

Journalism between Cultures: Ethical Ideologies and the Challenges of International Broadcasting into Iran

Maximillian T. Hänska-Ahy*

SUMMARY

Drawing on interview data from research with Persian language international broadcasters (IBs), this paper asks which ethical ideologies journalists draw on when their work is dislocated between contexts. IBs are both spatially displaced from, and often operate within a journalism culture that is extraneous to the traditions of their audiences. Persian language IBs offer a salient example. Here, the pertinent question about differences in journalism culture and ethical ideology across contexts becomes one about dislocation between contexts. The challenges of dislocation are manifestations of the more general challenge of moving between universal principles and particularistic conditions. At stake are questions about the kind of ethical ideology that should inform journalism. Interpreting conversations with journalists, the analysis follows three directions of ethical ideologies, understood as rationales of journalistic decisions, in the newswork of IBs' – a) relativist considerations of contextual particularities, b) means-oriented considerations of principles, and c) ends-oriented considerations of consequences. It finds all three orientations present within the newswork of Persian language IBs, suggesting that this diversity can be understood as a product of dislocation. Further, the paper argues that diversity in ethical ideologies challenges assumptions of internal coherence, raising the question whether an emphasis on coherence focuses attention on a false dichotomous choice between universal and particular. As a way forward this paper suggests a distinction between ethical ideologies as normative and pragmatic resources, and that a pragmatic focus has advan-

* Maximillian T. Hänska-Ahy, LSE Fellow & Doctoral Candidate, Department of Media and Communications, London School of Economics, UK. E-mail: M.T.Hanska-Ahy@lse.ac.uk.

tages when it comes to supplying global journalists with the resources most useful to doing their work.

Key words: Journalism, international broadcasting, Iran, ethical ideologies, journalism culture, globalization

Introduction

Discussions about the universality and particularity of journalistic cultures and ideologies have a central place in journalism scholarship. The growing body of empirical work that tracks similarities and differences in journalistic professions and traditions is producing an increasingly richly textured understanding of the way in which journalism is both global and diverse, how it has both universal foundations and particular manifestations (Hanitzsch et al., 2011; Weaver, 1998; Weaver et al., 2007).

The national container has by and large served as the standard unit of analysis, and it is from a position of methodological nationalism that variables have been drawn to explain contextual differences in journalistic culture. With processes of globalization, the emergence of new communication technologies, and the transformation of media ecologies, the field of journalism studies has expanded, become more diverse, and possibly more complex. Perhaps it is accurate that the process of globalisation necessitates global journalists, as there increasingly exist global news (Seib, 2002: 20). A growing area of research addresses global journalism, a set of journalistic practices where the assumptions of methodological nationalism seem ill-suited as a basis for comparison (Berglez, 2008; Hafez, 2011). Indeed, the question whether methodological nationalism offers suitability categories on which to base comparative research has received discussion in its own right (Cottle, 2009; Hanitzsch, 2009; Livingstone, forthcoming). Foreign correspondents, but also journalists working for international broadcasters (IBs), whose newsworld traverses different places and cultures, belong to the genre of journalism where national journalism cultures and their ethical ideologies are disrupted. Much of this kind of journalism is, in a quite literal sense, located in an intermediate space between different journalism cultures.

This paper offers an analysis of the ethical ideologies (*vide infra*) drawn upon by journalists who are, in the above sense, dislocated between journalism cultures. It studies the diverse ways in which journalists at two Persian language IBs negotiate the differences between the journalism culture of their broadcaster and the journal-

ism culture of their context of reception, and the associated cultural expectations of their audiences. It does so by examining the ethical ideologies that come to bear in their practices. A thematic analysis of interview data reveals a remarkably consistent set of ethical ideologies, but also shows that the set of ethical ideas that are brought to bear in the decisions of journalists are not necessarily internally coherent, reflecting the contradictions that are inherent in the situation of dislocation. It is argued that the emphasis on coherence is an expression of the focus on universality or particularity of foundations. The conceptual demand for coherence can itself become problematic, at which point a useful distinction can be made between ideologies as normative and pragmatic resources for action. Understanding ideologies pragmatically can help to explain the lack of internal coherence, and might provide a fruitful way of addressing the challenges faced by a dislocated and global journalism.

