visa to go there, a journalist visa, and they don’t give them out very often. But in the rest of the region, it was just me on the whole.” (29, Lon)

Similarly, one senior editor emphasised how important it is to know “each country’s personality” As an example she spoke about sensitive topics and the difficulty to organise the logistics for a story which is not seen favourably by the government in question:

“But we just for example did a ten-day job in Cambodia, which was with Oxfam and that was quite complicated. We went to a prison, we went… it was about land grabs and the government is very sensitive. Not here, but in other places I’ve had people kidnapped.” (40, Lon)

At this point I am adding two sub-categories to political constraints – domestic and international constraints. This difference has not been drawn by Hanitzsch et al (2010), but it emerged as a theme in this study. London-based interviewees spoke about the political and legal constraints they face in the reporting of international news. In contrast, one New York-based editor expressed the difficulties he faces when dealing with US political and military institutions.
The domestic constraints he perceives are described in the quote below. The quote refers to a story entitled “Torture at Abu Ghraib,” by investigative reporter Seymour M. Hersh, published in The New Yorker on April 30, 2004. As a consequence of this article, The New Yorker became one of the first publications to break the story of the torturing scandal at the Abu Ghraib prison during the Iraq War. In his interview, one of the editors involved in publishing this story describes the difficulties of the process in the following way:

“[Seymour Hersh] really works largely off blind sources. He seldom goes to press conferences, because he thinks they’re a waste of time, and so we would then get his stories, which were often on issues of real significance, and inside The New Yorker there may be five or six people who would know who his blind sources were [...] We would then be the ones who would go to the CIA, the Pentagon, the White House, and tell them we were running these stories... we were making these allegations about torturing people at Abu Ghraib, or about secret plans for military build-ups... Then we would have to manage their responses, which were not cooperative responses.” (6, NY)

The interviewee explained that he would then have to manage the responses of these political bodies, which were not cooperative. He described that they were “mostly obstructionist in varying degrees”. In some instances they would “respond to something that wasn’t the question that you asked, and they would deny it adamantly, and say it’s completely untrue, and then you would look at the way they had formulated their response, and you would say, that’s not the question I asked. That’s a different, related question.” Further, they would send information and statements in after press deadlines and subsequently make complaints that their responses had not been included in the report. The interviewee concluded by saying that “it can be quite stressful, but it contributed significantly to the national dialogue... at that period of time, and still does.” In contrast to London-based editors who mainly described facing political constraints in the international arena, this New-York based editor mostly perceived them domestically. Apart from domestic political constraints, only one New York-based editor mentioned an international political constraint. This constraint was the UK libel law: “I think we have a lot of readers in England, because we’re always worried about libel law there. You people have a horrible libel law.” However, it is important to note that this was brought up in relation to questions about audiences rather than international constraints.

The difference between New York-based and London-based editors in this instance can be explained in the following two ways. Firstly, this difference may be explained through the different political orientation of the publications in this sample. For example, while The New Yorker published articles revealing mixed views about the Iraq war (Chait, 2011), The Economist initially supported the invasion, but later revised its stance (Anonymous, The Economist, 2013). Secondly, the finding may
be explained through the difference in focus, *The Economist* focuses on covering stories from all over the world, while *The New Yorker* remains New-York centric. *The Economist* is much more likely to face political constraints in the international arena, while *The New Yorker* encounters them domestically. Thus, differences in perceived political constraints are related to organisational identity which was discussed in the previous chapter. While editors possess the skills of navigating different cultures, the focus and discourses their publications participate in limits the areas where editors can use their cosmopolitan skills.

Editors aim to represent their publication in a favourable light across cultures. One example for this is the way editors use their cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures in relation to cultural appropriateness and potential offence. Further, cultural norms can constrain editors’ autonomy to choose certain images or examples. This point is demonstrated in the following quote:

“I believe we shouldn’t use bad words or even show... if we have a... cover which shows a nipple, even if it’s a piece of classical art... that will not sell in the Gulf, we’ll lose all the copies there... So you’re always trying to think, what am I actually trying to do here, and is there a way of doing this that will particularly please the readers in a way... and also not particularly offend other readers unnecessarily.” (17, Lon)

This quote shows the editor’s awareness of the fact that female nudity, even as a piece of classical art might cause offence in Arab countries, and his intention to avoid financial loss through offence. This quote is particularly poignant in relation to current debates on the role of offence and freedom of expression in journalism, following the *Charlie Hebdo* terror attacks in Paris on 7 January 2015. In the above quote, the intention to avoid offence is driven by pragmatic financial considerations, and it can also be viewed as an international political constraint. Sadly, the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks made clear that domestic and international political constraints (if it is possible to include terrorist organisations in this category at all) are no longer easily separable.

To conclude, this section on editor’s political autonomy and its constraints to navigate different cultures has found that editors encounter both domestic and international political constraints. London-based interviewees spoke about the political and legal constraints they face in reporting international news. In contrast, editors based in New York tended address the political constraints within their own nation. With the exception of UK libel law, New York-based editors did not address any limitations they may face to their autonomy in the international context. Some studies have found that political constraints are not perceived as an influence on journalistic autonomy because they do not emerge in the day-to-day work of journalism (Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Mellado and
Humanes, 2012). However, London-based editors expressed a wide range of constraints they perceive on their autonomy in reporting international news. They expressed that they encounter political constraints and constraints imposed by governments in some countries outside of the UK, including Cuba and Cambodia.

5.1.3. Procedural autonomy and its constraints

Procedural autonomy refers to journalists’ autonomy over resources of time and space, as well as autonomy within highly routinized procedures and standards of their organisations (Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 15). Procedural constraints include pressing news deadlines, a shortage of resources and procedures which journalists perceive as constraining to their autonomy. Many editors expressed their concerns about the constraints of format, space and time on autonomy. Their voiced concern can be summed up in this response, given by a male senior editor: “I think I never have enough space”. Similarly, one senior editor at The New Yorker explained: “I think the greater limitation is that The New Yorker - everyone says it’s so many words each week. It’s really only five pieces or so.” He explained that very few things that are discussed at “ideas meetings” actually end up in the magazines, and that very few ideas that the writers pitch end up in the magazine. One editor said: “Well, I’m limited by length. I’ve quite a small slot in the magazine, so I try and make it sort of sparky.”

Editors at all three publications complained about the scarcity of space they have to cover all the topics and ideas they are interested in. Their concern over length and not being able to fit a piece into the print edition shows the prevalence and relative importance given to the news stories in print over news stories that solely appear online. On the digital platforms, editors have boundless space to publish their stories, but they remain focused on the printed flagship product of the publication. None of the three publications in this study are published on a daily basis in print, but rather on a weekly or bi-monthly basis. One editor contrasted his situation with the situation of being limited by space to the situation of an editor at a daily newspaper:

“...whereas, if I were on weekend section at some English newspaper, it would be like, I’ve got 18 columns to fill, Saturday, Sunday. Could you do something for me on your garden? And the question would be, why not? ...Whereas the question in the pages of the magazine - not the website, but the pages - is why? And that can be quite oppressive. I think everyone struggles with that a bit, because everyone has the piece that they wanted but didn’t happen. Everyone thinks the piece could have been longer. That sort of limitation is bruising to deal with for people who work there. But the advantage of it, for the reader, is
This quotation elucidates the difference between the “slow news” publications analysed in this study, and newspapers, which have received comparatively more attention in journalism research. Editors in this study perceive space as a constraint on what they can and cannot do. The scarcity of space has been described as one of the major limitations of their autonomy. However, this limitation largely applies to printed space rather than digital space. All three publications in this study have online platforms, where articles are published in addition to those published in print. When it comes to topics that are slightly on the fringe, the problem of space is resolved online, where space is not an issue. One editor describes that one story he wrote was not perceived to be suitable for the print edition of *The Economist*; instead it became a widely read story online.

“I wrote a story in Mexico about a scandal to do with the governor of Mexico State, which is a big state in Mexico, fiddling the murder rate in his state. And this was especially important because this guy later became the president, and everybody knew at the time that he was the frontrunner to become the president. And I wrote this story about how he’d been very misleading about the murder rate in his state; it was actually double what he’d said. And we decided that it just was a bit too local to really make it into The Economist, in the printed issue. But I wrote about it for the web; I did a blog on it and the story in Mexico was huge. It was very, very widely read and it was during the presidential debates one of the candidates held up a copy of my story, on TV and said, look, The Economist said this. So it was one of my biggest stories in Mexico but we didn't cover it in the print edition and the reason was just because it was too detailed. It was too local and it was a bit too... not sufficiently interesting for people who didn't already know about Mexico. So that was one example of a constraint, but I think that's a reasonable constraint.”(29, Lon)

This shows that digital transformations are perceived as an opportunity for editors to autonomously report stories that might not have been published in print, due to considerations of space or the level of detail. Thus, new digital platforms are perceived to provide more autonomy and give editors the opportunity to overcome some of the procedural constraints they face. Similarly, previous studies found that journalists felt greater creative and journalistic autonomy thanks to digital technologies (Dickinson and Bigi, 2009: 521; Hemmingway, 2008: 95).

Digital media platforms provide editors with additional spaces to cover niche topics of international news. A story that might not have been deemed important enough to be published in print, finds its way to publication online instead. The editor explained that “the internet is quite good in that sense because it means that you can cover some of these subjects via a different medium”. He explained that the aforementioned story about Mexico was most relevant to *The Economist* readers in Mexico,
who access The Economist online anyway: “You can stick it on the internet and people in the country itself will read it there because most of our readers in Mexico read The Economist on the web, I think.” This quotation, once again, reveals the editor’s interest and awareness of his readership. Because publications have more space online, than in print, stories that are relevant to readers outside of Anglo-American audience are likely to be published online. There, they are read by readers outside of the Anglo-American audience who are more likely to read the publication online rather than in print as well.

In addition to giving space to very local stories, the online platforms of well-known publications provide space, which is otherwise scarce, for the younger and less senior editorial staff members. One editor describes The New Yorker’s website as “a great venue”, she has written a few dozen pieces for the website, which “has grown a lot, just incidentally, in the time that I’ve been here. I feel really comfortable writing for it now. The web is infinite in a sense. But The New Yorker doesn’t run 10,000 word essays on its website, that weren’t also in print. So, yes, so I would say in terms of length, that has limited me.” Thus, the abundance of space online offers less senior editors the chance to contribute stories to the publication. In some cases, the format or length of articles online might however be restrictive in itself.

Further, it emerged that editors’ procedural autonomy is constrained in relation to digital platforms and fact-checking. While the New Yorker has sixteen fact-checkers, they mainly focus on the print edition of the magazine. Meanwhile, articles written for the print are very closely proofread and fact-checked. Financial constraints were further mentioned in relation to fact-checking resources. These quotes demonstrate the difference in resources allocation between the slow and fast component of news publications:

“I recognise that at this point in time all journalistic enterprises are financially stressed. We’re doing pretty well, but we’re still financially stressed. It’s a tremendous luxury and investment to have 16 fact checkers” (19, NY).

“[Printed articles] those pieces are written with a view to creating a bundle once a week of stuff and if you read all that stuff you’re informed. So that bundle is put together in a very careful way to fit together and be a, sort of, representative round-up of the week’s events, an analysis of the week’s events. So those pieces go through the editing pyramid, they’re very, very closely edited and fact-checked and all the rest of it. The blog posts that we do on the daily cycle are not fact-checked. They mostly go through one editor but that’s all and many of the bloggers are actually editors themselves so they can just blog straight out.” (38, Lon)
Another editor explained that especially online, not all stories get fact-checked because the volume is simply too high. This leads to less accurate pieces online compared to stories published in print. This finding echoes a survey conducted by Navasky and Lerner (2010) which found that the majority of magazines surveyed deployed fewer resources to copy editing and fact-checking to their blogs, compared with their printed editions. In this study, too, procedures still focus on those articles that appear in print. But it can only be a matter of time for this balance to flip, and the following quotes show that editors work on shifting the focus from print to online, whereby the new online formats can also be part of slow news, as illustrated in the second quote:

“I’m sort of also a part of just conversations about how the department is functioning and changing, and recently we’ve been figuring out a way to fact-check the website, and so I’ve been a part of those conversations in deciding what our standards are for online versus print, and figuring out a system of how we can sort of lend people in our department to the website, to do fact-checking.” (8, NY)

“Because most newspapers had a newspaper and then they launched a website and then they added an App and ...the idea that they should switch primarily to producing stuff for consumption on mobile devices is weird but if you start a news organisation today that’s exactly what you’d do. And you would also have, multimedia and data and inter-active stuff in there from the beginning so I just think, if you just repeatedly ask yourself, is this what we’d be doing if we were a start-up? And that’s one of the things we do. So we’re about to launch a new, basically, a new long-form format which I’m going to be editing and I’m doing it in a new way; I’m doing it as a digital first piece of content because that’s what we should be doing. It’s not going to be a print article that appears on the web and it’s not going to be a blog post that doesn’t appear in print. It’s going to be a new thing which is a piece of long-form intended to be consumed primarily digitally that will also, by the way, run in print. What would a start-up do, is always the question to ask yourself.” (38, Lon)

Moreover, the label of articles “in print” is no longer a wholly appropriate, because those articles that are printed are increasingly read on smartphones and tablet version of the publication, rather than on paper. However, one editor explained why the distinction still holds. It is largely due to the profitability of ads in print compared to those online, as demonstrated in the following quote:

“...whether they consume it online, or whether they consume it in printed form, ultimately, it shouldn’t matter. It’s just... for our business model it matters a bit, because full colour print ads, stretching over a page or two, are very profitable; on the web they’re less profitable.” (33, Lon)

The extension of publications into online platforms provides solutions to issues of space but also to issues of time. One editor said: “The fact that we can do things online gives us a little bit more scope to write a little bit more, especially out of the usual rhythm of the week”. If something happens after the publication has gone to print, journalists can publish stories and write blogposts on the online
platform. He added “we cover probably a bit more than we would have been able to if we didn’t have the technology”. However, this has fundamentally changed editors’ work patterns:

“We’ve got a website, obviously, which is refreshed every day; we put all the sort of latest stuff on there. So, instead of being a weekly operation, as it used to be, it is now a daily, even hourly operation; any expert that we’ve got on anything needs to be ready to rattle into action when something happens. And, it could be a Saturday night when they’ve just had a drink – too bad! In the old days you would finish the paper on the Thursday; you would come in for a meeting on the Friday, talk about what you might do next week, and then go home for the weekend. And you come in on the Monday and start talking about that week’s paper, and in-between; total peace. It’s not like that anymore. And it’s obviously difficult to be in this transitional state, because we don’t actually know how quickly our people are shifting to a new media...what people really feel about it, how long they spend there, how fast the transition is. So, it’s quite a difficult period... the last five years have been, maybe a bit longer. We've been seeing this coming, obviously, for a bit longer... I think for any publication, it’s quite a difficult period or transition.”

The above quote illustrates that technological change is perceived as both an opportunity and enabler of journalists’ autonomy but also a constraint on their autonomy to structure their work patterns.

The findings in this study support the findings of Hanitzsch et al., who explored the perceived prevalence of procedural constraints. Aspects of format, space and time were among the major constraints described by interviewees. Hanitzsch et al. previously found that procedural constraints are perceived to be among the most powerful limits to the work of journalists (2010: 17). They explained that this is due to the fact that journalists struggle with procedural limitations on a daily basis. Thus, the effects of these factors seem to be much more evident and tangible than external and more abstract constraints. This study supports their findings, because procedural constraints were the most frequently mentioned and most strongly perceived limitations.

5.2. Mobility

5.2.1. Economic autonomy and constraints

Previous research has found that economic constraints play a relatively subordinate role in journalists’ perception of their autonomy at work (see, for instance, Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Mellado and Humanes, 2012; Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013). Hanitzsch et al. (2010: 17) have stated that the subordinate importance of perceived economic constraints may contradict intuition, because their objective influence can hardly be denied (2010: 17). They explain their findings by suggesting that
economic constraints are rarely directly experienced by the average journalist. However, this study is concerned with editors, who hold a higher degree of editorial responsibility than the average journalist. I found that editors do perceive economic constraints as a limitation to their freedom. But rather than stemming from profit expectations, advertising revenues, market pressures or financial pressures resulting from audience research, as conceptualised by Reich and Hanitzsch (2013: 15), they perceive economic constraints through general budgeting decisions, such as travel budgets.

In relation to economic constraints, one male senior editor said: “I quite often think is it really worth blowing £2,000 of The Economist’s money to fly you to America for this? And money is limited, and in the end once you’ve spent on one thing you can’t spend it on another.” This quote shows that financial constraints are perceived as a factor in decisions on travelling budgets. However, it is important to note that the editor still holds a high amount of autonomy in deciding whether to spend money to travel and cover a certain story or not. Economic constraints are also perceived as constraints when it comes to foreign correspondents and foreign bureaus:

“For financial reasons, we can’t have correspondents everywhere; paid correspondents, but we do have paid correspondents in Paris, Brussels, Berlin and Moscow, and a semi-paid correspondent in Rome. But the rest of Europe is stringers or freelancers.” (19, Lon)

These findings echo the findings of “The New Global Journalism” report by Columbia’s Tow Centre (Niknejad et al. 2014), which found that financial pressures and technological developments have forced many news media organisations to close their international bureaus. While editors value physical mobility in their journalism, their autonomy to be mobile is constrained by economic concerns. Sambrook (2010) has questioned whether digitalisation and social media have made foreign correspondents redundant. For the editors in this study, physical mobility remains an indispensable feature of journalistic work. Economic constraints are the main limitation to editors’ mobility. However, the development and proliferation of digital technologies has not changed editors’ views on the value of physical mobility.

Another perceived influence on editors’ autonomy, which emerged in the course of interviews, is the issue of the organisation’s geographical location and the limited mobility of editors. Niknejad et al. (2014) argue that the new global journalism is characterised in the following three ways: Firstly, citizens living through events can tell the world about them directly via a range of digital technologies; the journalists who were previously essential are no longer needed. Secondly, journalists now have the ability to report on events without having to physically be there. Thirdly, digital technologies have brought about financial pressures which forced many publications to close
their international bureaus. Interviewees in this study echoed these findings, by describing digital technologies as both an enabler for journalists and as a constraint on their personal mobility. One editor said:

“When you’re partly a writer and partly an editor, you have to accept that the editing business mainly is sitting at a desk and staring at the same screen every day. And the variety and stimulus comes from the number of different things that pass across that screen, and the fact that writers take you into a different world. I mean, I had never thought about the world of junior Ukrainian ballet dancers or female boxers in the North-Eastern corner of India. Or I only knew a vague little bit about Cambodia and its trials and tribulations. So you do sit at the same desk a lot of the time, but you’re being taken... it’s a bit like the reader. You’re being taken to different worlds. So that’s very stimulating.” (3, Lon)

One editor was less optimistic and more concerned about being limited in his personal mobility, he said:

“I think a lot of what attracts people to doing journalism is the idea that it’s not just an office job, and the idea that you get to meet new people as part of it. So I think that it is a driving desire for lots of people in the industry when... in an era when the majority of journalists are based behind a desk.” (15, Lon)

Similarly, previous studies have found that journalism is increasingly becoming a desk-job despite of increasing opportunities to be mobile (Witschge and Nygren, 2009: 43). This finding echoes arguments made by Andrew Marr who described “the growth of an office-based, editorial culture, rather than a reporter’s journalism” in My Trade (2004: 115) as a current trend in British news values. When asked whether he perceives digital media to be an advantage that enabled him in some way to experience far-away places and events while working with local reporters or stringers, the aforementioned interviewee responded:

“I work for an organisation which is sort of intensely interested in events in other countries, but my current role provides a bit of need to travel to some of the countries but not as much as I’d like. I tend to travel around Europe and do different stories there, but I’m keen to go somewhere a bit off the beaten track to focus more intensely on one country.” (15, Lon)

Thus, he expressed his desire to travel more frequently and live in another country. As a result he expressed an interest in switching for freelance reporting rather than being employed as a full-time staff member at the organisation he works for, because that would grant him more mobility. Editors
perceive their limited mobility as a constraint on their autonomy, which has serious consequences for their daily work practices. Another editor said:

“I feel like more and more I would love to be mobile. I feel like a lot of the work that I do, with the right set-up, could be done from a remote location, not having to be in the office. But there are certainly amenities here that make it much easier, you know – computers and printers, scanners, all those things that I don’t have in a home office. But, it seems like more and more, just having a mobile phone where you are sending emails from that, it’s just easier to do work from anywhere.” (9, NY)

This quote shows that while the editor believes that technology would allow her to be mobile, she is currently still limited in her mobility at work. Editors still hugely value physical mobility in their work and try to overcome economic constraints when it is possible:

“So for that [story] I went to Brussels and I tracked down a scholar who’s been working on researching [the subject] for 40 years. I went to see him and then I went to Normandy just overnight to... get some kind of local flavour of where they lived and maybe go to the [city] which is where the archives are and there are lots of academic publications there that you can’t get online and things. So I’ll probably go there for a week and maybe rent a cheap place and go and do the research there. I mean working for [a prestigious publication which is not part of this study’s sample] there was a lot more money in those days, in the 80s, you could travel more and stay in nice places but everything’s cut back now and... I didn’t stay in a hotel I stayed with the academic.” (7, Lon)

Another issue that was raised in relation to geographical location and limitations of mobility is the following concern, expressed by one editor:

“We do try hard to take a global... not write about things in an inward-looking way. The only way I think you would solve that is if we had an office in New York or an office in Paris and writers and editors who were living and working elsewhere, realistically. We don’t do badly at it, but it’s an area we could definitely improve on.” (5, Lon)

When I asked her to elaborate on this aspect, she explained offered the example of the film industry, when covering a film or writing about an actor:

“We would try and look at when the film was released generally worldwide, but there are whole film industries out there in Bollywood and in France that we’re not writing about, we don’t know who the lead actors are, who the big stars are, what the big stories are, until they either get translated or come over here. So, it’s in that way those kind of stories... that’s just from culture because that’s what I know, it’s from film. There is a whole gap there of ideas that aren’t getting fed in, it’s about geography, where your editors are.” (5, Lon)
Thus, this study has found that geographical location and limited mobility were perceived as one of the major constraints on editors’ autonomy at work. While digital technologies were perceived as enablers of global exchange to some extent, editors feel more autonomous when they can physically travel to places domestically and internationally. Economic constraints were the main reason for their limited mobility and the closing down or lack of international bureaus was perceived as a limitation on editorial autonomy.

5.2.2. Professional autonomy and its constraints

Professional autonomy refers to individual journalists’ freedom within the constraints of conventions and customs of the profession (Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 15-6). It refers to the extent to which editors can influence and structure shared assumptions about what journalism is or ought to be. I already discussed the concept of professional autonomy and its constraints in relation to the cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures, but it is also relevant in relation to mobility. The previous chapter has shown that almost one-third of interviewees in this study have previously worked as foreign correspondents, and even if they are not able to travel very often now due to economic constraints, they use their previous experiences of mobility to enrich their writing. This is demonstrated in the following quote:

“...my take on this is some experience looking at other countries is pretty helpful when it comes to looking at the country where you happen to be born, or happen to live, only because to some extent you realise that the kind of problems that places face, while different, are sort of universal, and allows you to grade how things are in your kind of home country compared with others, more accurately, and it slightly changes your ideas of what is a big problem and what isn’t.” (25, Lon)

The interviewee elaborated on the understanding and sensibility he has gained as a result of his experiences as a foreign correspondent. He can now compare and contrast stories from London with stories he has previously written as a foreign correspondent based in Delhi and São Paulo. As an example for this skill he cited political corruption stories:

“...if you just followed the UK newspapers you would sort of believe that British politicians are a terribly kind of corrupt bunch and they’re all paid to say things, and it’s all a complete mess. I think once you’ve covered some other democracies, kind of let alone our autocratic systems which are, often much, much more corrupt, you kind of realise that actually the sort of corruption that happens in Britain is kind of tiny stuff, and if it constrains things it tends to be, kind of at the margin, rather than the centre of the story, so I think, whilst
obviously any corruption is bad, it slightly helps to put in perspective those kinds of problems.” (25, Lon)

This finding echoes Beck’s principle of perspective-taking (2006: 7) which is a feature of his concept of the “cosmopolitan outlook”, which informs the cosmopolitan skill of navigating and appreciating cultures. The principle of perspective-taking refers to the skill in virtually interchanging situations with other people’s and view them as both situations of opportunity and of threat. According to Beck (2006: 7), knowing the situations of people around the world acts as “a counter-image to the territorial prison theory of identity”. Borrowing from Szerszynski and Urry’s work on cosmopolitans, the cosmopolitan skill of mobility is characterised as a kind of mobility that expands journalists’ awareness of the world and their capacity to compare places, their curiosity towards places as well as their ability to interpret different cultures (2006: 113-115). Editors value this skill of perspective-taking and they have the autonomy to use their experiences of mobility, despite being constrained by economic concerns.

To overcome the economic constraints to their mobility, editors commission work from various sources depending on preferences, networks and newsworthiness. The journalists they commission news stories from include freelance writers, stringers, fixers and photographers, who are based in various countries. Similarly, Reese (2008: 242) has previously conceptualised newsgathering practices across national boundaries as a central feature of global journalism. Editors use their professional autonomy to commission articles from freelance contributors and stringers. Their judgement of who to choose is dependent on editors’ tastes and the endorsements of their colleagues. To overcome the economic constraints posed to their mobility, and reach contributors who are partial insiders to various cultures (see section 5.3.1.), editors commission articles from a global network of contributors. According to Volkmer, global networks offer a frame to represent and access a variety of viewpoints (2003: 15). The following quotes illustrate the ways in which editors interact with their global networks:

“So in any one week I could be commissioning in four different countries.” (2, Lon)

“…building up a network around the world, slowly, of people that we use regularly” (9, Lon)

“We have a large number of staff correspondents as well as quite a lot of stringers and a few occasional writers. Such that, any story we do from abroad […] ought ideally to… have some reporting from the main country that’s mentioned.” (10, Lon)
In these three quotes, editors say that they draw on various sources from different places. However, these quotes reveal that staff journalists and photographers have become less mobile, while the use of freelancers has increased.

To conclude, editors make use of their professional autonomy to overcome the economic constraints that are placed on their mobility. They commission stories from a global network of contributors. In cases where content is suppressed within one country, such as the “firewall” of mainland China which blocks material related to, for example, the religious sect Falun Gong or Tibetan independence, content can re-emerge through global networks (Volkmer, 2003: 13). Thus, global networks, accelerated through the procedural autonomy that digital technologies offer, provide opportunities to circumvent regulatory and censorship restrictions, as well as providing editors with a variety of viewpoints.

5.2.3. Reference autonomy and its constraints

Reference autonomy and its constraints refer to the various sources of influences that surround journalists, spanning across professional and private settings. Reference groups include colleagues, competing news organisations and audiences, as well as family, friends and acquaintances (Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 16). Mobility has been conceptualised as a central cosmopolitan skill, because it has the possibility to increase the awareness and understanding of a variety of cultures. In the ideal situation, mobility leads to an attitude openness to all forms of otherness “associated with an appreciation of, and interaction with, people from other cultural backgrounds” (Vertovec and Cohen, 2002: 212). However, it may not increase the awareness and understanding of the world if the mobile person chooses to remain within an enclosed or diasporic circle without interacting much with the societies they enter (Hiebert, 2002: 214). This argument is relevant in relation to journalists, who are on the move, and their reference groups. Journalists can choose to interact with the cultures they are in, or they can choose to remain within enclosed circles of foreign correspondents when abroad.

This study found that interviewees had varying degrees of involvement with foreign cultures. While most editors have British and American citizenship, many editors in this study do not live in the country of their origin. Additionally, some interviewees have previously worked as foreign correspondents, and the ways in which they chose to engage with foreign cultures while abroad is demonstrated by the following quotes: 
“...in Mexico City there’s a regular thing where every Friday night all the foreign correspondents meet for a drink in a particular cantina... I made friends with lots of the other foreign journalists in Mexico City; lots of Americans there, some British people and then a mixture of people from all over the world.” (13, Lon)

“I went and made friends with all my neighbours in the apartment block I was in and just said... I can’t understand how to turn the heating on. I can’t make my phone work, I can’t do this, I’m a foreigner; I’m very sorry – I do speak Czech, but not very well... and then, once you meet people who are going to say, so what do you do for your job, what do your parents do, how long have you lived here, have you got children? And you just chat away... and they became really useful contacts.” (28, Lon)

“...wherever you go there’s a community of foreign correspondents and in my case I had kids going to the local International School and so that becomes your core community but, certainly we had Brazilian friends as well... very often it would be sort of mixed marriage couples. I mean foreigners who’ve come to the country marrying locals and they’re sort of bilingual, bi-national families... it certainly wasn’t just ex-pats that you would talk to, but the non-ex-pats that you had the closest relationships speak fluent English, at least in my case they did. I’m sure if the best way to learn the best way to learn a language really well is to have a girlfriend or wife who speaks that language but my case wasn’t an option.” (26, Lon)

The first interviewee was involved with the circle of foreign correspondents, many of whom were American and British. Thus, his professional autonomy is influenced or restricted by reference groups which mainly consist of other American and British journalists. The second interviewee made an effort to befriend as many locals as possible, but approached mainly those who were his neighbours and likely to be from a similar socio-economic category based on the place they live in. The third interviewee tended to interact with English-speaking ex-pats, and explained that he found “working in a language, a foreign language easier than playing in a foreign language”. So while he was comfortable to conduct interviews and do his work in a foreign language, he preferred to socially interact with other English-speakers.

Further, the third quote revealed that marriage to a person from another culture is seen as the most common way in which journalists get to understand and appreciate another culture. Inter-racial marriage is often considered an important indicator in theories on how to measure cosmopolitanisation (Ong, 2009: 459), which informs the concept of cosmopolitan skills in this study. In “Distant Love” (2014), Beck and Beck-Gernsheim conceptualise “world families” and the increasing amount of relationships between people living in or coming from different countries, which they understand as an outcome of cosmopolitanisation.
In addition, interviewees have the autonomy to cultivate their cosmopolitan skills of navigating various cultures in their career planning; when they prepare for foreign placements. This point is demonstrated in the following quote:

"You read the history, you read the literature, you try and immerse yourself as much as possible in the culture and history of the country that you’re going to [...] You talk to people you know who might know people in the country and can suggest people for you to speak to... the most efficient journalistic tool is conversation.” (26, Lon)

This quote shows the ways in which interviewees prepare for their foreign postings. Hannerz has previously argued (2004: 88) that handling a foreign news beat depends partly on the journalist’s interactive and communicative abilities and partly on the social characteristics of the place. The above quote demonstrates the interviewees’ intention and effort to immerse himself in the culture of the country he was sent to in order to be able to navigate it.

Scholars have previously questioned whether mobility necessarily leads to a cosmopolitan understanding of the culture one visits. A transnational individual has been defined as someone who experiences and is attached to two or more places at the same time (Basch and Szanton Blanc, 1995: 48; Glick-Schiller). Vertovec and Cohen equated cosmopolitanism, which informs the concept of cosmopolitan skills, with “an appreciation of, and interaction with, people from other cultural backgrounds” (2002: 212). But they questioned whether transnational lifestyles and mobility are necessarily complementary with cosmopolitanism (2002: 210). In the case of journalists who report from other countries, knowledge of a foreign place becomes a requirement of the profession. But the extent to which journalists use their professional autonomy to explore other cultures varies. After all, a journalist might decide to remain in a mono-cultural social circle, without engaging with the local language, culture and people, but only official institutions and other journalists, while staying in Hilton Hotels and frequenting Starbucks coffeshops. However, when editors in this study spoke about their travels, many emphasised the need to immerse themselves in the local culture of the country they are visiting as much as possible.

Interviewees in this study had varying degrees of involvement with foreign cultures during their travels. While most editors have British and American citizenship, many editors in this study do not live in the country of their origin and engage with a different culture on a daily basis. Editors have developed different strategies to interact with the locals of a foreign place. At the same time they interact with the group of foreign correspondents that is placed in one location. This interaction with reference groups that are similar to editors themselves, might constrain their professional autonomy
to use their cosmopolitan skills fully. If editors limit their reference autonomy to a small group of like-minded foreign correspondents, their reporting will suffer.

5.3. The appreciation of difference and autonomy

5.3.1. Professional autonomy and its constraints

In this chapter, I already used the category of professional autonomy and its constraints twice; in relation to the skill of navigating different cultures as well as mobility, and it is also a relevant category in relation to the appreciation of difference. According to Beck (2006: 59) appreciating difference is to affirm the Other as both different and similar to oneself. In the context of this study, it is journalists’ appreciation of the diversity of those contributors they commission stories from. Diversity refers to a variety of social identities with regard to nationality, ethnicity and gender. Appreciating diversity in relation to journalists’ professional autonomy means their desire and intention to include various voices in journalism, and to make intercultural communication a standard element in the journalistic repertoire (Van Ginneken, 1998: 214).

The previous chapter has shown that almost two-thirds of editors in this study have at one point at one point in their career worked in a different country, either as foreign correspondents, freelance writers or in another professional capacity. Many of those who have not previously worked in other countries expressed a wish to do so in the future. Thus, editors in this study tend to be highly mobile and have an extent of economic autonomy to do so. Further, this study found that many editors are aware of and know how to work with the norms, laws and regulations of various countries when it comes to issues of travelling and reporting from and to other countries. At the same time they face political constraints (i.e. government, politicians and censorship) especially legislation, military constraints and cultural norms (see section 5.1.2.). However, editors possess the skills of navigating different cultures and countries, including being familiar with travelling and visa restrictions, regulations and norms in various regions. This point it demonstrated in the following two quotes:

“Each country’s got its own personality and you’ve got to know how to travel in the country, and you’ve got to know how to get into the country. For example if I were to send someone to shoot something in Syria, I couldn’t then send them to Israel, because they wouldn’t get into Israel with a Syrian stamp in their passport. So you’ve got to know about things like that.” (40, Lon)

“‘In Germany you follow different cultural norms from the ones you follow in India... to give a small example, I remember in Germany, I think it’s loosened up a bit but in Germany,
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diversity. In contrast, none of the interviewees in New York mentioned any domestic travel for their reporting.

One finding in this section is that interviewees, who are not usually mobile, can use their professional autonomy to commission stories from writers who are based abroad. Editors appreciate it when these writers have particular ties or personal insights into to the place they are writing about. This is demonstrated in the following to quotes:

“No, sadly not, I’m afraid I’m rather deskbound. But... in the case of Nicolas Shakespeare in Cambodia, that’s someone who grew up there, has very strong links and ties there, who’s prepared to invest a lot of time, and energy in getting the best story and contacting people.” (4, Lon)

In addition he specified that instead of having a “travel” section, his publication has a “places” section for the following reason:

“We call them places, not travel, to put the emphasis on the other place rather than on the journey. And we try to use them to get under the skin of another culture. And so, very often, the pieces will be written by somebody who lives in the place or has lived there or married someone who came from there. [...] A story about Crete and a story about Guyana, both written by men who had married women from those places, so they knew the culture really well.” (4, Lon)

These two quotes demonstrate that while editors’ work can often be based in the location of their publication, the journalists they commission to work with them tend to be selected on the basis of whether they have a connection to the place. This includes being married to a person from that place (as previously discussed in section 5.2.3.) or having grown up in that place. Journalists’ personal background or marital status can tie them to a particular place and provide them with the necessary cultural knowledge. This is why editors prefer to work with contributors, who are, to some extent, insiders in a particular cultural context. Their professional autonomy allows editors to choose contributing writers, according to such categories. But editors are nonetheless limited by the overall organisational identity of their publication (see chapter 4) when it comes to the question whether a freelance contributor would fit into the organisational identity of the publication.

At the same time as valuing freelance contributors, who are partial insiders to a foreign culture, editors in this study expressed the value of “being an outsider” in the context of reporting. This point may be seen to somewhat contradict the previous finding, and it is illustrated in the following quotes:
“If you’re a reporter, you should play as dumb as possible and get the subject to help you through everything. Your job as a reporter is not to be a cool person or an in person; your job is to be a... somebody from Mars who’s trying to understand the ways of people on Earth. You’re really an anthropologist, and the more outside the world of whatever you’re writing about, the better, in a way, because the more perspective you’ll have on it. So trying to be an insider is a dangerous game, both for writers and for editors.” (4, NY)

“People domestically, within Brazil, would say to me that the press is biased in this way or that way, or this newspaper is biased, or that magazine is biased, and I think there’s one advantage you have with something like The Economist being an outsider, is that you can genuinely say we don’t have an interest here, but it’s not really in our interest to see a particular person elected, or we’re not going to benefit from it, I suppose is the better way of putting it. And so you can play the part of a kind of neutral referee.” (14, Lon)

These two quotes illustrate the ways in which editors value the outsider position in their work as editors and the work of the journalists they commission. The finding that editors value both insider and outsider positions might be seen as a contradiction. However, such contradictions, echo previous arguments about cosmopolitan skills when taken back to the theories of cosmopolitanisation, a process that follows a “both/and” logic rather than following an “either/or” approach (Beck and Sznaider, 2006: 14). When editors chose their freelance contributors, they value people who are both insiders in a foreign culture as well as being insiders within Western media and particular organisational cultures.

To conclude, editors in this study have partial professional autonomy to appreciate the diversity of social identities of their freelance contributors; they have the professional autonomy to commission stories from writers who are based abroad. They appreciate it when these writers have family ties to a country they are covering, or have spent an extensive amount of time there. However, editors’ autonomy is constrained by the fact that their contributors have to fit into the organisational identity of the publication. This means that while editors have an extent of autonomy in creating intercultural communication, their professional autonomy to do so, is still limited by organisational constraints.

5.3.2. Organisational autonomy and its constraints

Organisational autonomy refers to individual editors’ freedom within their media organisations (Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 15). In contrast to professional autonomy, which refers to individual journalists’ freedom within the customs of the profession, organisational autonomy refers to company-specific constraints and it is tied to the concept of organisational identity. It analyses the role of the individual journalists within the constraining boundaries of organisational structures.
Previous research tended to focus on fast news and thus reduced journalists to the role of newsgatherers (see, for example, McQuail, 2000: 327; Örnebring, 2010: 61). Journalist has been defined as employees who engage in gathering, processing, and disseminating news (Beaujon, 2013). However, such definitions omit the crucial autonomy editors in this study say they have at the slow news publications they write for. Editors in this study say they have a great extent of organisational autonomy to express their opinions. This point is illustrated in the following three quotes:

“I tell my students whom I teach journalism... your opinions are all you have, it’s your views, and you should know what you think when you read something, and say it... that’s the only currency, really, because if the emperor has no clothes, you have to speak up.” (4, NY)

“At The Economist we do less in the way of sort of breaking news than many people do, but we try and get what some people call scoops of thought or scoops of ideas, you know; in other words, to be the first to think about a particular... I remember one good example was we had a cover story several years ago about the end of cheap food and it was just before everybody else realised that and it had quite a big impact... From Latin America we had a cover a few years ago called Brazil Takes Off and it was just before everybody else got really excited about Brazil.” (29, Lon)

“Well, because we’re a weekly magazine... there's no point in simply reporting the news, because most people have already read it by the time they get to us, so you have to either add... you say this has happened in Britain, let me tell you what happens in other places, or you find a different way, a different angle to look at a news story, or just some way of adding to what people have already read.” (22, Lon)

These quotes demonstrate that editors have the autonomy to express their opinions at work. The first quote supports the fact that personal opinions are not only beneficial but essential to the work of journalists. The autonomy they perceive to have to express their opinions, in turn, can enhance the way in which they can use their cosmopolitan skills. The second quote demonstrates the autonomy editors perceive to have to be analytical and express their opinions. The editor refers to “scoops of thought” which were his way to highlight stories from regions such as Latin America and Brazil. The third quote demonstrates that the requirement for journalists at weekly publications have changed, to some extent, because of digitalisation and the provision of information online. Instead of providing information, the role of journalists, especially at weekly publications, has shifted to providing contexts and comparisons, and this includes commentary on international comparisons with other countries. This finding supports Stephens’ argument (2014: 185) that journalists increasingly play the role of evaluators and idea generators. However, it remains to be seen whether the publications in this study will remain focused on their slow components rather than shifting their resources to their fast components.
Only a few studies have analysed the more interpretative and slow kinds of journalism. Some scholars have addressed culture, feature and slow news journalism (see, for instance, Hellman and Jaakkola, 2011; Navasky and Cornog, 2012; Steensen, 2009) but such studies remain rare. Stephens has argued that in the current media landscape, weeklies and publications that occupy more analytical niches in the media landscape, such as the publications in the sample of this study, will play an important role. “Slow” news publications are characterised by their thoughtful analysis (Ellis and Tett, 2014) and they offer opportunities for editors to make use of their autonomy and to apply their cosmopolitan skills in their news work by providing commentary on international comparisons and “scoops of thoughts” on countries outside their own location.

Tumber and Prentoulis have argued that the journalist’s role as an interpreter has become more pronounced and recognised (2003: 228). As a result we may be witnessing a shift in the journalistic role from detachment to involvement and from objectivity to subjectivity. This section has shown the ways in which editors say they are autonomous in analysing and interpreting information about news stories, including the coverage and international comparison of countries outside their own. Such accounts help to explain some of the current transformations in the journalistic profession from a news-gathering to an interpreting role, which are the consequence of the process of globalisation and digitalisation in journalism.

However, the organisational autonomy that editors have in using their cosmopolitan skills and expressing their opinions is confined not only by their organisational identity as discussed in detail in the previous chapter, but also by referential constraints on their autonomy. This point is shown in the following quotes:

“Here we have... it’s like the English justice system: you’re bound by precedent. So that you can break away from our past line, but it gets... you have to produce good reasons why what we argued in the past was wrong. You can’t just say anything you like. So that’s one constraint, but I think that’s a healthy constraint [...] I also have a personnel thing, which is that I feel it’s important for people who edit sections to be able to write editorials on their part of the world. So I have to be careful about, sort of, overriding them. So that sometimes limits how much I can wade in.” (10, Lon)

“Physically we’re very free, in that we do our own commissioning... We can commission a great variety of material. On the other hand, if you don’t have any constraints, then you don’t have character or a framework... it is like playing tennis without a net. We’re playing tennis with a net.” (3, Lon)

These two quotes show the limitations of individual editors’ autonomy. Editors face constraints from reference groups, such as colleagues, competing news organisations, audiences, friends and family.
Thus, editors’ autonomy is constrained by precedent, as shown in the first quote, and by the character of their organisation, as shown in the second quote. Unlike the interviewees in Draper’s study (2014: 1126), however, the interviewees in my study are well aware of these organisational boundaries.