Journalism culture and ethical ideologies

Comparative studies of journalism cultures rest on the assumed and generally given correspondence between national contexts and a set of institutional arrangements that we call the media system and the political system (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). This correspondence helps us to explain why journalism cultures vary from one context to another (Deuze, 2002; Weaver, 1996). Journalism culture has been used to track differences in the profession of journalism across contexts (Blumler & Gurevitch, 2004; Campbell, 2004). This paper adopts the conception of journalism culture synthesised by Hanitzsch (2007), as “the way journalists think and act; it can be defined as a particular set of ideas and practices by which journalists, consciously and unconsciously, legitimate their role in society and render their work meaningful for themselves and others.” (p. 369) The value orientation embedded in a journalism culture, through the perspective of which journalists address ethical problems, has been called journalism’s ethical ideology (Hanitzsch, 2007). It offers the resources for evaluating situations and making judgements about the appropriate course of action, and is a part of journalism culture (Hanitzsch, 2007; Zelizer, 2005). The assumed consistent correspondence between context and culture is accompanied by an assumption of internal ideological coherence within different journalism cultures. That is, within a culture, journalists have a consistent way of thinking about ethical issues, manifested in more or less consistent disposition to conduct their professional activities in a particular way and under the consistent guidance of a particular set of values (Lull, 1995). It is the assumption of internal

coherence of ethical ideologies that correspond consistently with a particular context that makes journalism culture a salient explanatory construct that allows us to track differences across contexts.

Comparative studies of journalism have tracked differences and similarities in journalism culture across context (*vide supra*), but they have not examined what happens if the continuity of context and culture is itself disrupted. When journalism goes global or is dislocated between contexts these associated correspondences are disrupted. Under conditions where journalists move between cultures, when they are based within a news organisation that hosts one journalism culture while they serve audiences with roots in a different culture, it is important to ask how they respond to ethical problems. That is the question this paper addresses. In other words, when journalists traverse contexts, cultures and traditions, how do they respond to ethical dilemmas and what ethical ideologies do they draw upon to guide their journalistic practice?

To answer this question this paper must operationalize ethical ideologies. Ethical ideologies offer frameworks for evaluation and judgement, thus they are practice oriented and like all ethics they are action guiding (Hanitzsch, 2007; See also: Appiah, 2003: chapter 5). They provide resources for journalists to decide how best to respond to situations that might contain ethical dilemmas. Journalism of course has several important functions, such as providing the public with relevant information and adequate understanding, which allows self-government, and is important in holding authority to account (Schudson, 1995). Democracy requires this kind of information, but it also requires debate: another function of journalism (Dzur, 2002; Etema, 2007; Garnham, 1992; Lasch, 1995). Both the information but particularly the debate function of journalism introduce particular kinds of ethical dilemmas. The former introduces questions about the kind of information that is relevant? The latter requires a more active, indeed participatory involvement of the public. When journalism is dislocated between contexts, this might mean a public that the journalist herself is not a part of. When facilitating debate an important ethical decision that journalists need to take is which views to include. The journalist needs to ask at what point “the views of dominant insiders must be counterbalanced by the views of the marginalized?” (Ryan, 2001: 15) In the case of dislocated journalism, for instance with international broadcasting into Iran, is this question answered endogenously, from a perspective of theocratic principles of authority, or exogenously from a perspective of a secular human rights discourse and western journalism culture? How do journalists respond to such ethical dilemmas, and which ethical ideologies do they draw on in deciding such questions?

Forsyth (1980) establishes two fundamental dimensions of ethical ideology that were used in a comparative study on journalism cultures by Hanitzsch *et al.* (2011). Forsyth distinguishes between a relativist dimension, which is the extent to which journalists understand their guiding values as universal or contextual, or put differently the extent to which they consider ethical decisions to be context dependent or context independent. The other dimension is that of idealism, which includes both deontic and consequentialist ethics, as they are usually distinguished in moral theory. Though Hanitzsch treats them as one under the label of idealism, they are here treated as two distinct dimensions: Deontic ethics is means-oriented, and holds that the right action is that which is in accordance with universal principles (Alexander & Moore, 2008). Consequentialist or utilitarian ethics is ends oriented, and holds that the right action is that one which has the best consequences (Sinnott-Armstrong, 2008). This gives us three lines of ethical reasoning: a context dependent relativist orientation, a principle or means based orientation, and a consequence or ends based orientation. It is along these three lines that this article explores the question: Which ethical ideologies do journalists working for Persian language IBs draw upon in responding to the challenges of dislocation?

Case and context

International broadcasting into Iran offers an interesting case for examination. Firstly, Iran is a country fraught with contradictions, with a lively media ecology and civil society on the one hand, and theocratic and authoritarian state institutions on the other. Under the reformist Presidency of Mohammad Khatami (1997–2005) the public sphere expanded and publications proliferated, only to have their licences revoked a few years on. Thereafter Iran's blogosphere exploded to become one of the most active in the world (Kelly & Etling, 2008; Khiabany & Sreberny, 2006; Rahimi, 2003). Though the idea of a "fourth estate" took hold in Iran, institutionally domestic news media suffer multiple restrictions (Khiabany, 2008). Being a theocracy with elected representatives, the sovereign remains an unelected religious authority, a contradiction emblematic of the country. Not straightforwardly authoritarian or theocratic, Iran is a country in which contradictions between state and society prevail, between democratic polity and theocratic state (Gheissari & Nasr, 2006). This ambiguity raises questions with respect to the most appropriate ethical ideology for journalism in and around Iran.