In his study on Danish journalists, Skovsgaard conducted surveys and measured journalists’ autonomy through different variables (2014: 352). These variables included “conflict-agreement with superiors”, “adjustment to superiors”, and “own sense of independent discretion”. “Superiors” in his study referred to editors who can wield influence over the decisions of other editors, due to their higher position in organisational hierarchy. This study focuses on editors, junior editors as well as senior editors. When asked about whether she feels constrained by anything in her work, one senior editor explained:

“There are always limits, the limits that are set by your editor’s taste, by what you know your editor likes and doesn’t like in terms of writers and stories and approaches... The limits of what you think your readers will enjoy and like and want to see, the limits that are set by what other magazines are doing or have already done, or might be going to do in the future. Yes, you’re constantly working within restraints: taste, time, money. I would feel free personally in the relationships I have with other people in the office here to raise most stories as possibilities. I don’t get any sense of censorship in that sense, but there are an awful lot of constraints that go into making the final decision of what goes into the magazine, so constant paring away of ideas, and of approaches to ideas as well.” (41, Lon)

This quote shows the constraints of reference groups, in terms of the leading editor’s taste, reader preferences, as well as procedural constraints and professional autonomy within organisational constraints. Another finding in this study is that editors emphasise the need to speak to a variety of people and go beyond official sources. This is part of editors’ organisational autonomy and it can also be encouraged as part of their reference autonomy. Editors use their professional and organisational autonomy to fight back political constraints (as shown in section 5.1.2.). Similarly, editors intend to go beyond political constraints in the form of official sources and press conferences, as demonstrated in the following quotes:

“[About a well-known writer] He seldom goes to press conferences, because he thinks they’re, kind of, a waste of time, and so we would then get his stories, which were often on issues of real significance, and inside The New Yorker there may be five or six people who would know who his blind sources were” (6, NY)

“Our kind of reporting should be people who are going out and actually talking to... talking to real people, rather than sitting in press conferences.” (10, Lon)
He adds that “real people” refers to people who are not the usual reference groups, and who are not “journalistically interesting”:

“I’m a great believer in not hanging out with other journalists, where possible … you don’t go to foreign countries to go and meet other British people. You go to countries to meet the people who live there, and the more difficult they are to meet, the more interesting… Another thing, which I believe very strongly, is that, as a journalist, you shouldn’t just look for people who are journalistically interesting. There’s a tendency for people to think… if I’m writing a story about – religion, then I need to go and find a theology professor and a priest. It’s must more interesting just to talk to ordinary… believers and non-believers.” (28, Lon)

These quotes show that interviewees expressed a dislike for press conferences. This is especially the case for senior editors. Previous journalism scholarship has shown that journalists tend to rely on official sources, such as governmental press releases (see, for instance Hickerson, Moy and Dunsmore, 2011). In contrast, the above quotes show that interviewees explicitly try to avoid press conferences, which gives them an extent of reference freedom from official sources. While some editors say that they try to avoid press conferences, their interviews do not tell us the extent to which editors prefer unofficial to official sources. In fact, editors might encounter restrictions to their professional autonomy by organisational constraints or reference groups, when they try to avoid press conferences and seek out people who are not “journalistically interesting”.

To conclude, editors have an extent of organisational autonomy in appreciating difference in relation to the sources they choose. Editors in this study say they have a great extent of autonomy to express their opinions, which points to a shift in the journalistic role. Editors face reference constraints in terms of the leading editor’s taste, reader preferences, as well as procedural constraints. This is why it is has been useful to supplement the concept of organisational autonomy with reference autonomy in this section. Another finding in this study is that editors emphasise the need to speak to a variety of people and go beyond official sources. Some editors expressed that they try to avoid press conferences. This finding stands in contrast to previous research which argued that journalists tend to rely on official sources, such as governmental press releases (see, for instance Hickerson, Moy and Dunsmore, 2011).
5.4. Diverse audience awareness and autonomy

5.4.1. Reference autonomy and constraints

Reference autonomy and its constraints include influences from editors’ colleagues, competing news organisations and audiences, audiences as well as family, friends and acquaintances (Hanitzsch et al. 2010: 16). This concept has previously been used in the section on mobility and it is also a useful concept for this section, because audiences are categorised as a reference group within the concept of reference autonomy. Traditionally, studies have shown that journalists knew very little about their audience, had no adequate point of contact with their audience and rejected feedback from it (Gans, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978). Journalists tended to make news judgements based on an internalised image of their audience (Quinn and Trench, 2002: 5). Thus, journalists have long been unaware of their actual audiences. Current transformations in the journalistic profession have added multiple levels of complexity to journalists’ autonomy to interact with their audiences.

The shift to an engagement with readers can be witnessed across other leading news media publications too. In 2014, The New York Times released its Innovation Report which includes on chapter that is dedicated to the experience of the reader (Sulzberger, 2014). “For the first time, both the newsroom and business side are focused primarily on readers,” reads the report (2014: 60). While media companies’ marketing and publishing departments have traditionally been interested in getting to know the reader, The New York Times now encourages its editorial departments to catch up with that trend. One key finding in this study is that many editors no longer “write for other journalists” or their editor-in-chief but also consider their needs and desires of their audiences. Only one interviewee out of thirty-one said that she has the editor-in-chief in mind as her main imagined reader. Other editors expressed the sentiment that knowing the reader has gained new significance:

“One of the most important things you can do when you’re working on a magazine is know who your reader is, and that doesn’t necessarily mean actually going out and meeting them, though it does help.” (5, Lon)

The editor described various meetings and encounters she had with her audience at promotional events. Another editor described the following anecdotal situation of how he met one of his readers, who has now become one of the readers on his mind when he makes editorial decisions:

“I was once driving through Iowa, and I had to pull over for a flat tyre, and a farmer came by on a tractor and we started talking. And he asked me what I did, and I mentioned I worked for a magazine in New York. And he said, which one? I said, one called The New
Yorker. And he said, oh, I read that, and he started talking. And within a few minutes, I realised, as he analysed recent articles and discussed them that we had published, that he was actually smarter than I was and would have been a much better editor of The New Yorker than I was. And he was driving a tractor on a farm in Middle America. So it’s hard... and so now I sometimes think of him when I’m editing a piece: would this guy... will this get by him? Will he approve of this? So he’s one imaginary reader that I have in my mind.” (20, NY)

Another editor described her and her colleagues’ awareness of readers’ letters, which can be critical:

“They’ll send an email to the main letters account, and it’s inevitably saying: What happened to the fact-checking department at The New Yorker? I thought you had the best fact-checkers in the world. Are they all asleep? Did you fire them? I can’t believe you got this X obscure detail wrong. And actually, in a lot of cases it will be... the person who is wrong and they really think they’re right. But you have some complicated answer for why it might seem like that’s wrong, but why we phrased it in such a way to protect ourselves... Or, that they’re subscribing to a common misconception and that we actually went and dug down deeper and found that what everyone thinks is not actually true. So a lot of times you’re able to shoot back, like, no, I did my work, and they’re wrong. But sometimes they’re right, and you sort of have to answer for that, like I’m so sorry I missed that little thing, I don’t know how, I read that eight times and I just didn’t notice it.” (8, NY)

This quote shows that editors no longer reject feedback from their readers, but they say they consider and respond to feedback. Quinn and Trench (2002: 5) found that journalists tended to make editorial judgements based on their image of an imagined audience. In contrast, editors in this study say they interact with their readers in some cases and that it is very important to know their readers. Another editor explained the way in which the interaction between him, his colleagues and their readers has changed in the following way:

“I think you can’t get too ahead of your readership. I think there’s a danger of becoming, a little paternalist. Obviously, we have a comment section. The New York Times has its editorials. There is a sort of space in which people expect their media to tell them what to think. But I think there’s a bit less deference to that now, and perhaps a greater expectation that a publication might reflect a diversity of opinion.” (1, NY)

This quote reveals the way in which editors say they consider their readers’ feedback and expectations. Another way in which editors meet their audiences is through focus groups they conduct to better position their publication’s brand. One editor explained that The Economist conducted focus groups to identify the latent Economist reader, the kind of person who would be interested in what The Economist has to offer but who does not read it. Part of this effort of reaching out to the latent reader was The Economist’s “Where Do You Stand” advertising campaign (Macleod, 2014). This campaign highlighted the range of subjects The Economist covers. Highlighting
the range of topics was seen as necessary because The Economist’s perceived obstacle to attracting
the latent reader is in its name, as illustrated by the following quote:

“We did these focus groups where we asked people to talk about The Economist and
famously they were asked to draw a personification of The Economist reader. He turned
out to be a man called William who worked in finance and he has a bowler hat and a brief
case and he works for a bank and he hates his life and he reads The Economist. So this is
the cliché of The Economist reader. He’s just some bastard who works in banking and is
only interested in money.” (18, Lon)

This quote shows an interesting development: While traditional media studies prior to the era of
globalisation and digitalisation found that the audience hardly features on journalists’ minds at all
(Schlesinger, 1978; Tunstall, 1971) these quotes demonstrated that not only do actual readers
matter to editors, but editors also explore the ways potential new readers conceive of their existing
readership. Thus the question of the reader has gone from being largely ignored, to being something
journalists contemplate and hand back to their audience in a reciprocal exchange. Knowing the
reader can be a desire driven by economic pressures, which may result in constraints to editors’
professional autonomy, if editors feel they have to cater to certain audiences.

Today, media forms transcend the borders of nations, cultures and continents and audiences can
choose to read news stories produced anywhere provided that they speak the language. Thurman
found that some British news websites, such as FT.com or BBC.com, attracted larger audiences than
their American competitors (2007: 285). Therefore, editors need to consider audiences from a
variety of nations beyond their own. Out of its 1.57 million subscribers (including both print, digital
and both) The Economist has, 876.420 subscribers in the US, 248.415 in Continental Europe, 223.915
in the UK, 152.282 in Asia, 26.921 in the Middle East and Africa and 19.371 in Latin America (Doctor,
2015). These numbers reveal the geographical spread of subscribers and the dominance of
subscribers within the US who form over half the subscription base. Thus, the biggest audiences are
in the West, and editors are aware of this:

“These days about half of them [readers] live in the States, and we make a point of using
British English rather than American English, but sometimes I’ll avoid using particular
words or phrases that I think Americans just won't understand, especially ones which could
be misleading.” (13, Lon)

“I would say, it’s the sort of educated New York scene…I think that there’s something about
the pulse of this magazine, and the current media ecosystem, that I don’t know where
most of the readers of The New Yorker website are. I’m sure they’re nationwide, and
probably to some extent, throughout the globe.” (14, NY)
These quotes demonstrate that editors mainly locate their audiences in the West. In the case of The New Yorker audiences are perceived to be concentrated in New York, but also situated nationwide throughout the globe. However, none of the interviewees in this study knew the exact distribution of their international audiences. This reveals that editors’ reference autonomy is still somewhat limited.

Some editors say they consider diverse audiences to ensure the clarity of their language, but this mainly applies to Western audiences, particularly American readers. While language is a minor attempt to address the differences in audience, the kind of journalism that is produced is still Anglo-American journalism. As an example, the interviewee cited the word “scheme”, which tends to have a pejorative meaning in the American English, it does not have in British English. For instance, a government scheme to help the poor sounds fine in English, but it can have connotations of an “underhand plot” in American English. This is why the interviewee tends to try and use a different word – he does not want to imply that “the government is scheming to do something bad when, in fact, they just mean it's a new initiative.”

Further The Economist’s style guide has specific sections which relate to, for instance, Arab words and names, Chinese names, Indonesian names and Iranian names (Wroe, 2015). This shows an explicit awareness and care with foreign language words and names, including spelling and pronunciation. The section on Arab names and words, for instance, describes several sounds in Arabic which have no exact equivalents in English: “Moreover, there are three sounds—a glottal stop like a hiccup, a glottal sound akin to strangulation and a uvular trill like a Frenchman gargling—which have no equivalent except occasionally in the East End of London.” It is interesting that the comparison by which Arab language sounds are explained refer to the sounds of other languages as well as the sounds of ethnic parts of London. Thus, that publication’s style guides give some clues as to how editors are told to address their diverse audiences and subjects. However, it needs to be pointed out that editors still focus on the English-speaking world (this point is further analysed in chapter 6).

In his study of editors at US men’s lifestyle magazines GQ, Esquire and Details, Draper (2014: 1125) found that the recurring sentiment among editors was the magazine’s imagined reader was the editor-in-chief, and that his tastes (all editors-in-chief in his study were male) dictate the work of his staff. This echoes Gans’ finding that news journalists “serve their audiences without paying much attention to it” (1979: xiv). However, the findings in this study contrast their findings. Contrary to
Draper’s study, in this study one editor explicitly stated that it his publication is “not one person’s magazine”. While editors’ tastes were perceived as an influence on individual editors’ autonomy, they were only rarely perceived as an overbearing limitation, as demonstrated in the following quote:

“I think there was somebody I once suggested, and [the editor] said, oh, I can’t stand his writing, so I didn’t ask him, but on the whole, no. I don’t feel that I’m, sort of, just toeing the line.” (6, Lon)

Moreover, interviewees talked about the tastes of their colleagues, the expertise and beats of their colleagues and the tastes of their audiences were seen as an influence on editors’ reference autonomy. Editors described a “constant pairing of ideas” among colleagues which points to a more nuanced influence of tastes, than the autocratic editor-in-chief presented in Draper’s study. While the tastes of the editor-in-chief and senior editors are perceived as a source of influence on editors’ authority, the interests and tastes of the reader were perceived as an influence as well. It is interesting to note that ownership was not perceived to be a constraint:

“There needs to be a very clear Chinese wall between them and your editorial staff... that’s what we have. So we have a separate unit that oversees our sponsor content and has people to write it for them, and it’s nothing to do with our editorial operation and there’s no communication between them and I think that’s very important.” (38, Lon)

In this quote the editor expressed his explicit autonomy or freedom from the commercial side of the publication. He added:

“I think the main problem is that sponsor content, and native advertising in particular, and the appeal of it to advertisers, is that you fool the viewer or the reader into thinking it’s editorial. Any business model that’s based on dishonesty like that is just not going to work, it’s not going to be sustainable in the long-term. So we don’t do that, of course... we label everything so that it’s very clear. These models where you’re not quite clear who’s behind it, who’s paid for it, is it a sponsor post, is it an editorial post, etc. paid articles like you get in the press in India, I think that’s just not going to be a sustainable model.” (38, Lon)

Thus, this distance between editorial and commercial operations was seen to create trust among the publication’s readership. The editorial independence of one publication in this sample, in particular, has been acknowledged (see for example, Gayle, 2015). Once again, the editor shows an awareness of his audiences’ perceptions and preferences.
To conclude, this section found that editors have the reference autonomy and the organisational autonomy and desire to meet and interact with their readers. Contrary to previous studies, editors here do not reject feedback from their audiences, but they take it into account and try to respond to it. Editors have a spread of diverse audiences in mind. However, they still focus on the English-speaking world, because they are somewhat aware of the distribution of their audiences, who are mainly located in the West.

5.5. Conclusion

This chapter analysed cosmopolitan skills in relation to interviewees’ autonomy and its constraints at work. Journalistic autonomy has been defined as the “latitude that a practitioner has in carrying out his or her occupational duties” (Weaver et al. 2007: 70). This chapter explored the opportunities and limitations interviewees perceive on their autonomy to practice their cosmopolitan skills in relation to six constraints, as conceptualised by Hanitzsch et al. (2010): (1) political constraints (i.e. government, politicians and censorship), (2) economic constraints (i.e. profit expectations, need for advertisers, implications of audience research), (3) professional constraints (i.e. conventions and customs of the profession, conventions of specific newsrooms), (4) procedural constraints (i.e. resources of time and space), (5) organisational constraints (i.e. higher editors and ownership), as well as (6) reference groups (colleagues in other media, competing news organisations, audiences, friends and family).

I analysed editors’ skill of navigating different cultures with reference to their professional, political and procedural autonomy and its constraints. Their mobility has been analysed in relation to their economic, professional and reference autonomy and its limitations. Further, their appreciation of difference has been investigated through the concepts of professional and organisational autonomy and its constraints. Finally, their diverse audience awareness has been analysed with reference to their reference autonomy and its constraints. Overall I used the concepts of professional and reference autonomy the most, because they were the most relevant kinds of autonomy editors perceived in relation to their cosmopolitan skills.

Previous research has found that economic constraints play a relatively subordinate role in journalists’ perception of their professional autonomy at work (see, for instance, Hanitzsch et al. 2010; Mellado and Humanes, 2012, Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013). Hanitzsch et al. (2010: 17) have stated that a relatively subordinate importance of perceived economic constraints may contradict
intuition, because their objective influence can hardly be denied (2012: 17). They explain their findings by suggesting that economic constraints are rarely directly experienced by the average journalist on a daily basis. However, this study is concerned with editors, who hold a higher degree of editorial responsibility than the average journalist. The findings in this study show that editors do perceive economic constraints as a limitation to their freedom. But rather than stemming from profit expectations, advertising revenues, market pressures or financial pressures resulting from audience research, as conceptualised by Reich and Hanitzsch (2013: 15) this study has found that economic constraints are perceived through general budgeting decisions, such as travel budgets.

Further, editors make use of their professional autonomy to overcome the economic constraints that are placed on their mobility. They commission stories from a global network of contributors. Thus, global networks, accelerated through the procedural autonomy that digital technologies provide, and professional autonomy, helps can editors circumvent regulatory and political constraints. It is important to emphasise that New-York based editors mainly perceive political constraints domestically, while London-based editors perceive political constraints in the international realm. This difference has been explained with reference to organisational identity. It found that while procedural and organisational constraints were more prevalent in editors’ perception of their autonomy, editors were conscious of budgeting decisions, which differs from the findings in Reich and Hanitzsch’s study (2013) on journalists’ perceived autonomy. Overall, procedural and organisational constraints remain a stronger factor in editors’ perception of their autonomy, which supports previous studies (Mellado and Humanes, 2012; Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013) on the issue of individual autonomy in journalism.

This chapter demonstrated that while editors have somewhat internalised the structures of their publication’s organisational identity, it is a conscious process that they are aware of. This finding contrasts with Draper’s finding (2014: 1126) that editors perceive their autonomy as unbounded. While this study found evidence to support previous studies which have shown that journalists perceive they have substantial autonomy in their daily work, interviewees emphasised that their autonomy is never unbounded. Ownership did not feature as a significant influence on editors’ perceived organisational or reference autonomy. While previous studies have suggested an unhealthy blurring of boundaries between journalism and commercial forces (Erjavec, 2004; Harro-Loit and Saks, 2006; Quinn, 2004) this study, found evidence to suggest that editors felt that they had organisational and reference autonomy from ownership and advertisers. However, geographical location and limited mobility emerged as major limitations to achieving the kind of ideal publication
or occupation that editors envisioned. While digital technologies were perceived as enablers of
global exchange to some extent, editors felt more autonomous when they can physically travel to
places domestically and internationally. Economic constraints were the main reason for their limited
mobility and the closing down or lack of international bureaus was similarly perceived as a limitation
on editorial autonomy.

Editors in this study had varying degrees of involvement with foreign cultures during their travels.
While most editors have British and American citizenship, many editors in this study do not live in
the country of their origin and engage with a different culture on a daily basis. Editors have
developed different strategies to interact with the locals of a foreign place. At the same time they
interact with the group of foreign correspondents that is placed in one location. This interaction with
reference groups that are similar to editors themselves, constrains their professional autonomy to
use their cosmopolitan skills fully. However, editors did express an appreciation for the diversity of
cultures their contributors are part of, even though English still dominates as the commonly used
language. Editors can use their professional autonomy to commission stories from writers who are
based abroad. But the limitations they encounter are posed by organisational constraints.

Further, editors have an extent of professional autonomy in appreciating difference in the sources
they choose. Editors in this study say they have a great extent of autonomy to express their
opinions, which points to a shift in the journalistic role. Editors face reference constraints in terms of
the leading editor’s taste, reader preferences, as well as procedural constraints. However, this study
supports Skovsgaard’s findings (2013: 358) that the relationship between editors and their superiors
tends to be characterised by consensus. Another finding in this study is that editors emphasise the
need to speak to a variety of people and go beyond official sources. Some editors expressed that
they try to avoid press conferences, which contrasts with research that has found that journalists
tend to rely on official sources, such as governmental press releases (see, for instance Hickerson,
Moy and Dunsmore, 2011).

In relation to their cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures, editors in London perceived
political constraints internationally, while editors in New York spoke about political constraints
domestically. Editors felt that they have a high degree of professional autonomy to express their
opinion at work – “as good as it gets in terms of being able to say what you like”. However, their
reference autonomy was constrained by reference groups, including their colleagues and editors, as
well as their organisations customs such as precedent and the character of the organisation. The
main perceived constraints to their mobility were economic ones. However, editors expressed that they have the professional and reference autonomy to develop global networks and commission stories from various contributors to somewhat replace their own lack of mobility. When it comes to the cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference, editors perceived to have the professional and organisational autonomy to draw on their previous and current experiences of mobility to work within and write about cultures that are different to their own. Further, editors perceived to have the reference autonomy to think of their diverse audiences, which exemplifies a shift from earlier studies where journalists did not express an interest in their audiences' identities or whereabouts. However, editors still focus on the English-speaking world, and they are aware of the distribution of their audiences, which are mainly located in the West.
Chapter 6: The possible limits of cosmopolitan skills

Introduction

The first empirical chapter juxtaposed cosmopolitan skills with editors’ identities and found that that even though editors are aware and proactively use their different identities, they are still often unable to break existing boundaries such as gender and ethnicity. The second empirical chapter investigated the extent of editors’ autonomy in using their cosmopolitan skills. The results included that editors have autonomy and make use of some of the cosmopolitan skills although again there are many restrictions to their autonomy. Organisational identity was found to take precedent over individual and social identities. However, cosmopolitan skills are valued on the organisational level as a form of enhancing editorial work. The first empirical chapter primarily focused on the level of the individual, the second empirical chapter primarily focused on the level of the organisation, whereas this chapter considers the wider effects of globalisation on journalism. This is why it focuses on the interplay of cosmopolitan skills and global flows. For the purposes of this thesis is it important to separate the concept of globalisation from cosmopolitan skills and not assume that there is a linear connection. Globalisation does not automatically increase people’s cosmopolitan skills.

Globalisation in relation to journalism has been defined as the intensification of social interconnections which creates the perception of the world as a single place (Reese, 2010: 344). Globalisation is not understood as a process of homogenisation or heterogenisation (Nederveen Pieterse, 1995: 45), but as hybridisation. Rowe and Schelling define hybridisation as “the ways in which forms become separated from existing practices and recombine with new forms in new practices” (1991: 231). However practices that mix cultures can also be constructed in the interest of dominant sectors in society (Kraidy, 2002: 23). Nederveen Pieterse suggests that globalisation entails a range of organisational levels, i.e. global, transnational, national and local levels, all of which operate simultaneously. He concludes that globalisation translates into the pluralisation of organisational forms, which is one of the bases for multiple identities and the diversification of “sources of the self” (1995: 50-2).

Thus, globalisation is understood as creating “a complex, overlapping, disjunctive order, which can no longer be understood in terms of existing center-periphery models” (Appadurai, 1990: 296). This is why its processes need to be viewed as flows, instead of rigid structures, as conceptualised by Appadurai (1990) in his framework of five dimensions of global cultural flows. According to Appadurai, these five landscapes interact in shifting and at times disjunctive or diverging ways. Their
relationships are hard to predict because each of the five landscapes is subject to its own constraints and incentives (some political, some informational) at the same time as each act as a constraint for the movement of the others (Appadurai, 1990: 298). Using these five flows helps to analyse how cosmopolitan skills work, not only inside the media organisations, but also outside them. Thus, this chapter focuses on the third research sub-question: “What limitations, if any, do journalists face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the global age?”

The four cosmopolitan skills have been investigated in the previous two empirical chapters. While these skills have previously been attributed to the work of foreign correspondents, they have now, to some extent, become present in the work of all journalists. This is due to the transformations that journalism as a profession is experiencing in relation to the processes of globalisation. But, as Reese has argued, theories which aim to capture hybridity between the global and the local still fail to capture the distinct transformations that globalisation has brought to journalism (2010: 346).

Thus, what has lacked in the globalisation debate is the acknowledgement that the media has emerged “as an independent institution with a logic of its own that other social institutions have to accommodate to” (Hjarvard, 2008: 105). The national imaginations of journalists have been challenged by globalisation and transnational processes. Kunelius and Ruusunoksa (2008: 663) defined the notion of journalists’ professional imagination as their collective of agency. Deuze writes that, in a multicultural society, the role of the media has to be discussed anew (2005a: 453). He argues that multiculturalism challenges historically embedded views of journalism. As a consequence we need to rethink journalism and the professional role of journalists in order to maintain an understanding of what journalism is, in an increasingly complex global society.

This is why the processes of globalisation need to be studied vis-a-vis cosmopolitan skills. This chapter analyses editors’ ability to have and use cosmopolitan skills at work. But this time it did not only analyse individuals as employees in their media organisations, but the analysis was conducted in relation to the “world at large” – to global societal flows. The findings are the result of thematic analysis throughout all questions of the interview related to career background, role and experiences, mobility, audiences, and other questions.
Appadurai (1990: 296) has famously proposed an analytical framework to explore the five dimensions of global cultural flows. For Appadurai, individual agency is at the heart of globalisation. This is why he coins the notion of “grassroots globalisation” (2000: 1). He writes that the way individuals imagine the world is “now central to all forms of agency, is itself a social fact, and is the key component of the new global order” (1996: 31). Appadurai’s analytical framework is useful for this study because it avoids methodological nationalism as well as allowing for individual agency. He conceptualised the five flows as (1) ethnoscapes, (2) mediascapes, (3) technoscapes, (4) financescapes, and (5) ideoscapes that affect all forms of agency. The suffix “-scape” in Appadurai’s analysis indicates that these are not objective relations but rather “deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political situatedness of different sorts of actors” (1990: 296). Due to the increasing uncertainty brought about by processes of globalisation, the role of the imagination has come to the fore. As Appadurai argues (1990: 297), the world we live in today is characterised by a new role for the imagination in social life.

The five landscapes are characterised by both overlaps and disjunctive shifts. Ethnoscapes refer to the landscape of people who constitute the shifting world through their mobility, including tourists, immigrants, refugees, exiles, guest workers and other mobile individuals and groups (1990: 589). Mediascapes refer to the processes of production, distribution and dissemination of information and images through various media forms including magazines and newspapers, which are available to a growing number of people throughout the world (1990: 590). Technoscapes refer to the global configuration of technology and its ever fluid and instant moves across previously impervious boundaries (1990: 589). Financescapes refer to the flow of global capital through national borders at instant speed (1990: 590). And finally, ideoscapes refer to the ideologies of states and the counter-ideologies of movements, they include terms and images related to freedom, rights, sovereignty and democracy (1990: 591). However, it is important to remember that Appadurai’s analysis refers to people of the world in general and not necessarily to editors working for elite magazines in New York and London.

In this study, the five landscapes are applied to journalism. Ethnoscapes refer to the movements of people, including both journalists and audiences. Technoscapes serve as the lens for journalism in the age of the Internet, including the new technologies and affordances it provides. Mediascapes refer to the locations and processes of production and distribution of media content. They also
address the changing role of audiences from passive into active users. Financescapes help to address the implications of the global economic crisis and more specifically the financial crisis of journalism. Finally, ideoscapes help the address the ideological polarisations among journalists and the question of what the role and values of journalists in the global age is. Each skill is analysed and discussed with the help of the five landscapes.

Appadurai’s work is useful because it locates the individual in the process of imagining the world. This study focuses on journalists as individuals who play a key role in the process of globalisation by interpreting the world for most people who don’t have first-hand contact with other parts of the world. Multiculturalism poses new challenges for journalists. The national imaginations of journalists have been challenged by globalisation and transnational processes, but this does not necessarily result in cosmopolitan skills. The question of “What limitations, if any, do journalists face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the global age?” is answered in four sections. Each section relates to one global theme, which refers to one cosmopolitan skill each, and is supported and explained through its supporting organising themes, as presented in Table 6.
### Table 6: Cosmopolitan skill and the five landscapes of global flows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cosmopolitan skills</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Skills of navigating different cultures** | • Those who were foreign correspondents have experienced 1-2 countries in addition to their own (a focused kind of globality)  
• Interviewees are experts on the Arab world, China and Africa, thus cosmopolitan in this context is not limited to “Western” or the global north  
• They read various international sources; but mainly the New York Times; their use of sources remains Western-centric | • Ethnoscapes  
• Ethnoscapes  
• Ideoscapes |
| **Mobility** | • Financial concerns limit mobility  
• While many editors express the wish to travel, the inner circle holds and for many, family is the main reason for why they don’t  
• Editors feel limited by their office being located in one place  
• Mobility remains a freelance feature | • Financescapes  
• Ethnoscapes  
• Financescapes  
• Financescapes |
| **Appreciation of difference** | • Diversity is stifled by publishing industry  
• Editors have global networks, but English is the lingua franca  
• Editors are aware that UK/US media are perceived to dominate the agenda by people from other countries | • Mediascapes  
• Ideoscapes  
• Ideoscapes |
| **Diverse audience awareness** | • While editors are aware of different audiences, but most stories are still local stories that appeal to people in certain localities  
• Complexity of the world requires interpretation – the standpoint of a publication and its interpretation are rooted in a culture; editors speak to audiences who share their ideology (of, for instance, liberalism) | • Ideoscapes  
• Technoscapes  
• Ideoscapes |
6.1. Skills of navigating different cultures

All of Appadurai’s five landscapes can be used when analysing editors’ skills of navigating cultures. The changes in the five landscapes have changed the ways journalists work, some more positively and some more negatively. For example, my previous findings showed that by using combinations of their social and professional identities, editors were able to cross national boundaries with their knowledge of languages and cultures across ethnoscapes. Another finding on the cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures in relation to autonomy (see section 5.1.) was that editors had also the professional knowledge required on know how to navigate the laws and regulations of various countries, which relates to the concept of ideoscapes.

While these findings substantially support the claim that editors possess the cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures, there are limitations to the extent of their cosmopolitan skills. While editors are familiar with the regulations of countries beyond the country they were born in or live in, and speak languages beyond their native tongue, their cosmopolitan skills tend to apply to one or two countries beyond their own. Thus, their skills cannot be understood as globally applicable, but instead, editors exhibit a focused kind of “globality” in terms of maximising the diversity of their cosmopolitan skills. This point is shown in the following quotes:

“About three years, based in São Paulo, and covering politics and economics, and a bit of the environment [Interviewer: Was that your only time as a foreign correspondent?] “...my only permanent one. I did a short time in Delhi.” (14, Lon)

“...my experience is not... is not terribly exciting because Washington and Brussels are not very... they're not hardship places. It's not quite like being based in Delhi or Latin America or somewhere like that, but you definitely get a different perspective by being around there. And since Europe, Continental Europe is... has been my main journalistic interest. The best way to understand the European Union [...] I did in Brussels, I repeatedly visited places like... Bonn, Paris, Rome, other major capitals.” (23, Lon)

“I then went to Paris to work for a French TV news channel [France 24], and then came here as an intern... It is quite a well-trodden route, actually... because they're on the lookout for sort of young British journalists because they've got an English channel” (27, Lon)

“I travelled to Mexico... My wife and I lived in Chiapas in Southern Mexico, and I wrote a travel adventure book about Mayan Indians. That took about three years, basically. I lived there for two of them, not continuously, and travelled a lot in Guatemala and in Chiapas and Yucatan, Belize, but especially in Chiapas, and Guatemala.” (16, NY)
These quotes reveal that interviewees have a certain amount of countries or a particular region they tend to be very familiar with. Their knowledge of these places gives them an area of expertise or a point of comparison within the news work of their publication. Hannerz (Interviewed by Rantanen, 2007: 18) argues that foreign correspondents, rather than anthropologists, possess cosmopolitan skills. He writes that “most anthropologists don’t really maximize diversity. You find some who go away from home to some distant place, but then keep returning to that place again and again. So they have two places that they know intimately, but the idea of an ideal cosmopolitan is more of one who shifts around and goes to many different places and maximizes diversity” (Interviewed by Rantanen, 2007: 18). According to Hannerz, cosmopolitan skills of navigating different cultures need to apply to many different regions and cultures ideally, following the principle of “the more diverse experiences of diversity, the better”.

But most interviewees in this study are similar to anthropologists in that they have a limited amount of places they know very well, rather than maximizing diversity as such. If interviewees were to focus on more locations, however, one might object that this sacrifices the depth of their knowledge for more breadth. Additionally, it is important to note that interviewees were more likely to have worked in global cities of the West than other places. Here we can see how despite the world becoming more connected, as technoscapes imply, the interviewed editors still mainly move between the capitals mostly located in the West. The editors are among the most privileged people in the world when it comes to the access of technology, but technology alone cannot change navigation skills restricted by financescapes and professional ideology.

This finding can be viewed through Appadurai’s concept of ethnoscapes (1990: 589), which is the movement of people who constitute the shifting world through their mobility. Appadurai (1990: 297) argues that individuals warp the stabilities of communities and networks that were thus far stable, to some extent, as more people deal with being mobile or desire more mobility. The editors in this study constitute part of this group of people on the move. They are mobile and expressed the desire to be mobile. Further, their work influences the locations they are based in and their areas of expertise in turn influence their further mobility. However, the places they go to are still largely global Western cities.

Considering editors’ skill of navigating different culture to the lens of ethnoscapes shows that among interviewees in this study, their skill is best understood as focused on a few particular areas or regions. While editors aim to experience diversity, they do not necessarily aim to maximise their
experience of diversity. Partly this is due to their professional ideology, which Deuze defined as “a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular group, including – but not limited to – the general process of the production of meanings and ideas (within that group)” (2005a: 445). Following their organisational ideology, identity and logic, editors adhere to their particular news beats and areas of expertise. This is demonstrated in the following quote:

“I wouldn’t pitch stories about Chinese politics, because we have a guy in Beijing who’s been there since 1985 and speaks perfect Chinese, and is a really good political analyst... if I did develop some theory, and I could convince him [the member of staff based in Beijing] that it was right and interesting, then I’d probably be allowed to write it, but the chances of that happening are quite slim.” (25, Lon)

The interviewee explained that Chinese politics are not part of his “territory”, which is why he is unlikely to contribute to that area of the publication. Interviewees’ experiences can be compared with Beck’s concept of “place-polygamy (2006: 43), whereby people are attached to a few different places during their lifetime because of globalisation. Similarly, the editors in this study have come to work on reporting about more than one country because of the growing relevance and interconnectedness of the world that has been brought about by globalisation. Yet, their experience is not wholly “global” in terms of spanning the globe, but tends to focus on a few global cities instead.

A finding in this study was that interviewees are experts on regions including the Arab world, China and Africa. Critics of cosmopolitanisation, on which cosmopolitan skills are partly based have often emphasised the Euro-centrism and Western-centrism of theories of cosmopolitanism (see, for instance, Bhambra, 2011: 313; Calhoun 2007: 873). Calhoun, for example, has argued that academics conceive of cosmopolitanisation because they themselves frequently travel (2002: 872). Robbins describes how “cosmopolitan immediately evokes the image of a privileged person: someone who can claim to be a “citizen of the world” by virtue of independent means, expensive tastes, and a globe-trotting lifestyle” (1998: 248). Robbins compares this viewpoint to what Donna Haraway described as the white man’s privilege of “a conquering gaze from nowhere,” a gaze that claims “the power to see and not be seen, to represent while escaping representation” (1990: 188). When it comes to the cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures among editors in this study, their skills are neither limited to Europe nor to the West, as these quotes show:

“I was in South Africa, and Zimbabwe, and Mozambique just sort of travelling around. And then I came back and did another four or five months as the online Middle East and Africa editor, and then in April this year I moved to the Home Affairs beat, on the Britain section.
So that covers prisons, police, immigration, law, and I tend to do our sort of Islam-related stuff, because of my background in Middle Eastern things, and I do some things for the international section, sometimes kind of women-related.” (22, Lon)

“But we don't sort of set out each week to persuade people that Liberia's incredibly important and they ought to pay attention to it, I think it's more that we try and sort of prick people's interests by writing stories from a particular place, hopefully writing them well, and with some interesting analysis in there, in such a way that... like presenting people with a kind of intellectual puzzle, and that they can then get involved in and can see, oh, I can see from this that, actually Liberia's quite important.” (14, Lon)

“I grew up in Africa and was educated in Europe and work in Europe and I'm very conscious of the different strands and different places. In a post-colonial world, everything calls for a completely different attitude. It's not that Europe can go and impose its museums on Africa and tell them what to do, but there's a new kind of partnership in trying to get things right.” (35, Lon)

These quotes show that counter to the criticisms levelled against cosmopolitan theories as being limited to the Western world, the cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures is not limited to the West among editors in this study. Similar to Appadurai's ethnoscape, there has been a change in the editors’ mobility and interests even though it is limited by financial constraints brought about by the financescape. However, developments brought about by the technoscape allow editors to read sources beyond their own location.

In their seminal work on De-Westernizing Media Studies, Curran and Park (2000: 3) have observed that “it has become routine for universalistic observations about the media to be advanced in English-language books on the basis of evidence derived from a tiny handful of countries”. Similarly, Livingstone (2007) has argued that there is a difference between extending a largely westernised field of study and seeking to diversify a field by de-Westernising it. This argument is useful for this study in the following way. Interviewees are trying to de-Westernise the scope of their publications reach, however their framework remains Western and cannot be viewed as a universal or global framework due to the special position of power the publications in this study hold.

One previous finding (in section 4.1.) was that editors follow and read a variety of sources and news media publications, including non-English news media publications. This allows interviewees to develop their cosmopolitan skill of navigation and gain an understanding of the discourses that are formed outside of English-speaking media publications. However, in terms of frequency or magnitude, this study found the most frequently read publication among interviewees is the New York Times. This was particularly evident among interviewees in New York, but also among interviewees in London:
“I always read the [New York] Times. Religiously” (14, NY)

“I read the [New York] Times every day.” (12, NY)

Editors were aware of the biases in their media diet, as demonstrated in the following quote:

“We are a global publication. We write about Britain, and we write about Britain in much the same way as we write about other countries... I've spent the last ten to 15 years writing about European matters... But it is a fact, nevertheless, that the bulk of the staff here are British, British educated and we are based in London, so you are bound to form some of your knowledge of the news and views from quite British sources.” (19, Lon)

The New York Times and the New York Review of Books have a lot of clout among interviewees in both New York and London. Many of the interviewees in London mentioned that they read New York-based publications including The New Yorker, but few of the interviewees in New York mentioned that they read London-based publications, such as the Guardian, while none of the New York-based interviewees mentioned The Economist or Intelligent Life magazine as a publication they follow. A few interviewees mentioned international sources they read regularly such as Haaretz, the Spiegel and online sources such as The Daily Dish, a blog published by Andrew Sullivan who is a British author and blogger based in the US. Therefore, the overall news consumption and sources interviewees draw on remain largely Western-centric, and more specifically, New York-centric. This finding supports Sparks’ argument that far from lacking any recognisable centre, as the strong globalisation paradigm claims, the US remains the political and “news flow” centre of power (2007a: 173).

The concept of ideoscapes, which refers to ideologies, ideas and images (1990: 591), is particularly relevant to this finding. According to Appadurai, ideoscapes are composed of elements of the Enlightenment worldview, which consists of terms and images, such as freedom, welfare, rights and democracy. Similarly, newspapers proclaim that they follow in their work core values such as fairness, integrity and truth (for example, the New York Times Standards and Ethics, 2015). However, this study has questioned the objectivity norm (see section 2.2.2.) and the assumption that the journalist is an objective reporter. Journalism has long focused on the ideology of objectivity in its ideoscape. The normative focus on journalistic objectivity asks for journalists to distance themselves from their sources, to be culture-neutral and to erase themselves from their stories. In The New York Times, journalists still refer to themselves in writing with the detached notion of “this reporter”. Because this is the most dominant publication mentioned by interviewees it inescapably influences
the value judgements and ideologies of journalists in London and New York about what good journalism is in the global age.

Previously, scholar have pointed out that the tendency to privilege Western practices, thought and values obscures from view other journalism practices (Breit, Obijiofor and Fitzgerald, 2013: 119). Further, it renders Western modes of journalism as replicable in any part of the world. A narrow view on sources and the rootedness of Western publications in Western sources overlooks non-Westerns modes of thought and journalistic practice. Therefore, the focus on Western sources inevitably establishes Western modes of thought and practice as desirable among interviewees, even when they are based in non-Western locations.

To conclude, this section found that in relation to ethnoscapes, editors in this study constitute part of the group of professionals on the move. They expressed the desire to be mobile and they value mobility. However, editors in this study do not tend to maximize the diversity of their experience. Instead, they become experts in a few regions, similar to anthropologists. Additionally, some editors are experts on China, India, Africa and the Arab world, which means that their cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures is not limited to the West. Nonetheless, the majority of interviewees in this study tended to move between global cities of the West. While developments brought about by technoscapes allow editors to read sources beyond their own location, the most frequently read publication was the New York Times. In relation to ideoscapes, this finding shows a largely homogenised media diet and ideology, whereby New York remains a central source for news flows. Compared to the rest of the world, the journalists in this study have a considerable amount of resources at hand, but even so, they could do more to go beyond their bubble.

6.2. Mobility

Over the last two decades, international travel has become easier and cheaper, mobility has increased drastically, and technological connectivity has made it easier to stay in touch across various locations. In principle, mobility and connectivity have become easier, because many professional groups, migrants and refugees are constantly on the move. However, the global financial crisis and the crisis of journalism have obstructed journalists’ ability to be increasingly mobile. As a result journalism lags behind the fast, and interconnected processes of societal globalisation, argued Benton (2015) in a recent Nieman article. Financescapes, in particular, are moving more rapidly than any other scapes.
In relation to financescapes in journalism, the theory chapter has argued that as a result of the crisis of journalism caused by financial pressures and technological developments, many news media publications were forced to shut their international bureaus (Niknejad et al. 2014). Previously, it has been shown that interviewees in this study are mobile (see section 4.2.) and still value physical mobility over mediated mobility in their reporting (see section 5.2.). Nevertheless financial concerns somewhat limit the extent to which interviewees can make use of their cosmopolitan skill of being mobile, as demonstrated in the following quotes:

“...we have to watch the budget much more than we used to. We've been reminded about watching the budget much more than we used to be, but there isn't really a substitute I think for going out and seeing people and meeting somebody.” (12, Lon)

“I quite often think is it really worth blowing £2,000 of The Economist’s money to fly you to America for this? And money’s not limited, and in the end once you've spent it on one thing you can’t spend it on another” (17, Lon)

“I'd say most of them were based in New York, but you know we certainly have an international network, mainly because we fly photographers less and less. So if we have a story based in, you know, Europe, we’d be trying to use a European photographer.” (17, NY)

This quote reveals a decline in the mobility of staff members and the turn towards freelance contributors to supplement coverage on European countries.

[About video journalists:] “They're New York-based, pretty much, and New York State-based just because we don’t have much money on the web side...” (12, NY)

This quote shows that most contributors are based in New York due to financial constraints. This especially applies to contributors who work for publications’ online platforms which tend to still have smaller budgets, and pay contributors less, than their print counterparts.

“For financial reasons, we can’t have correspondents everywhere; paid correspondents, but we do have paid correspondents in Paris, Brussels, Berlin and Moscow, and a semi-paid correspondent in Rome. But the rest of Europe is stringers or freelancers, but many of them are quite experienced and have been there for quite a long time and obviously know the place they’re from, and they’re probably the most important... my most important source of information.” (19, Lon)

Therefore, financial concerns are perceived as constraints for interviewees to be mobile themselves as well as to send their contributors to other places. This is why interviewees outsource the work that requires mobility to freelancers and local stringers in their areas of interest. This concept of
financescapes is particularly relevant to this finding (1990: 590). It refers to the flow of global capital through national borders at instant speed. Outcomes of this flow were the global economic crisis and the crisis of journalism. Editors in this study are aware of the financial pressures in their industry and these pressures limit the extent of editors’ mobility. Appadurai writes that international capital continuously shifts its needs, as production and technology generate different needs (1990: 589). Editors are affected by these financial changes, which have changed the balance between staff and freelance journalists in international news. They can neither afford to be as mobile as they like, nor afford to send their staff writers abroad. Instead, editors increasingly commission freelance writers abroad to cover the regions they cannot physically reach.

At the same time editors feel that being based in one location limits their cosmopolitan skills in various ways. This point is shown in the following quotes:

“We try hard to be not noticeably British but it’s quite hard when our only editorial office is in London, when we’re pretty much most of the time all British, living in London all the time... The only way I think you would solve that is if we had an office in New York or an office in Paris and writers who were... editors who... were living and working elsewhere, realistically. We don’t do badly at it, but it’s an area we could definitely improve on.” (41, Lon)

“...it would be nice to have spent time in other cities and absorbing other cultures. That’s a good thing. I envy Times reporters who go... who are forced to spend three or four years in different capitals, and they just have a much broader knowledge of the world than I have, having been here. Although I’ve always felt this was the centre of the world, and The New Yorker’s about New York and the cosmopolitan nature of the American urban society.” (20, NY)

In the first quote, the interviewee stated that she feels limited by the location of her office, in addition to limitations relating to issues of social identity. A solution for this limitation, she suggests, would be to have multiple offices in various locations. The second quote reveals that while the interviewee would have liked to work in various places, the organisational identity and location of his publication has created work conditions whereby he felt that New York was “the centre of the world” which was cosmopolitan in its nature and telling of American urban society.

With regards to technoscapes it is important to note that these perceptions are related to the fact that the three publications in this study are traditional print publications that have expanded to have digital platforms. Today, younger news media, such as Buzzfeed or Quartz, have been created with the purpose of being digital-only news platforms. The headquarters of these platforms are based in New York but they hire local journalists in various countries to contribute to their publications.
Contributors at these publications might not feel limited by their publication’s offices, but, the majority of their staff members and their headquarters still remain concentrated in one place.

Another central finding on major limitations to the cosmopolitan skill of mobility is that mobility is challenged by editors’ family ties. Editors have the choice not to be mobile, unlike refugees, for instance. But if they do not become mobile this might affect the advancement of their career. It is important to note that there was no gender difference was noted in this regard. Both male and female editors expressed the wish to be mobile, family ties are the main reason for why they choose certain locations to go to or choose to be based in one location. This point is illustrated in the following quotes:

“I’d wanted to do a foreign correspondent’s job but I was fairly restricted in where I wanted to go, because my wife didn’t marry a journalist, she married somebody who was an economic consultant and did the sort of nine to five-ish type job. So and also we had a youngster, as well … if we were going to go somewhere, [we] wanted to go to North America or Western Europe, Japan in a pinch.” (24, Lon)

[Interviewer: And would you like to, at any point, live in another country, or city?] “I think it’s very unlikely to happen now because my husband, he’s a Londoner through and through. I think I’m very unlikely to live anywhere else but London now for the rest of my life. Yes and the children are at school in London, so it’s not very likely.” (6, Lon)

“I travelled, generally speaking, without my wife, because it’s, kind of, harder… if you’re writing that sort of first person narrative stuff, it’s harder to have two people in it... Because I think you’re operating as a recording device, and you, yourself are not a recording device, in a tape recorder sense, but you... your presence is part of the narrative.” (16, NY)

[Interviewer: How much do you travel now?] “Not so much, because my daughter is still at home, finishing school this year. So I try not to be away too often, too long. But you can’t do what I do and not get out there and go and see what’s on and hear people talking about things.” (31, Lon) [She travels about once every two months.]

These four quotes reveal that family life arrangements are the main consideration for both male and female interviewees when it comes to decision related to mobility. Here the gender aspect of editors’ social identity has not been a divisive factor. The third quote demonstrates why journalists feel that they have to conduct their work on their own, which makes it difficult for them to travel with their spouse. The journalist is part of the narrative he or she creates and thus, the presence of another person may change the narrative. Therefore, the affiliations and ties of interviewees post somewhat limit to their ability to exercise their cosmopolitan skills.
This finding is relevant in relation to the concept of ethnoscapes, because it elucidates the ties that influence people’s movements. This finding supports arguments made by Bude and Dürrschmidt (2010: 481) who suggested that globalisation and mobility serve to reinforce traditional social bonds. But family ties and other affiliations do not have to contradict each other. Nussbaum (1994) argues that the Stoics conceptualised the affiliations of a citizen of the world in terms of concentric circles. In order to be a cosmopolitan, they argued, one does not need to give up local identifications. Instead, each person can imagine him or herself as surrounded by a sequence of concentric circles. The first one is drawn around the self, then the immediate family, then the extended family, the neighbourhood, city and country until the largest circle on the outside forms humanity as a whole. Our task, argues Nussbaum (1994), and cites the Stoic philosopher Hierocles, is to “draw the circles somehow toward the centre”. She concludes that rather than giving up their special affections and identifications, whether ethnic or gender-based or religious, people should nourish them, and “make all human beings part of our community of dialogue and concern, base our political deliberations on that interlocking commonality, and give the circle that defines our humanity a special attention and respect.”

Her idea is relevant to this study, because the findings confirm that the inner circles of affiliation still take precedent over wider circles in considerations related to the work of editors. In his book on foreign correspondents, Hannerz (2004: 98) interviewed David Remnick, who was based in Moscow as a foreign correspondent for the Washington Post in the late 1980s during the time of glasnost and perestroika. Remnick consequently went on to become the editor of The New Yorker. In one part of the interview, Remnick tells Hannerz that once he had his first child he decided to make time for family life, and his family returned to the US. Therefore, one of the main limitations mobility as a cosmopolitan skill is posed by personal family life circumstances of interviewees.

Another finding in this study reveals that, on the whole, mobility remains a feature of freelance journalists, rather than editors who tend to be based in one location. This is due to organisational hierarchies of media companies. Editors have permanent jobs, nice offices and prestige, while they commission freelancers to do a large amount of the journalistic work. This is partly due to the crisis of journalism and the fact that editors’ skill of being mobile themselves has decreased as a result of financial pressures. One interviewee described this development in this way:

“I think a lot of what attracts people to doing journalism is the idea that it’s not just an office job, and the idea that you get to meet new people as part of it. So I think that it is a...”
driving desire for lots of people in the industry when... in an era when the majority of journalists are based behind a desk.” (15, Lon)

This quote illustrates that while one of the attractions used to be its feature of mobility, it has increasingly become a career that is not very mobile. Other interviewees stated the following obstacles to being mobile:

“...the longer you’re in a profession, the more you realise it’s to do with sort of banked kind of loyalty to institutions... there are very few walks of life in which you can just pick up and go. Maybe if you’re a photographer, or... if you’re a freelancer of any sort, maybe you can do these things. But even then, I think, as you grow older, perhaps, think about starting a family and so on, you’d become limited in those respects. (1, NY)

This quote shows that the editor feels tied to his institution. In contrast, Hannerz has previously argued that cosmopolitans are often people with “credentials of knowledge that can be readily decontextualized and recontextualised” (2007b: 74). While editors possess cosmopolitan skills, they currently face a financescape within their industry which has makes it difficult for them to transfer their skills across institutions and locations. This, however, may not apply to the biggest names in journalism and it does also, to some extent, not apply to freelance journalists who do not have a permanent staff role.

“I think what delineates the kind of work that I do, is the fact that I’m at my desk, here, all day. So, I haven’t reported in the same way. I’ll make phone calls, and have, conduct interviews in that way, but it’s not the same as actually being somewhere” (2, NY).

These quotes show that news media companies’ members of staff are less likely to be mobile, due to a combination of institutional loyalty, age and family ties as well as financial pressures that affect their companies. When asked whether he perceives digital media to be an advantage that enabled him in some way to experience far-away places and events while working with local reporters or stringers, he responded:

“I think that’s an advantage to be had there, but I think the advantage... it’s a kind of balance sheet of the news organisation rather than the quality that’s out there... I think the reason that that model exists there is because revenues are down substantially, so it’s a cheaper model to have permanent staff almost uniquely sat behind desks in a big city in the world and pay freelancers and stringers not very much money to do the reporting and the legwork.” (15, Lon)
This quote shows that news media companies increasingly rely on freelancers, which is one result of the proliferation of digital technologies. Thus, technoscapes have overlapped with financescapes to change the mobility of journalists. This finding is relevant to the concept of financescapes, which refer to the flow of capital across national borders. Freelancers, who are mobile, are one of the outcomes of the financial crisis of journalism and the global economic crisis more generally. Franks has argued that the shift from staff foreign correspondents to a reliance on stringers is an important reason behind the changes and decrease of foreign news coverage: “If an institution has invested in a member of staff, there will be good reasons for taking regular material from that person and running his or her stories. In the case of a stringer, there is no longer such an obligation” (2006: 92).

Further, Franks (2010: 41) has argued that the nature of reporting has changed so that the presence of the foreign correspondent “out in the field” has shifted. Long-term foreign correspondents tend to get replaced with “fireman” or “parachute” foreign correspondents and editors following news agencies can override the decisions and views of reporters on the ground (2010: 42).

Another result of the interplay between technoscapes and financescapes is the mounting pressure put on editors to diversify their role and try different ways of engaging and acquiring new audiences. This point is demonstrated in the following quote, which has previously been referred to in section 5.1.1.:

“I think we’re always constraint by time, in the sense that more and more is demanded of us. Because such a hurricane is going through our industry... so we’re trying different things all the time. For instance – should we run a book club, should we do more videos, should we do more audio, should we have more books, should we have fewer book? Should we run international, global best seller lists? Should we interview authors? There’s still only 24 hours in the day. And everything has to be done well, it takes time.” (21, Lon)

This quote demonstrates the ways in which technological developments, digital media and a global reach combined with changing financial circumstances limit and constrain the autonomy of editors, who have to deal with an increasing demand of tasks. This finding echoes the experience voiced by journalist Ruth Reichl (2012), who gave two Delacorte lectures at Columbia’s Journalism School to talk about her experience of editing a magazine – the first in 2003 and the second in 2009. The difference between the two lectures is striking. Due to technological developments and pressures in the industry her tasks have broadened from editing a magazine, to tasks that include long-term planning, dealing with art directors and digital strategy. She concludes that “it’s very much a changing role” (2012: 46).
To conclude, it can be said that while mobility has been increasing in the world, surprisingly less mobility takes place in the journalistic profession. Editors in this study cannot be very mobile across ethnoscapes due to financescapes’ constraints. The global financial crisis and the crisis of journalism have obstructed journalists’ ability to be increasingly mobile. Another central finding on major limitations to the cosmopolitan skill of mobility was that mobility is challenged by editors’ family ties. Mobility for journalists is increasingly seen as a freelance feature. Perhaps the real new foreign correspondents are freelancers.

6.3. The appreciation of difference

The five global cultural flows in the form of ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes and ideoscapes have brought actors from different cultures together. This creates a greater awareness of our own place and its relative location within the range of world experience (Reese, 2010: 344). However, an awareness of difference does not necessarily translate into an appreciation of difference as a result of these five landscapes. The opposite, a rejection of difference, is just as possible. Ideoscapes are particularly important in this respect, especially because nationalism is on the rise in many countries today. Chapter 5 demonstrated that editors still view audiences in national terms to some extent. Journalism has long been seen as a national enterprise and it is difficult to change this configuration, even if individual journalists try their best to do so. Chapter 4 has shown that organisational identities take precedence over social and professional identities among journalists, and that there is still an underrepresentation of minorities and women in the media. While developments in the technoscape are unfolding on a daily basis, other landscapes are slower in comparison.

As argued in chapter 4, women and minorities are still underrepresented in the journalistic profession, even though editors expressed a desire to diversify their profession. As one of the external limitations to diversification, editors noted that the publishing industry stifles diversity. Editors raised the publishing industry as an issue in their profession and expressed similar sentiments on this matter. They say that the diversity of the pool of writers they can draw from is stifled by the publishing industry, because it publishes few authors who are female or LGBT or from ethnic minorities. Therefore editors have a smaller pool of mainly male and mainly non-minority published contributors (or authors whose books they can review) to draw from. This point is demonstrated in the following quote:
“I think that there are structural issues in publishing that make my job harder than I want it to be sometimes. Like, it’s hard to find good stories. I have nothing right now. I’ve got fucking nothing and it’s annoying [...] I can’t find any good stories by women right now and I think that that is in part a function of the industry being constrained for women in a way. I think that it goes far. I think it’s a wide and deep issue and that’s getting some attention lately” (3, NY).

This quote illustrates that the editor feels constrained by the functioning or the forms of discrimination that run through the mediascape of the publishing industry. He explained that while “the staff here is very gender balanced, the writers are not and I think there are a lot of reasons for that”. He referred to the VIDA count, which counts the amount of by-lines according to gender. While the editorial team is gender-balanced, the proportion among freelance writers, authors and reviewers is far less balanced. The reason is that in order to become a freelance contributor or reviewer to a publication such as The New Yorker, it helps to be a published author. However, the publishing industry limits the sample of potential authors and thus, magazines and newspapers have less material and a smaller and relatively homogenous group of people to work with. He added that gender is just one example of the constraints he perceives as outcomes of the publishing industry. Further, he stated that he could say the same thing about “international narratives”, “literature in translation” and “LGBTQ narratives”.

In addition, one editor expressed concern over the shrinking of the market for non-fiction and the growing power of publishing conglomerates and supermarket chains over distribution and placement:

“...it’s to do with places like Waterstones where they don’t promote serious books, and things like Waitrose, all the chains have enormous power. My last book -- I couldn’t get an English publisher for it. But the American publisher distributed it here -- it’s much easier in America to get published. But, they’ll hide it away under French history, whereas, it’s the sort of book that... for Christmas would have been selling well.” (7, Lon)

Many editors in this study are authors of non-fiction books. Because the market for non-fiction is shrinking they feel constrained by the publishing industry. All three publications use well-known authors of non-fiction and fiction as their contributors and all three publications review both fiction and non-fiction. Therefore, the mediascape of the wider publishing industry is perceived as a major force and constraint among editors, who draw on books, authors, reviews and reviewers in their everyday work. In contrast, another editor explained that while there are not many outlets for either novellas or non-fiction pieces, this has changed with the internet “where space and the amount of
paper is no longer a consideration.” However, the availability of space does not guarantee a revival of sustainable and economically viable long-form non-fiction formats, or the distribution of such.

Further, it is interesting to note that the book publishing industry is perceived as having become less cosmopolitan in recent years. This point is demonstrated in the following quote:

“…there’s still the remnants of a sort of like cosmopolitan, multinational, multilingual approach. Like, when you see a book editor of the generation before mine in publishing putting out feelers for a new assistant, for example, they’re still saying stuff like preferably reads in more than one language. They want people who can read in French, which is almost too antiquarian. It almost doesn’t really apply anymore, because the literary translations into English are kind of spare.” (3, NY)

He added that “the publishing industry is very tight and they’re not publishing very many works in translation, less and less every year, so I think that’s kind of less and less pertinent”. This finding echoes the previous finding that younger editors tend to speak fewer foreign languages than their older counterparts in this study. Moreover, other sources confirm that translated fiction forms a very small percentage in the English publishing world (Flood, 2015).

One previous finding (in section 5.2.2.) was that editors have global networks and are able to commission stories from various contributors. However, this skill is limited by the fact that English remains, to a large extent, the lingua franca among editors in this study, which is demonstrated in the following quotes:

“I’ve worked with Anglophone writers all over the place. And for some reason, I often seem to get the people who are in far-flung time zones, such as China, Egypt, Turkey, India. But it’s quite rare that I’ve worked with writers who are not of British or American nationality in those places.” (1, NY)

“We’re trying to be a British magazine that is sufficiently international to appeal to the English-speaking reader who might be in Zurich or in Zagreb or Sydney. Or if they’ve got an iPad or an iPhone, they might be in New York or LA.” (3, Lon)

These quotes show that while contributors and readers are imagined in different locations, they remain bound by one language. This is why many contributors who are based in various places tend to be British or American nationalists or hold two citizenships. This finding is similar to Hannerz’s argument that “despite the fact that the news business is in some ways obviously global, most foreign correspondents do their reporting in a single language” (2004: 78). In addition, Hannerz
argued that it happens very rarely that foreign correspondents decide to switch their primary allegiance from one language segment to another (2004: 78).

This finding is relevant to the concept of ideoscapes, which are dominated by Anglo-American affiliations, ties and norms in this study. In addition, one editor explained that he is aware that the UK/US media are perceived to dominate the agenda by people from other countries, which is linked to the issue of language:

“I’ve heard people in places like Greece and Italy, to take two recent examples, who have been saying to me that they find it very irritating that global views of what’s going on in their countries tend to be informed by what people have read in The Financial Times, The Economist and The Wall Street Journal, and no… even in translation… what they hear from the media in their… own, in those countries.” (19, Lon)

This quote demonstrates that editors encounter objections or unease among people they meet in other countries, when it comes to the way their nations are represented on the global level. Rather than reading the perspectives of journalists writing from Greece about Greece in translation, these people find their countries represented through the ideoscapes of news media publications that are based in London and New York.

The process of diversification is limited by the mediascape of the publishing industry. Further, Anglo-American ideoscapes and mediascapes dominate the news agenda. Even though editors have global networks, English remains the lingua franca. “Anyone Here Been Raped and Speaks English?” is the title of the foreign correspondent Edward Behr’s autobiography (1982). He took the title from a question shouted by British television reporters at a crowd of refugee women and children escaping the civil war in Congo in the 1960s (quoted in Hannerz, 2004: 89). Hannerz concludes: “It seems to say something about what you can do with a language and at least as much about what you cannot do without the right one” (2004: 89). As long as English remains the dominant news language among journalists, to an extent where other languages are not a necessity, non-English speakers are less likely to be heard.

To conclude, this section has shown that developments in the landscapes mediascapes and ideoscapes pose limits to editors’ cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference. While the world is seen as being on the move, journalism lags behind to an extent. Additionally, the rapid developments in the technoscape do not further the appreciation of difference at this current stage.
6.4. Diverse audience awareness

Mediascapes refer to the locations and processes of production and distribution of media content. They also address the changing role of audiences from passive into active users. The previous chapter has analysed the way in which editors have become aware of and interested in the members of their audiences and how they have begun to interact with each other. In relation to audiences, two landscapes are potentially important: ethnoscapes and technoscapes. While technoscapes develop with great speed, allowing journalists new ways to communicate with their audience, ethnoscapes lag behind. Audiences are still perceived on as somewhat nationally bounded interest groups. This is demonstrated in the quotes to come.

The importance of technoscapes in relation to journalism has come to the fore over the last two decades. Fifteen years prior to the present study, Deuze (1999: 379) established three keywords to characterise online journalism: (1) interactivity; (2) personalization and (3) convergence. According to him, online news had the potential to make the reader part of the news experience. And comment sections and the exchange of emails between journalists and readers would allow for a rapid reader response. Personalization, also an audience-related feature, was the second key feature of digital journalism. Deuze argued that the technology of the Internet allows for adjustments between the individual preferences of the user and the journalist through custom-made news platforms. The third feature, convergence in the context of online journalism compared to traditional journalism, referred to the “melting of these traditional media forms – (moving) image, text, sound – in one story told online” (1999: 379). The provision of all these elements gives the journalist as well as the reader a larger choice in deciding how to cover and how to read a story respectively.

But in the last decade, research has moved from the deterministic and overly optimistic to the empirical and critical. Technological determinism has generally been rejected as promoting digital utopias (Domingo, 2008; Spyridou et al., 2013). Empirical research has already offered some evidence that there is “a gap between, on the one hand, online journalists’ perceptions of the Internet’s potential and, on the other hand, the actual use of interactive features hypertext and multimedia in practice” (Deuze, Neuberger and Paulussen, 2004: 22). Other scholars were more have put it in more blunt terms: Domingo (2008) for instance, declared interactivity in the daily routines of online newsrooms to be an uncomfortable myth.
In the previous two chapters, it has been shown that editors take interest in their audiences. This is a huge shift from earlier studies on journalists that have shown that journalists are not interested in their audiences (Schlesinger, 1978: 106; Tunstall, 1971: 41). However, it has to be noted that while editors are aware of different audiences, most news stories are still considered local stories that appeal to certain audiences in certain localities. This point is demonstrated in the following quotes:

“I would feel very sceptical of people who tried to... give a kind of global perspective on the problems which are always, to a degree, local ones... if I was going to do that, which I never would, I would try and approach it from the bottom up, approaching the point of view of the individuals concerned, the stories that they told me...” (37, Lon)

“...there’s going to be more Asian interest in articles on an Asian subjects and more European interests on articles with European subjects. I think of the Economist as being the house organ of globalisation and to some extent, we’re addressing a very pretty international audience that has kind of global perspective.” (16, Lon)

These quotes show that editors perceive certain stories to be interesting to certain people depending on their geographical location. In fact, in the first quote one editor suggests that if would be detrimental to try and frame stories from a global perspective, when they concern specific individuals in certain localities. Similarly, Hannerz argued “every story is a local story” (2004: 81) which is why journalists can fall back on standard structures of reporting. In her seminal study, Tuchman (1973) argued that journalists “routinized the unexpected” by putting news into categories. When it comes to news from different parts of the world, certain categories still apply to the format of the news story.

However, Franks (2010: 45) has demonstrated that while some journalists have applied a double standard in reporting domestic stories compared to foreign news stories (which could not be seen or scrutinised by those they were about) in the past, this is no longer possible. Thanks to technological advances, international audiences can now access and scrutinise any news stories that have written about them in another country. This creates new pressures for journalists to be accurate and avoid stereotypes in their reporting. At the same time this creates new dangers for journalists, if audiences dislike what journalists produce.

There has been an attempt to theoretically define global journalism as a distinctive style of news (see, for instance Berglez, 2008). In his study, Berglez distinguished the style of global journalism from the style of domestic and foreign journalism. He argued that global journalism as a news style “makes it into an everyday routine to investigate how people and their actions, practices, problems,
life conditions etc. in different parts of the world are interrelated” (2008: 847). However, this study found that interviewees still perceive that news stories are relevant to people in specific locations, rather than emphasising the interrelatedness of news among people across different locations.

Another finding was that while editors are aware of their diverse audiences, they still maintain a certain ideological outlook that is tied to their organisational identity. The complexity of the world requires interpretation and the standpoint of a publication and its interpretation are rooted in a culture. Thus, editors speak to audiences who share their ideology (of, for instance, liberalism). This point is demonstrated in the following quotes:

“So we have values that, if you like, are the product of that liberal movement in the 19th century. We are the product of the society to which this newspaper was born... we wouldn't have been created in Russia in 1853, we were created in Britain in 1853.” (12, Lon)

“I do think that the habits of mind of The New Yorker journalist are hard to instil in someone who’s grown up in the other tradition. It only works if they’ve actually read The New Yorker passionately. That’s the only way they can have internalized it.” (1, NY)

These two quotes show how values of organisational identity are intimately linked to a historical trajectory. Additionally, contributors are expected to internalize these values.

“The history of the media is such, that every publication was tied to a place. So, that may change, but there’s still a sense of – this domain is based here. This office is based here. I don’t know of any publication that’s really, truly, totally international. So, the way The New Yorker’s called The New Yorker, the New York Times is called the New York Times. The LA Times is called the LA Times. Le Monde is, I mean, it means the world, but it’s very, very Paris based. I guess it’s actually, the Guardian doesn’t. But places are geographically affiliated. So, I think that the role, I think that what they present is necessarily bound to that geography... I would rather read something that is about me as a citizen of the world, than me as a citizen of my country. But, like language, and the way people write. That makes a huge, huge difference in what I understand.” (21, NY)

“The New Yorker began as a very provincial New York magazine in the 1920s... I think the circulation was almost confined to New York City and the suburbs. And then during the Second World War, a few publications, including The New Yorker, were reprinted in paperback books and distributed to the soldiers in Europe, and as a result, GIs marching through France and Germany were given The New Yorker, it was handed out to them every week. And many of them came back and went to college under the GI Bill, which suddenly education in this country just mushroomed; the number of people that went to college in the late 1940s was huge compared to the number before. And those people continued to read The New Yorker, so suddenly The New Yorker was a national magazine even though it was still nominally about New York, even though we still referred to Fifth Avenue as The Avenue, and all these silly local things.” (20, NY)
These quotes show that *The New Yorker* originated as a local magazine and became a national magazine during the Second World War. However, editors at *The New Yorker* have not described it as an international magazine at any point.

“We have a British, English character and culture and I think part of what people like about *The Economist* is a certain flavour, a certain kind of particular cultural flavour that comes from being published in Britain.” (26, Lon)

These two quotes show that every media publication is perceived to be tied to a particular nation state or global city. Further, editors do not try to be “all things to all people” but speak from a particular cultural perspective to audiences who agree with that particular perspective as demonstrated in the following two quotes:

“We’re not trying to be Esperanto. We’re not trying to be all things to all people.” (39, Lon)

“Well, I don’t think you cater to your audience. I think the success of what we’re doing here is that, we have our own stance and our own view and our own perspective, and that’s what is put out every week. And then, that’s put out to all different cultures and people in the whole world, and if somebody’s interested in that stance and that view and that perspective, they come to us and read it.” (9, Lon)

These quotes illustrate the complex boundaries and ties that editors perceive to bound the publications they work for. Publications are seen as somewhat tied to a specific location, geographically, historically and ideologically. Thus, language and style are factors that can enable or obstruct the ways in which news stories can be understood by people external to the publication. In order to set their publication apart, editors help to create their publication’s “stance” and “view” which is inextricably linked to the publication’s origin, ideology and the location of its publication. While people shift and flow through various ethnoscapes, and editors are aware of their international audiences, the news media publications in this study still relate to their geographical location and its associated norms. It is important to point out that the notion of nationality tended to emerge in relation to organisational identity.

To conclude, this section showed that while editors are aware of different audiences, most stories are still perceived to be local stories that appeal to people in certain places. Further, the complexity of the world is viewed to require interpretation. And the standpoint of a publication and its interpretation are still rooted in a national culture. Adding to Appadurai’s analytical framework,
Rantanen has used the concept of a languagescape (2005a: 154) to analyse the role of language “as a separating or uniting factor”. In this study, the dominance of one language, English, in all these publications has been analysed.

6.5. Conclusion

To conclude, this chapter investigated the limitations editors face in using their cosmopolitan skills in the context of Appadurai’s five scapes (1990). The editors in this study constitute part of the group of professionals on the move through the ethnoscape. They have some skills of navigating different cultures. However, their skills tend to apply to one or two regions. Thus, they focus their globality, similar to anthropologists, rather than intending to maximize the diversity of their experiences and expertise. Some editors are experts on China, India, Africa and the Arab world, which means that their cosmopolitan skill of navigating different cultures is not only limited to the West. Nonetheless, the majority of interviewees in this study tended to move between global cities of the West. While developments brought about by technoscapes allow editors to read sources beyond their own location, the most frequently read publication was The New York Times. In relation to ideoscapes, this finding shows a largely homogenised media diet, whereby New York remains a central source for news flows. Compared to the rest of the world, the journalists in this study have a considerable amount of resources at hand, but even so, they could do more to leave their bubble and use their cosmopolitan skills more widely.

In relation to mobility, the limitations brought about in the financescape are perceived as the main constraint for interviewees to be mobile themselves as well as to send their contributors to other places. Editors face financial pressures within their publications which transform the role of mobility in their profession. This is why interviewees outsource the work that requires mobility to freelancers and local stringers in their areas of interest. Editors have permanent jobs, nice offices and a status and they send freelancers to do a large amount of the journalistic work. Thus, technoscapes have overlapped with financescapes to change the mobility of journalists. Freelancing, with the skill of being mobile, is one of the outcomes of the financial crisis of journalism and the global economic crisis more generally. Further, editors feel limited by the location of their publication’s offices. Another central finding on major limitations to the cosmopolitan skill of mobility is that editors’ family ties play a big role in their decisions relating to their mobility.

When it comes to appreciating difference, editors have expressed that they feel limited by the mediascape of the publishing industry, which promotes a narrow pool of writers. In addition editors
commission English-speaking contributors, who tend to have British and American citizenship. Considering ideoscapes this means that journalists as well as foreign correspondents do not usually switch their primary allegiance from one language segment to another (Hannerz, 2004: 78). Even though editors have global networks, English remains the lingua franca and Anglo-American ideoscapes and mediascapes dominate editors’ work. Therefore, developments in mediascapes and ideoscapes contribute to limiting the ways in which individual editors can use their cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference.

Another result of the interplay between technoscapes and financescapes is the mounting pressure put on editors to diversify their role and try different ways of engaging and acquiring new audiences. Editors are interested in their audience, which represents a major shift from earlier journalism studies, which show that journalists are not interested in their audiences. Editors are aware of the diverse locations of their audiences. However they still consider most news stories to be somewhat local and to appeal to certain audiences in certain localities. Further, editors see their own news media publication as well as other publications as traditionally and historically bound to a specific location. In order to set their publication apart, editors help to create their publication’s “stance” that is linked to the publication’s origin, ideology, location and national identity.

While people shift and flow through various ethnoscapes, and editors are aware of their international audiences, the news media publications in this study still relate to their geographical location and the norms that are associated with it. It seems that the five landscapes of global cultural flows move faster than the editors of major news media publications. While the world is seen as being on the move, journalism lags behind to an extent. Financial constraints have bound editors to their desks and have shifted the load of reporting to freelancers. The financial crisis has diminished the resources editors have to invest in news work. At the same time, the technological developments have brought new pressures to diversify their role, which places new demands on editors’ time.

Rapid developments in the technoscape have enabled editors to read and follow sources from all over the world, but they still mainly read The New York Times. Hannerz has previously argued that the result of current media saturation is often more narcissism than cosmopolitanism (Hannerz, interviewed by Boyer, 2014: 188). While journalism is undergoing a slow process of diversification, some voices are heard, while other, more diverse voices remain silent. Women and ethnic minorities are still underrepresented in the current mediascape. This is further aggravated by the selective
biases of the publishing industry, which does little to publish books by authors from minority backgrounds or books in translation. The editors in this study have some adequate skills to provide a new form of global journalism, but they find themselves in the straightjacket of their organisational identity. The imagination of journalists has previously been defined as their collective potential autonomy (Kunelius and Ruusunoksa, 2008: 663) and it has been argued that the age we live in is characterised by a new role for the imagination (Appadurai, 1990: 297). This study argues that journalists need to further their cosmopolitan skills and imagination if journalism is to catch up with societal transformations.
Chapter 7: Conclusion

Introduction

This project started by asking whether there is a new global journalist and what kinds of skills such a global journalist needs. Various skills previously attributed to foreign correspondents, were analysed in relation to editors at publications in London and New York. For this purpose the concept of cosmopolitan skills was created to encompass (1) mobility; (2) the ability to navigate various cultures; (3) the appreciation of difference in identities; and (4) an awareness of diverse audiences. I argued that cosmopolitanisation and globalisation have changed journalism profoundly. The skills, which were once required of foreign correspondents, are now also increasingly present in journalism as a wider profession. All journalists need cosmopolitan skills in the global age.

The study drew its theoretical insights from different fields, including studies of media and communications, sociology, anthropology and journalism research, especially on foreign correspondents, but also on studies on journalists’ identity and autonomy. Editors’ social, organisational and professional identities have been investigated. It was found that organisational identity takes precedent over other forms of identification at work. Additionally, editors’ autonomy and its constraints have been analysed in six different domains. Further, five cultural global flows have been applied to analyse editors’ opportunities as well as the constraints they face in using their cosmopolitan skills on a societal level. Overall, the working lives of editors were investigated on three levels: (1) the level of the individual; (2) the level of their news media organisation and; (3) the societal level.

The theory chapter criticised previous journalism research as a result of four important limitations, which this study attempted to overcome. These limitations are (1) the focus on the national frame; (2) the focus on journalistic ideology; (3) the focus on fast news and (4) the lack of a definition for editors. The chapter argued that the media has traditionally been treated as a national project (Anderson, 1983) and current journalism research still largely remains within national confines. Second, previous studies have often focused on ideology, which overlooks the relatively high degree of autonomy leading editors hold in the news making process. Third, journalism research has neglected the analysis of slow news publications. Fourth, editors have only rarely been studied in journalism research, and no adequate definition of their role has been developed.
Based largely on work done by Appadurai (1990), Beck (2006 and 2008), de Bruin (2000a and 2000b), Hannerz (1990 and 2004), Hanitzsch et al. (2010), Reese (2008 and 2010) and Sassen (2000 and 2001), this study suggested that four new cosmopolitan skills are needed for the new type of global journalist. The ways in which editors use these cosmopolitan skills was investigated in relation to their social, professional and organisational identities as well as their autonomy and the constraints thereof. It was argued that if journalism is to overcome to current difficulties imposed by economic pressures and technological change, editors need to cultivate their cosmopolitan skills to be able to represent and appeal to wider and increasingly diverse audiences.

I designed a project to study leading editors in two global cities, New York and London, working at *The New Yorker*, *The Economist* and *The Intelligent Life Magazine*. *The New Yorker* is owned by the transnational media company *Condé Nast*, which is based in New York. The latter two are part of *The Economist Group*, which is a transnational media company headquartered in London. Both London and New York are global media cities. The choice of these two cities was influenced by two things: first, one is likely to find global journalists in global media cities. Second, this approach was chosen in order to avoid methodological nationalism, by studying two cities rather than nations.

Semi-structured in-depth expert interviews and thematic analysis were selected for the methodology. This is a study of how editors perceive their work and their audience; it is about how they see themselves and about what they say about what they do. Interviews are the most appropriate methodology to investigate personal attitudes, beliefs and experiences. It is however, important to remember that interviews only give us access to the stated experiences and beliefs others wish to share within a particular interactional context. Despite all limitations, the chosen method enabled me to address the research questions.

This study found that there is indeed a new global kind of journalist who possesses and uses his or her cosmopolitan skills. The foreign correspondent was long seen as “a cosmopolitan among cosmopolitans, a man in grey flannels who ranks very high in the hierarchy of reporters” (Cohen, 1963: 17). Now this description is more likely to encompass some women, and in rare situations those with a minority background.

The use and emergence of these skills are still restricted by identities, lack of autonomy and the general processes of globalisation with its consequences. Juxtaposing cosmopolitan skills with editors’ identities revealed that while editors appreciate diversity in theory, the process of
diversification in terms of having more women and journalists from ethnic minorities remains a slow process. Editors still struggle to break the existing boundaries of gender and ethnicity. While editors have a degree of autonomy to make use of some of the cosmopolitan skills, there are many restrictions to their autonomy. Organisational identity and financial limitations are perceived as two of the main pressures. On the societal level, editors deal with the negative consequences of globalisation, such as the economic crisis.

This study provided empirical evidence to support the main argument that it is no longer possible to define journalists using their nationality as the only starting point. National categories alone do not suffice to explain differences between journalists, and journalism can no longer be viewed as taking place within national boundaries. During interviews editors rarely discussed the role of nationality, whereas media scholars primarily view journalists through the national lens. While the organisational identity of publications was often linked to a particular place, ideology or nationality, editors stated this point as an afterthought rather than a starting point.

This chapter follows the following structure: (1) Theoretical implications; (2) methodological implications; (3) empirical implications; (4) practical implications and; (5) recommendations for further research. The first section provides the theoretical insights provided by this study. The second section explains methodological decisions and their advantages and disadvantages. It elaborates on the main limitations arising from the choice of participants, publication and methodology. The third section discusses the empirical results and how they could have been different with a different choice of questions or a different sample. The fourth section discusses the practical implications for this study and how it can be useful for journalism education. The final section offers recommendations for further research, including non-Western locations, local publications and new methodological ventures.

7.1. Theoretical implications

By researching globalisation and journalism, this thesis established a new category of media professionals – global journalists. It has been shown that this categorisation is not merely a new term for foreign correspondents, but instead, it applies to editors who are based in London and New York. Global media has previously been defined as those owned by transnational corporations, and as having a global reach and creating a global culture (Herman and McChesney, 1997: 1-8). Other
scholars have attempted to theoretically define global journalism as a distinctive style of news that “makes it into an everyday routine to investigate how people and their actions, practices, problems, life conditions etc. in different parts of the world are interrelated” (Berglez, 2008: 847). This study complements previous research and contributes a distinctively bottom-up understanding of the global journalist from the level of individual agency.

Journalism studies, with all their limitations, still provide useful concepts in relation to journalistic identity and autonomy. This study has shown that journalistic autonomy, which is the degree of judgment or ability journalists have in making editorial decisions, is particularly high among editors. Despite limitations stemming from political, economic, professional, organisational and referential constraints, editors have the autonomy to influence the course of journalistic practices and standards in this crucial phase of transition. The narrow focus on ideology and objectivity that dominates journalism research (Beam, Weaver and Brownlee, 2009; Schlesinger, 1978; Schudson, 2001) has long overlooked the influence of personal autonomy in the news-production process. This study has shown that research into how the “global” influences journalism requires a complementary focus on the choices made by individuals working in the profession. According to Newkirk (2000: 10), news judgement is far from an objective process, but it is “an outgrowth of the experiences, attitudes, interests, and perceptions of those at the helm of a news organisation”. This study has shown that journalists’ identities and autonomy inform the ways in which they portray the world. It complements previous research on collective phenomena such as ideology and the objectivity norm, by providing an analysis of the ways in which individual journalists deal with processes of societal change.

Economic pressures, in particular, which have been brought about by globalisation intertwined with technological change, are perceived as a major limitation on journalistic autonomy. At the same time, digital technologies and global networks accelerate the procedural autonomy editors have in covering stories, as well as helping editors circumvent regulatory and political constraints. New-York based editors mainly perceive political constraints domestically, while London-based editors perceive political constraints in the international level. Unlike earlier journalism research, which tended to be technologically deterministic or optimistic, this study has empirically grounded the impact of technological change and editors’ experience. Technological developments thus remain a double-edged sword for journalists.
Having analysed the development of five global cultural flows in relation to the work of editors, this study found that financescapes and technoscapes have developed faster than ideoscapes, ethnoscapes and mediascapes. The former two have changed rapidly, while the latter three lag behind. While technologies and money move rapidly across borders, editors and their mediascapes and ideoscapes have not kept up with the rapid developments of global flows. Newsroom staff members are not representative of the diversity of their audiences. Further, mobility has decreased while overall mobility is increasing, language skills have decreased compared to previous generations, and media sources are still relatively homogenous, which means that the ideoscapes are confined to particular locations and views.

This study has argued that it is important to distinguish between studies of globalisation and cosmopolitanisation. Globalisation has been defined as a top-down process characterised by an “intensification of social interconnections, which allows apprehending the world as a single place, creating a greater awareness of our own place and its relative location within the range of world experience” (Reese, 2010: 344). Scholars have discussed the outcomes of globalisation through concepts such as homogenisation, heterogenisation and hybridisation. Cosmopolitanisation, however, is yet another concept that can be viewed as both a process and a possible outcome of globalisation. In contrast to globalisation, cosmopolitanisation is a bottom-up agency-based process characterised as an “internal globalisation” (Beck, 2002: 17) which “infiltrates our innermost thoughts and feelings, experiences and expectations” (Beck, 2006: 73). Therefore, it is a process related to how people experience and participate in communicative meaning-making practices on a global level through the media, whereby editors have a privileged position to participate in creating meaning. Thus far cosmopolitanisation has mainly been discussed in abstract and normative terms. The work of Beck (2002; 2003; 2006; also Beck and Grande, 2007; Beck and Sznайдer, 2006) has been seminal to the formulation of contemporary theories of cosmopolitanisation, but his work remains highly theoretical and normative. In contrast, this study has developed the concept of cosmopolitan skills to make an empirical contribution.

My concept of cosmopolitan skills, which is based on the work of Hannerz (1990 and 2004) and Beck (2006) allows for overlaps between the national, transnational and cosmopolitan parts of editors’ identities, work, autonomy and views. Beck has argued that, rather than following the logic of either/or, the concept of cosmopolitanisation follows the logic of both/and (Beck and Sznайдer, 2006: 14). This conceptualisation helps to overcome prior binary dichotomies between cosmopolitanism and nationalism (Nussbaum, 1996: 15). Therefore, possessing cosmopolitan skills
does not necessarily mean that a person is a cosmopolitan and it does not exclude national sources of identification.

It is important to note that I did not intend on studying whether journalists were cosmopolitans or not, but whether they had cosmopolitan skills and how they used them in relation to their identities, autonomy and global flows. Friedman has argued that during times of strong globalisation, such as the present age, elites tend to cosmopolitanise themselves for financial reasons (2007: 191). By situating themselves above the world, as a kind of international managerial class, transnational elites encompass the diversity that lies below without being part of it. Friedman draws a comparison to a previous period of globalisation (1870 – 1920) and argues that cosmopolitanism tends to emerge simultaneously with the rise of nationalism. He suggests that the notion of hybridity is a logical consequence of cosmopolitan identities (2007: 193). The group of editors in this study is not as transnational as the group that Friedman refers to, but interviewees do form an elite group of media professionals. Additionally, this study focuses on the particular skills of editors. However, it cannot be ignored that these skills have traditionally been appropriated by aristocratic and managerial elites, and journalists are elites in terms of being powerful media professionals who influence public perception and opinion.

To conclude, both globalisation and cosmopolitanisation studies need to pay attention to journalism research, because journalists have a privileged position in the meaning making of society in the global age. It does not suffice to analyse global media companies in relation to their ownership structures. Additionally, research needs to move beyond methodological nationalism and analyse the work of journalists on multiple levels, including the global, local and organisational level, rather than the national level alone.

7.2. Methodological implications

The main research question was investigated through qualitative research, using semi-structured in-depth interviews. Concepts of identity, journalistic autonomy and cultural global flows were used to analyse whether the four features that have previously been attributed to the work of foreign correspondents that now apply to journalists. Researchers have previously used interviews to analyse various aspects of journalistic identity and work practices (see, for example, Agarwal and Barthel, 2015; Harries and Wahl-Jorgensen, Örnebring, 2013; 2007; Sherwood and Nicholson, 2013; Voltmer and Wasserman, 2014; Wallace, 2013). Interviews allow for an analysis of the stated
experiences and beliefs interviewees wish to share within the particular context of the interviewing situation.

I chose editors as for my sample because of their high degree of autonomy in the meaning making process of news production in the global age. My decision to study editors instead of journalists changed the shape of my research in that it analysed media professionals who make decisions and influence the course of journalism. Due to the nature of editors’ professional positions, considerations specific to expert interviewing were discussed. Shedding light on the global networks, views and cosmopolitan skills of editors helped to provide an insight into the ways in which journalism is produced at the very top of the journalistic hierarchy.

I chose a multi-site study approach, focusing on London and New York. Hannerz has argued that in such a study, it is impossible to study the entire culture and social life of journalists in these two cities (2003: 208). It is also not possible to study particular editors particularly intimately. Instead, what matters is how their backgrounds, views and experiences might affect and contribute to their work as editors. By choosing London and New York I focused on two global media cities and avoided methodological nationalism. However, this choice limited me to analysing publications that are based in the West, more specifically, the Anglo-American world.

A major finding was that nationality did not arise as a major theme on the topic of social identity. This finding casts doubt on the general starting point of many studies on journalism, which are based on the national frame and analyse journalists as "American journalists" and "British journalists". In my study, their distinct location did not create any major contrasts that separated the journalists in my sample from one another. In fact, it was impossible to use national frames to analyse the materials of this study.

Further, I chose slow news publications because the role of journalists has shifted from information gathering to providing contexts and comparisons, and this includes commentary on international comparisons with other countries. Stephens (2014: 185) has argued that journalists increasingly play the role of evaluators and idea generators. He argued that weeklies and analytical publications, such as the publications in the sample of this study, will play an important role in the future media landscape. Only a few studies have thus far analysed the more interpretative and “slow’ kinds of journalism, with a few notable exceptions (see, for instance, Hellman and Jaakkola, 2011; Navasky and Cornog, 2012; Steensen, 2009). The advantage of choosing slow news publications is that this
study shed light on those platforms where editors have the autonomy to apply their cosmopolitan skills in their news work by providing commentary on international comparisons. Tumber and Prentoulis have argued that the journalist’s role as an interpreter is becoming increasingly pronounced and recognised (2003: 228). As a result a shift in the journalistic role from detachment to involvement and from objectivity to subjectivity is imminent. The disadvantage of choosing “slow” news publications is that they form a specific niche within the media landscape which is relatively small compared to the overall offer of newspapers, broadcasters and digital media platforms.

Interviews were the most appropriate methodology for the research question in this study. However, this method still has its limitations: Firstly, there is no way of knowing whether the views that editors expressed in this study were merely “corporate talk” designed to project a certain image of their companies. Editors are elite journalists who are more experienced in interviewing situations than I am. Additionally, editors might have embraced their organisational identity to an extent whereby they cannot consciously distance themselves from it any longer. When interviewees are asked to characterise an experience or describe how they act, their response most certainly involves a degree of inconsistency. Rather than viewing interviewees’ responses as the objective “truth” about journalism, I treated them as social constructs, which reveal interviewees’ views and opinions at the present moment, in the way they wish to share them with me. A possible alternate method, such as content analysis, could have provided additional evidence to support that what editors claimed they do is actually what they do.

Despite all limitations, interviews enabled me to address my research questions in this study. A sufficient number of editors were interviewed for this study, and their interviews provided a rich and in-depth set of interesting materials, which was consequently analysed. While scholars of journalism have previously focused on newsroom values and newspaper journalists and news reporting, this study, analysed the views leading editors at three slow news publications in two global cities. Therefore, the methodology was useful in providing empirical support for the concept of cosmopolitan skills among leading journalists which ties into larger theories of cosmopolitanisation while avoiding methodological nationalism.

7.3. Empirical implications

The empirical results of this study are theory affirming, in that they support my concept of cosmopolitan skills and the reality of five global cultural flows in relation to journalism. The empirical
chapters have shown the ways in which identity, autonomy and global cultural flows both enable and inhibit editors’ cosmopolitan skills. Juxtaposing these concepts, that have been used in earlier journalism studies, has helped in explaining the opportunities and the limitations imposed on the use of cosmopolitan skills.

The first empirical chapter explored the complex interplay of identities and their relation to cosmopolitan skills in the lives of editors. Editors possess the cosmopolitan skills, to some extent, to navigate different cultures, be mobile, to appreciate difference and diverse audiences. They stated the importance of multilingualism in understanding a variety of cultural contexts, particularly the older generation of editors. Further, they expressed their wish to overcome their own social identities in their reporting and speak on behalf of those who are hindered by language. Editors read a range of sources, including non-English sources, but the majority of their sources remain Western-centric. Thus, editors’ skills of navigating different cultures are somewhat constraint by structural and organisational norms. Further, editors have an emotional and intellectual ability to navigate different cultures and unmask cultural clichés, but it is hard to verify to what extent they actually make use of this skill. One third of editors have a migration background or dual citizenship while two thirds do not. Editors have various experiences of mobility, which they are able to draw on in their present work.

The diversification of editorial staff is seen as a necessary and desired feature among editors, but the actual process of diversification has been slow. Only one interviewee in this study identified as mixed race, and the issue of ethnicity has largely remained undiscussed. While female editors perceive specific gender differences between their male colleagues and themselves in relation to work practices, most male editors do not. Segmentation among gender lines is particularly evident with writing about feminism. Further, an awareness of and interest in their audiences has become commonplace among both male and female editors. Half of the group of editors interviewed are aware of and imagine their readers in various ways, including thinking of different audiences worldwide. Editors’ organisational identities encourage them to make use of their cosmopolitan skills. Overall, organisational identity still trumps concerns of social and professional identities. When social or professional values clash with organisational identity, editors tend to align with the values of their organisational identity.

Another major finding of this chapter is that journalists do not predominantly use this category of nationality in defining themselves, whereas researchers of journalism predominantly do. The fact
that national identity did not surface as a defining category, supports Castells’ argument that in the
global age people construct their identities from various sources of history, geography and collective
memory, rather than national building blocks only (1997: 7).

The second empirical chapter analysed cosmopolitan skills in relation to interviewees’ autonomy and
its constraints. While editors have internalized the structures of their publication’s organisational
identity, it is a conscious process that of which they are aware. In contrast to previous studies (see,
for instance, Draper, 2014) this study found that interviewees emphasised that their autonomy is
never unbounded. While previous studies suggested an unhealthy blurring of boundaries between
journalism and commercial forces (Erjavec, 2004; Harro-Loit and Saks, 2006; Quinn, 2004) this study,
found that ownership did not feature as a significant influence on editors’ perceived autonomy.
Geographical location and limited mobility emerged as major limitations. While digital technologies
were perceived as enablers of global exchange to some extent, editors felt more autonomous when
they can physically travel to places. Economic constraints were the main reason for their limited
mobility and the closing down or lack of international bureaus was similarly perceived as a limitation
on editorial autonomy.

However, editors make use of their professional autonomy to overcome the financial constraints
that are placed on mobility. They commission stories from a global network of contributors. Global
networks, accelerated through the procedural autonomy that digital technologies provide coupled
with their professional autonomy help editors circumvent regulatory and political constraints. New-
York based editors mainly perceive political constraints domestically, while London-based editors
perceive political constraints in the international realm. This difference has been explained with
reference to organisational identity. It was found that while procedural and organisational
constraints were more prevalent in editors’ perception of their autonomy, editors were conscious of
economic constraints, which is differs from the findings in Reich and Hanitzsch’s study (2013) on
journalists’ perceived autonomy. Overall, procedural and organisational constraints remain a
stronger factor in editors’ perception of their autonomy, which is supports previous studies (Mellado
and Humanes, 2012; Reich and Hanitzsch, 2013) on the issue of individual autonomy in journalism.

While most editors have British and American citizenship, many editors in this study do not live in
the country of their origin and engage with a different culture on a daily basis. Those editors, who
have been foreign correspondents, have developed different strategies to interact with the locals of
a foreign place. At the same time they interact with the group of foreign correspondents placed in
one location. This interaction with reference groups that are similar to editors themselves, constrains their professional autonomy to fully use their cosmopolitan skills. However, editors did express an appreciation for the diversity of cultures of which their contributors are part, even though English still dominates as the commonly used language. Editors are able to use their professional autonomy to commission stories from writers who are based abroad. In doing so, they appreciate it when these writers have particular familial ties or personal insights that provide them with an insider status into to the place they are reporting from, so long as they also fit into the publication’s organisational identity. Further, editors in this study say that they have a great extent of autonomy to express their opinions, which points to a shift in the journalistic role. Another finding in this study is that editors emphasise the need to speak to a variety of people and go beyond official sources. Unlike previous research which argued that journalists tend to rely on official sources, such as governmental press releases (see, for instance Hickerson, Moy and Dunsmore, 2011), some editors in this study expressed that they try to avoid press conferences.

In relation to Appadurai’s five landscapes of cultural global flows, the third empirical chapter found that editors constitute part of the group of professionals on the move through the ethnoscape. They have some skills of navigating different cultures, but their skills tend to apply to one or two regions. These regions are not limited to the West but encompass China, India, Africa and the Arab world. But the majority of interviewees in this study tended to move between global cities of the West. While developments brought about by technoscapes allow editors to read sources beyond their own location, the most frequently read publication was *The New York Times*. In relation to ideoscapes, this finding shows a largely homogenised media diet, whereby New York remains a central source for news flows. Compared to the rest of the world, the journalists in this study have a considerable amount of resources at hand, even so, they could do more to go beyond their immediate circles and use their cosmopolitan skills more widely.

In relation to mobility, the limitations brought about in the financescape are perceived as the main constraint for interviewees to be mobile themselves as well as to send their contributors to other places. Editors have permanent jobs and prestigious positions, while freelancer journalists do a large amount of the journalistic work. Another central finding on major limitations to the cosmopolitan skill of mobility is that editors’ family ties play a large role in their decisions relating to their mobility. Freelancing, with the skill of being mobile, is one of the outcomes of the financial crisis of journalism and the global economic crisis more generally.
When it comes to appreciating difference, editors have expressed that they feel limited by the mediascape of the publishing industry. In addition, editors only commission English-speaking contributors that tend to have British and American citizenship. This finding is similar to Hannerz’s argument that most foreign correspondents do their reporting in a single language” (2004: 78). Considering ideoscapes this means that journalists, as well as foreign correspondents do not usually switch their primary allegiance from one language segment to another (Hannerz, 2004: 78). Even though editors have global networks, English remains the lingua franca and Anglo-American ideoscapes and mediascapes dominate editors’ work. Therefore, developments in mediascapes and ideoscapes contribute to limiting the ways in which individual editors can use their cosmopolitan skill of appreciating difference.

Another result of the interplay between technoscapes and financescapes is the mounting pressure put on editors to diversify their role and try different ways of engaging and acquiring new audiences. Contrary to early journalism studies (Gans, 1979; Schlesinger, 1978; Tunstall, 1971), editors in this study do not reject feedback from their audiences, but they take it into account and try to respond to it. This is a major shift from earlier journalism studies, which shows that journalists are not interested in their audiences. Editors are aware of the diverse locations of their audiences. Increasing audience awareness is in the financial interests of publications. However, editors still focus on the English-speaking world, and they are aware of the distribution of their audiences which are mainly located in the West.

The empirical findings of this study help to explain some of the current transformations in the journalistic profession. These transformations include the diversification and digitalisation of journalism as well as the shift from a news-gathering to an interpreting role, which is one consequence of the process of globalisation and digitalisation in journalism. Further questions I could have asked include additional questions on the role of ethnicity. If the sample had been different, results might be different in the following ways: First, I could have chosen editors who are based at local publications rather than transnational publications that are based in London and New York. This would have implications for both the autonomy and the perceived limitations editors face. It would have been interesting to discover whether editors at regional and local publications, such as the London Evening Standard or the Evening Post in Bristol, need cosmopolitan skills in order to cover local stories. Second, had I chosen editors who are based in global cities outside of the West, again, their perceived autonomy and the societal limitations they face, would have been different.
To conclude, the empirical findings of this study contribute to the field of journalism research, journalistic identity and autonomy. The findings emphasise the need to view journalists as individuals with identities, autonomy, a past, views and experiences, rather than human tape recorders who are subject to an overarching standard of rational objectivity. Conversely it has shown, that while journalists maintain a unique individuality, editors who work for different publication in different cities still share the same journalistic culture, which confirms that such a journalistic cultures remain very powerful.

7.4. Practical implications: Implications of my findings for journalism education

This study adds to previous research which argued that the study and the art of journalism need to be improved through journalism education (Hafez, 2009). In an increasingly global world where the global can no longer be separated from the local by confining it to the foreign news section, all journalists need to be possess cosmopolitan skills. In a world that is no longer solely defined within national categories, journalists need to be able to understand various cultures, and go beyond cultural clichés and stereotypes. Only once this is achieved will journalists be able to overcome what Beck referred to as the “prison error of identity”, the world view which conforms to the either/ or logic of nations and the associated stereotypes (2006: 25).

Beck argued that due to the increasing turmoil of globalised lifestyles, the imaginary world of self-enclosed nations fails to capture the real circumstances of the world in a global age (2006: 26). As an increasing number of people are mobile, transnational and displaced, journalists need to find the journalistic means to represent and speak to a changing and diverse audience. Journalists need to make full use of their technological affordances to learn about other cultures and countries. They need to broaden their media appetite and sources as well as looking beyond the ideoscapes and mediascapes of the West.

For this reason journalists need to become more aware of their own identities, autonomy and the global cultural flows of which both them and the audience is a part. Most importantly, journalists and journalism research needs to admit that “news stories do not emerge from nowhere. Assuming otherwise alleviates journalists’ responsibility from considering self-reflexive approaches to journalism as well as assuming that journalists’ personal and professional geographies and experiences never mix” (Mahtani, 2005: 300-301). Instead, journalists need to question the notion of
journalistic rationality, objectivity and investigate the ways in which their identities, relative autonomy and imagination influence their reporting.

The idea of objectivity has traditionally stood in contrast to an interpretative kind of journalism, but in an increasingly complex world, informed and analytical opinions have gained value over information gathering. Objectivity has been defined as “at once a moral ideal, a set of reporting and editing practices, and an observable pattern of news writing” (Schudson, 2001: 4). Journalism education has helped to reinforce the value of objectivity (Vos, 2012: 436). While factuality remains a core aspect of journalism, cosmopolitan skills and reflexivity are needed in a complex world which does no longer have linear nation-based and “objective” narratives.

In conclusion, the practical implications of my studies are that journalism education needs to improve in the area of “global” reporting by teaching journalists cosmopolitan skills. By including skills of navigating different cultures, appreciate difference and mobility, as well as an awareness of diverse audiences in the journalism curriculum, journalism education can ensure that media professionals stay on top of global developments, without pandering to clichés, which are detrimental to intercultural understanding.

7.5. Recommendations for further research

The results of my study suggest new avenues for further research. This study has been concerned with an empirical analysis of the concept of cosmopolitan skills. While cosmopolitan skills were thus far required of foreign correspondents, this study showed that cosmopolitan skills can be applied to some journalists in the global age. So too could such skills be applied to journalists and media professionals in general in the age of globalisation. This study showed how everyday cosmopolitan professional practices and views are part of journalistic work. However, this study has focused on leading editors at three publications in London and New York and further studies should go beyond this focus in order to broaden our understanding of cosmopolitan skills empirically.

First, further research should investigate the views and experiences of journalists at local newspapers. Analysing the views and experiences of editors at local publications would be a very valuable supplement to my study. It would be highly interesting to investigate cosmopolitan skills among editors who do not work in global cities and who are not at publications like the ones in this sample, which consciously reach out to audiences beyond their own nation. The process of
cosmopolization captures an internal globalisation, which means that even on the local level people encounter diversity in their neighbourhood through globalisation and immigration. Journalists at local publications participate in the meaning making practices on the local level. However, their audiences may too have become more global, and as they might draw on international stories and comparisons. These aspects of their work, together with their identities and autonomy would be interesting aspects to investigate.

Second, further research could include more locations in its research design. Future research should complement earlier research by analysing journalistic initiatives outside of the West, that attempt to address the global realm, such as, for example, the global journalistic network HackPack recently founded by Moscow Times journalist Justin Varilek (Vereykina, 2015). Further locations could include global cities in the West, which are non-English speaking such as Paris, Barcelona, Berlin and Stockholm, and it should also include global cities outside of the West such as Shanghai, Cape Town, Hong Kong, Dubai and Kiev. It would be very interesting to investigate whether journalists at publications in these cities possess cosmopolitan skills and whether they would have the autonomy to make use of them. There would be variations in the political and press freedom of the locations, but in terms of reaching wider audiences and understanding different cultures, aspects of their lives and work might bear some similarity to the editors in this study.

Third, further research on journalism should consider avoiding methodological nationalism, by finding new and creative ways of conducting research. This could include research in local and urban categories. It could involve research that is based on individuals as well as mobile groups across national borders. Researchers could put more emphasis on groups of journalists within one genre of journalism across different countries. Alternatively, one particular type of journalists (such as investigative journalists, food critics or gossip journalists, for example) could be researched across publications in an area that goes beyond national borders, such as the global South. Research could also focus on journalists at English-speaking publications in non-English speaking places or vice versa.

This study has provided empirical evidence to support the main argument that it is no longer possible to define journalists using their nationality as the primary category. While previous journalism research tended to implement a national frame of reference, this study has challenged the dominance of national categories in journalism research. It suggested that the national category needs to be supplemented by global and cosmopolitan frames, as well as individual, professional and organisational categories for analysis. New approaches to locations in research methodologies
will help researchers overcome the confines of the nation state category in order to make sense of what Beck (2006: 5) described as the way in which people dip into the Lego set of globally available identities to imagine and build a progressively inclusive self-image.
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APPENDIX 1:

INTERVIEW GUIDE

1. Informed consent

Introduction

Recording

Difference between academic interviews and journalistic interviews

My role as a researcher

Anonymity option

Option to see the quotes

2. Background

Gender; age; ethnicity; nationality; class; language skills; place of birth and residence

3. Educational background

Journalism school or not

Subjects studied

Postgraduate studies

4. Career background

“How did you get to where you are?”

Previous work at other publications

Previous work as a foreign correspondent; reporter

5. Current work

“I see you write about X. What else do you like to cover?”

“Do you pitch stories – or are you assigned to cover certain topics?”

“How many pieces do you write/edit a week?”

6. Colleagues at work

“When you think of the people you’ve worked with, what is their background?”

Where are they from?
Where do they live?
Would you say British or English?
Local? International?

7. Friends
Would you say most of your friends are local/international?
Who do you interact with in London/ New York?

8. Mobility/ networks
“Have you always been based in London/ New York?”
“Have you worked in other cities?”
If yes: “Where, and for how long?”
“Did you notice any differences in culture/ media landscape/ people?”
Could you see yourself working as a journalist in another country? Why and why not?
Or work for a publication from another country?
Is it easier to transfer to another country as a journalist (compared to an engineer, artist, academic, teacher, factory worker, entrepreneur)

Have you written about issues outside of London, if yes – did you go there?
Do you have outside contacts/go-to people like friends of journalists in other countries?
Do you have a network of freelancers? Where do they live?
[If they work on the visual side:] Do you have a network of photographers?

9. The Reader
“Do you have a certain reader in mind when you’re writing/ editing your articles?”
“Is there anyone who is certainly not your reader?”
“What’s the [publication’s] typical reader demographic: age and gender – print vs. web?”
“Do you write differently for online pieces compared to print?”
If yes: “Is it to appeal to a different demographic?”
“Have you changed your stories/ style/ approach/ columns to widen your readership/ appeal to other groups?”

“Have you ever written about an ethnic group that does not read your publication?”

“Have you ever received comments online complaining about misrepresentation?”

10. Sources
Which media sources do you use? International ones? What do you watch?
What do you read?
[If they work on the visual side:] Which photographers do you admire?
Which other Journalist do you admire? Or philosopher? Books, fiction?
Who do you follow on Twitter?

11. Worldview/ role
How would your colleagues describe your work? And world-view?
How would your biggest readers, those who tweet your articles, describe your view on things?
Do you write about issues that your male/female colleagues don’t write about?
If you were to write an article for the whole world to read – say about the rape case in India or about Sheryl Sandberg’s new book Lean in – what would your write? Can it be addressed globally?
Nation-building or empathy: When is the time to root for your nation? And when is the time to appeal to the empathy of your readers?
Do you see it as your task to “enable your reader to imagine possible other lives”? (Orgad; 2012)

12. Autonomy/ limitations
How free are you to write about different issues? Do you feel protected?
[If they work on the visual side:] How free are you to commission and select photographs?
Do you know any examples of journalists who are not as free as you are? In which country?
Is there space for creativity in journalism?
Do you feel limited in any way? (By format, topics, time or commercialization)

APPENDIX 2:
EDITORIAL ROLE DESCRIPTIONS AND RESPONSIBILITIES
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Role 1: Homepage Editor

Interviewer: Can you tell me more about your role here?

Interviewee: Yes, sure. So my current role is Home-page editor, and I've been doing that for about three years. I look after the front page at Economist.com, and I run a small team that does that throughout the day, so we have somebody in Asia, and somebody in America. The idea is the page can keep moving all the time. I commission some stories, but also part of the job is about recognising stuff that we may have already published somewhere that's good, and pulling it up and making sure that it gets the kind of airplay it needs on the website.

Interviewer: And how is your co-operation with the people in Asia and in America, how does that work?

Interviewee: We work on email mainly. If there's something that we're particularly unsure about, we'll call each other up, but essentially what happens is at the end of my day at London I will send an email to both of them explaining the changes I've made during the day, and in some cases, why I've made them, and what I anticipate is coming up in the news in the next 12 hours or so, or even on new, more medium or longer-term things. And then that obviously goes to the guy in the US, and then at the end of his day, he does the same, it gets picked up by Asia, and that way we're able to sort of be on-duty, as it were, all the time, and at weekends as well.

Interviewer: And how does it factor in that they're based on other continents?

Interviewee: It definitely does. The idea is that they have a good idea of what the people in their regions are really interested in at that particular time, and that might be slightly different from what I think people in London or in Europe are interested in... Towards this part of the day, we're speaking it's about half past two. People in America, on the East Coast, are waking up, and having a cup of coffee, and checking the news, and so I like to think, for this part of the day – now well, what's relevant to them, or what's interesting, or what's new; it's always some mixture of those three.

Interviewer: So does it look different to people then, the starting page?

Interviewee: We only have one page throughout the world, so we don't sort of do geo-targeting, as it's called, but it is changing all the time. So yes, it will be a bit different now to how it was this morning when I came in, in London, because I will have made a few changes. There's no formula to plug it in. I suppose, we have a bias towards changing the website relatively frequently, whereas the print edition obviously comes out once a week, and you go – this is the thing you need to know about this week. With the Web, because we're changing it all the time, we can't sort of do that, if we were to take the same approach, we'd just have one story at the top of the website for, three days, and that would, although you could make an argument for doing that, it would look a bit odd, and it wouldn't encourage people to come back to the website, because they'd feel, okay, I've done that. So how do we do it, I guess the first thing I do is think about what's in the news now, and if there's a really big news story, I want to make sure that we've covered it, and it's sort of visible on our website. There are some days where, the news is a little slow, and that allows you to give more prominence to pieces which you think are just kind of interesting or slightly offbeat, subjects a reader might not be familiar with.
Role 2: Special Reports Editor

Interviewer: [...] And, can you tell me about your current job and your role?

Interviewee: Well, the current job... my formal job title is Special Reports Editor, and the special reports are the bit that you'll find every couple of weeks in the centre of the paper with their own cover, and they would typically be 14 pages and the cover, and if we're lucky, a few ads, and they would be about a variety of subjects. Quite a few of them, in the course of a year, would be about a country, or perhaps an industry, or perhaps an idea... and let me give you a few examples... The one I've just... the one we're publishing this week, which I've just finished editing, is on Myanmar, and the next one is on Germany; the one after that is on the Arab Spring. The one before Myanmar was on international banking; before that we had cars...

Interviewer: Yes, I remember that.

Interviewee: and before that we had China and the Internet, so you can see, it's a pretty wide spread of subjects. And the way we do that, we publish between 18 and 20 a year of those, and quite a long way beforehand – like, about a year beforehand – I start thinking about what we might do, and I encourage my colleagues to come forward with suggestions and pitches, proposals for what we might do next year. And then I will discover... I'll discuss their proposals, plus any ideas that I might have of things that we might do with senior colleagues, and then come down to some kind of list, and then discuss that with the editor, and then a bit of going back and forth, and then we decide be writing it. And each one of these is written by an individual member of staff; it's always somebody who's on the staff, and it gives them an opportunity to explore in much greater depth things that they're interested in. I mean, very often they're on subjects that they write about anyway. So, I've got one coming up on Brazil, and the person who'll be writing that is actually our correspondent based in Sao Paulo, and that's quite a typical situation, or it might be a section editor.

Role 3: Foreign Editor

Interviewee: So I'm Foreign Editor, which means that I look after our coverage of foreign affairs throughout the world, excepting the United States, which is separate. Its pages are not run by me, they're run directly by the Editor. However, because the US is such an important generator of foreign policy, I do end up writing about the US and what it's doing abroad a fair amount. My job consists of two things, really. There's a managerial component, which is to check that all the people in our foreign bureaus who work for our pages, and our staff in London, are happy, and their careers are going okay. And then looking after our week to week coverage, making sure we're writing about the right things and that we are covering the news. And then there's a third component which is even more journalistic, which is the one I enjoy most, which is editing and writing. So writing editorials, typically, but also the occasional piece, and editing copy.

Interviewer: Okay, so when you report about foreign affairs, how do you do that? What sources do you use? Do you travel, or, how does it work?

Interviewee: I travel a bit. But I don't travel for a particular story very often, unless I'm writing one of our special reports. But I think it's obviously, it's essential to have a sense of a place. I don't see my job so much as reporting, as asking the right questions of our reporters. So my job is to try and tease out the story and the implications and the ideas and push them to ask questions that they might not have thought of. And I think that the sort of journalism we do is one in which the outside world is always much more interesting and gripping than our own preconceptions. There are kinds of
journalism, particularly British tabloid journalism and broadsheet journalism, general interest journalism, where a very important part of the editor’s job is to impose the reader’s world view on the world. And their role is to go out and find, miracle cures, shocking weather, crime waves caused by immigrants. Just to, either to frighten or confirm the worldview of readers.

But I think the financial press is different from that. You don’t make money by investing in your prejudices. You make money by seeing the way the world’s really working. And I’d like to think our readers are like that as well. And for us, actually, the editor’s job is to be receptive to all of the ways in which your preconceptions are wrong. And nothing makes a story more interesting than to discover that the world is different from the way you thought it was. And to try and to give readers a framework to recognize how the world’s changing. I’d say for the financial press, and I’d include us in this, our job as editors is to listen and interrogate correspondents, not to tell them what to write.

Interviewer: And your reporters – where are they based?

Interviewee: We have a large number of staff correspondents as well as quite a lot of stringers and a few occasional writers. I’d say, any story we do, ought ideally to have some reporting from the main country that’s mentioned. That doesn’t mean to say that every country that’s mentioned in a story would’ve been actually directly reported to, because sometimes we use reports from the World Bank and other official bodies.

Role 4: Assistant Editor

Interviewee: I’m the assistant editor, and I work primarily for three senior editors, who sort of all have different little parts of the magazine, one of whom, [name], edits the comment section, which is the weekly political editorial at the front of the magazine. She also works on some of the back of the magazine stuff, she does cinema reviews, and she does the [name]’s art reviews, [name], who’s the dance critic and a wonderful literary critic, and she works with a number of feature editors as well, and then [name], who works primarily with books, who you know, and some feature-reporting kinds of things. And then Alan Burdick, who’s also a senior editor, doing primarily politics, and science, and culture, and just sort of a span of things.

And so what I do for each of them is actually quite different and quite interesting in that, on a given week I might work pretty closely with the writer assigned to write the comment, and will be kind of researching and going back and forth with them about the kinds of things they need. And at the same time I may be reading for Leo, let’s say, a draft of a long piece that he’s just got in, and kind of reading it and making notes, and talking to him about that over the course of the lifespan of the piece, which I do with Alan as well. And then, I also attend these ideas meetings occasionally, and I’m always looking for ideas for the magazine and sort of working with Alan on that particularly, and also for myself. And I think that is it in a nutshell, basically.

Interviewer: And do you write online also?

Interviewee: I don’t really, I used to, and I think the opportunity is there, but I find for some reason as I get older that I enjoy the editing at least as much, if not more, as the writing, and it’s sort of less crazy-making in a way for me. I do love writing, but I find that the speed and the variety of editing just suits me in a way, whereas I can sort of agonise over writing.

Interviewer: What else is it that you like about editing?
Interviewee:  Partly, I love... it's an interesting dynamic, being an editor and working with the writer, because in some ways of course the piece of writing belongs to the writer more, to the exclusion of anybody else really, but there is a certain way in which I find I come to feel very deeply about pieces that I'm working on, and feel some sense of ownership over, with the writer. So it's an interesting thing in that on the one hand it's obviously a singular pursuit, a writer is writing, and an editor is editing, and they're generally not doing that next to each other, but there is that collaboration, I think. And what I love is to get a piece and to sort of read it fresh, read it a couple of times, and kind of start to see a structure, let's say, take shape, and then, to go back and forth with the writer, or with, in the case of my bosses whether it's a piece they're editing, working out with them the way, the best iteration of the piece that we have. And then partly I think I like sending it back off to somebody else to do a lot of that work.

Role 5: Editorial Assistant

Interviewer: And what's your role here?

Interviewee: I'm on the editorial staff and I work for John Bennet, who we just passed, and Nick, I don't know if you interviewed him.

Interviewer: No, just John.

Interviewee: They were, when I was hired, I was working for them and then also, like, a week after I started working here, I was assigned to Roger Angell, who you might have heard of. He's a legendary – I shouldn't say legendary, because according to Eleanor Gould, the great New Yorker copy editor, legendary means the person didn't actually exist. That's only a legend. We misuse that term a lot of the time, so he is a wonderful and beloved writer and editor, who is 93 and comes to work every day and is very busy.

Interviewer: 93?

Interviewee: Yes, so he's, kind of, amazing, so I work for him too and then I also do some work for Willing Davidson, who's another senior editor, who is sort of added on but he's pretty self-sufficient, and so those are my various bosses and then I also write for the website, and that pretty much keeps me occupied.

Interviewer: And what exactly do you do for these editors?

Interviewee: So, as you probably heard from them, they each have about somewhere between eight and a dozen writers and those writers will sometimes come up with their own ideas and sometimes the editors and other members of the staff will help them come up with ideas. Then they have to report the story and that's when it involves research, which I will help with. Then comes the actual writing, they hand in a draft. I'll read the draft, talk about it with the editor, sometimes do a proof and then, when it's in a polished enough form to be put into our editing system, I help out with putting in copy changes, editing changes, moving stuff around, also putting in fact checking changes and making sure that it's all organised in the right way, and I have now started going to John's closing meetings, which is, as you've probably heard, the time when the writer and the editor sit down and, sort of, go one by one through a piece and make sure that everything is exactly as it should be. So it's sort of like, I guess I have a hand, in some way, in every step of the process but it's always, sort of, as called upon and as needed and it varies depending on the situation. I do more
research for some people than others and some people are more interested in having more rounds of edits than others, so it kind of depends on the person, depends on the story.

Interviewer: And so the editors that you mentioned, are they all on John’s level? Are they all about the same level?

Interviewee: Well, so [name] and [name] are editors of just non-fiction pieces, and they’re both senior editors, [name] edits fiction and non-fiction. He also edits columns, like he’ll edit [name], who does television column and [name], who writes about music. So I actually am not involved in any of the fiction stuff, so the only stuff I’d read for him would be non-fiction pieces and [name] edits – [name]’s involved in the fiction editing side, which I don’t do anything for that, and he also edits Woody Allen’s Shouts and Murmurs, and he doesn’t often have his own pieces because he doesn’t have a group of writers in the same way, which is how fiction works, because you don’t have fiction writers who go off and do assignments. So for [names], it’s more similar and somewhat, not so much, but for [name] too. For [name], it’s different and I don’t really do this whole process with Roger, because he’s doing his own thing.

[...]

Interviewer: and what is it that you write for the online part?

Interviewee: I write about all kinds of things, but I often tend to write for the Elements blog, which is about science and technology. I’ve written about an Emoji Art Show. I’ve written about this guy who tried to invent a better version of a wiffle ball.

Interviewer: Have you come up with these?

Interviewee: Yes, I don’t come up with everything, all the ideas that I write about, but most of the time, I’ll send a pitch to the editor and it goes that way. Well, so there’s Talk of the Town, which is short 800 word pieces, and that’s in print and the stories that I work on are long. They’re between, say, 5,000 and 13,000 words and when you’re writing a long piece, there are a lot of things that you have to deal with that you don’t have to deal with when you’re writing a short piece, that, looking at those pieces from an editorial standpoint, those are the problems that you’re looking to solve, like how do you structure a story. Where’s the most effective place to put the spectre and the anecdote and whatever, whereas if something’s for the web, it’s usually going to be shorter and you don’t have to think about all those structural questions and you’re just trying to, sort of, give somebody information or an opinion or a little story quickly. So when I’m thinking about writing something for the website, I’m usually thinking, how can I say this in a concise, entertaining way that gets the information across, whereas when I’m reading a long, 12,000 word piece, I’m thinking, like, what is the important information to include, what can we exclude and who are the primary characters, what are the themes? Where should these things go? So there’s generally, like, there are more knots that need to be unravelled for a long piece. I’m thinking in those terms more, but that’s not necessarily a function of it being printed versus online. It’s just a function of, you know, how we publish those two things.

Role 6: Britain Correspondent

Interviewee: And then a friend, who was working at the Economist Intelligence Unit, said they’re looking for a journalist for the Economist website, why don’t you apply? And so I applied for that, and that was five and a half years ago. So I started off here, working on the website, and at that
point we did, it was called news analysis, and we would do one story a day, and I wrote some of
them, and did some other things for the website, the way it worked was it was quite different then,
we did different things on the website. And then I became what was called the country's editor, we
used to run a series of briefings online that used information from the EIU reports along with our
articles, just sort of compile... it didn't involve very much writing on my part, but I did that, as well as
writing for the news analysis side.

And then, as the Economist expanded the work that it did online, and did more and more daily
coverage, I took over the online Middle East and Africa editor role, and so I did that for about two
and a half years, officially. And then last year I went to South Africa for the summer, to spend as our
southern Africa correspondent, and then I came back and...

Interviewer: How long was you there for?

Interviewee: For four months, and that was covering sort of, yes, southern Africa, so I was in
South Africa, and Zimbabwe, and Mozambique, you know, just sort of travelling around. And then I
came back and did another four or five months as the online Middle East and Africa editor, and then
in April this year I moved to the Home Affairs beat, on the Britain section. So that covers prisons,
police, immigration, law, and I tend to do our sort of Islam-related stuff, because of my background
in Middle Eastern things, and I do some things for the international section, sometimes kind of
women-related.

Role 7: Apps Editor

Interviewee: I got a job in publishing first, at Random House, which I stayed at for only about nine
months, and then I got taken to a literary magazine called Granta, where I was an editor, and I
worked there for a little over two years.

Interviewer: What kind of editor?

Interviewee: I kind of commissioned things, copy edit... I mean I worked mainly on non-fiction
pieces for the magazine. Occasionally I would commission covers; occasionally I would do kind of
comic book stuff for the magazine; I didn’t work in fiction. And then I freelanced for a bit, mainly as
an editor; bit of copywriting, and then I got a job here.

Interviewer: Okay. And what are the topics that you like to cover now?

Interviewee: Well, I write mainly about Arts, books, photography; mainly books and photography,
probably.

Interviewer: And do you choose the topics that you write on, or are you assigned what you
cover?

Interviewee: Both. If I write about books, I choose... I’ve been commissioned to write about
photographs.

Interviewer: Okay, and how many pieces do you write a week?
Interviewee: Oh, it totally varies. Last week I wrote three. This week I haven’t written any, because I’m doing editing and research for another piece I’m writing soon. So it totally varies.

Role 8: Video Editor

Interviewee: So what we tend to do is, we produce video or audio as an accompaniment to articles that are in print, so we’re very much tied to the stories that the print section are going to run with, so we respond to them – we react to them rather than go out on our own. And, so we’ll produce a mixture of journalists... we’ll quite often take the journalist that’s writing a story that we think is interesting and get another journalist to ask him questions about it. So team them up with questions to explain the story and explain why it’s interesting, basically. So that’s one format that we do. Another format, which we’re trying to do more of, is producing short video documentaries, even if it’s four or five minutes, on the same subject. So, yes... our workflow is – identify a story that one of our journalists is working on, work out the best way of repackaging that story, or retelling that story in video or audio.

Interviewer: And, how do you do that?

Interviewee: So we have a studio, which I think you’ve seen...

Interviewer: Yes, I have, yes.

Interviewee: which we use a lot, or we’ll go to the source of the story and film that, quite often with the same interviewees and the same case studies, and that sort of thing.

Interviewer: Yes. And is there any evidence, any kind of feedback that shows the effect your videos have?

Interviewee: Not as much as there should be. There are... we do have quite good tools to ascertain how many people watch our videos, but it’s not something... and my boss and her boss, in turn, I think analyse those numbers.

Interviewer: Do you know the numbers?

Interviewee: I do know some numbers, yes, but there’s probably not as much analysis as there could be in terms of how many people are watching, how many people do we want to watch. And that’s driven by... I imagine... we have an idea as to what we want to produce, and actually that’s not as influenced by viewers as it might be in other organisations.

Role 9: Art Director

Interviewer: And can you tell me about your role here, like what exactly your tasks are?

Interviewee: Yes, basically, I’m in charge of all of the visual expression of the editorial content of the magazine, so all of the photography obviously work and liaise very closely with [the photo editor] about which photographers to commission. And the sorts of photographers that we use that
deliver and give us the kind of feel and mood that I try convey in the magazine and the same with illustrators, commission of illustration.

And also, the structure of the magazine, how it's laid out visually. When I first started here lots of people raised concerns that visually it was too dark and too sombre, and still, you get various people saying can't it be more colourful, can't it be brighter?

And it's a very deliberate view that I hold which is that, since full colour printing became very cheap, if you walk into any newsagents, or you walk into WH Smith's and look at the huge racks of magazine covers on display. They're a riot of bright colour, process colours, special colours, and inks, and varnishes and millions of cover lines.

I wanted to do something that stood out from that by being very different to that. And I also think that, you know, the photography that we use in the illustrations has a kind of visual sophistication about it, which makes it stand out from a lot of the magazines that are out there. And also within the particular niche that we’re in, I mean it's quite a niche product in some ways, Intelligent Life.

Interviewer: In what ways?

Interviewee: Well, just that there are, the arts, the culture, style, travel, and kind of the literacy, the thinking, the writing, the long-form journalism that we do is something that's becoming more and more rare I think in editorial publications.

[...] And for me it's a personal expression of my tastes, I suppose, it's a personal choice for me, because I’m drawn to things that aren’t bright, and garish, and loud, and screamed and shouty. I don't think that's what we need to be and I don't think it's where we should be. I think, the visual elements of the magazine should complement the writing and the writing isn't shouty, and screaming, and look at me, downmarket, or mid-market.

It's more considered, it kind of feels more, and because of the pace at the magazine, because it was initially quarterly and now it's still only six times a year it's more of a slow, comfortable read. It's something that hangs around for a while, it's not an immediate, shouty, in your face kind of product.

[...] You know when we come to photograph or do a portrait of Neil Gaiman for instance, the photographers we use [...] articulate, intelligent people that bring a kind of depth and a resonance to that imagery.

Rather than dressing them up in the latest Gucci shoes and getting them jumping off a sideboard, and being kind of wacky, and crazy, and young, and hip and cool. It's kind of calmer, it's more long-form, it bears closer examination.