Secondly, the role of IBs as a crucial source of information in Iran makes the case of journalists working for these broadcasters an interesting one to examine (Alikhah,

2008; Barraclough, 2001). BBC's Persian radio is said to have played an important role in providing information to the public during Iran's 1978–79 revolution (Mohammadi & Sreberny, 1994). At the same time international broadcasting has long been considered part of governments' public diplomacy efforts and thus not strictly within the domain of conventional journalism. However, IBs have been going through some transformations. The proliferation of media outlets, the emergence of web based media, and the expansion of choices available to audiences has led to the need for some renewal among IBs, in their competition for audiences (Seib, 2005). It seems plausible that these developments have led to a more general shift in newswork at IBs, requiring an approach that carefully balances differences between the journalistic culture of the broadcaster and that of their audience's context of reception. This transformation entails a transition for journalist into an intermediate position that requires them to negotiate the competing demands of different ethical ideologies.

Method

This article is based on the author's doctoral research with two Persian language IBs, broadcasting original Persian language TV content via satellite: BBC Persian and Voice of America's Persian service. Semi-structured in-depth interviews were conducted with 23 journalists, who represent a cross section of these IBs, including different levels of seniority. Such interviews were deemed the appropriate choice given that interviewees were elites, and needed to be given sufficient space to bring their own framing to bear on the interview questions (Aberbach & Rockman, 2002). Interviewees were asked questions about their role perceptions and about editorial decisions, specifically about perceptions and decisions that can be considered problematic in relation to their spatial and cultural dislocation from the context of reception. All interviews were conducted in English, lasted around one hour and were subsequently transcribed. The consent agreement with the research participants included anonymity, which is why the names and positions of respondents have been omitted wherever they are quoted.

The findings presented in this paper are drawn from a thematic analysis of interview transcripts, utilising the NVivo software package for qualitative analysis. A thematic analysis is suitable for identifying patterns and recurring themes, in this case ideas and reasoning that relate to ethical ideologies, in the data (Aronson, 2004) The concept of ethical ideologies was operationalized into a set of codes for analysis through a process of prior instrumentation (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

This made it possible to have a set of pre-defined deductive categories relevant to the concept of ethical ideologies, while also allowing new codes to emerge from the data. In order to verify findings, the penultimate round of coding was used to conduct a negative case analysis, in which data segments were specifically sought that would contradict emergent findings (Morse et al., 2002).

Findings

Relativism: The Perspective of Contingency

Evidence was found for all three directions in which ethical ideologies could be oriented. We first explore the relativist orientation, or the way in which contextual contingency and particularity is manifested in interview data. The relativist orientation is reflected in the idea that when journalists face an ethical dilemma, the right response depends on the context in question. The interviews reveal three groups of contextual considerations. One is the context of the broadcaster; that is the traditions, remit and journalism culture of the broadcasting institution. Another is that of the society and cultural context of reception. Related to this socio-cultural context is the third context to be considered, the Iranian regime. The three contexts manifest three alternative ways in which journalists recognise their decision on ethical dilemmas as contingent.

Journalists show an explicit recognition that the *journalism culture of the IBs* for which they work makes different demands and leads to different conclusions when faced with ethical dilemmas than the journalism culture of an Iranian state broadcaster would. Interviewees showed a clear awareness that under conditions of displacement journalists make choices that will appear question begging to some. The objectivity and impartiality norm offers an interesting illustration. Being impartial when reporting for Iranian audiences, means being impartial with respect to a particular position. There is no position that is impartial both with respect to the broadcaster, society and the regime. There is no intermediate position that would be recognised as equally impartial from all three contexts. Impartiality from the perspective of the broadcaster is different than impartiality from the perspective of the regime. As one journalist explains: “we, by default, do not share the values of the Iranian regime to do with democracy and press freedom, we are by default, [...] not in the middle; we’re somewhere else. And our middle starts there.” The point of view of the objective and impartial observer shifts depending on the perspective one adopts. Therefore the way journalists respond to ethical dilemmas changes according to the context they are in. Journalism as practiced by the broadcaster is

seen as inherently and inevitably democratising, and therefore at odds with a theocratic political system.

I think by its nature journalism is democratic. Journalism cannot thrive on theocracy, or very limited theocratic points of view, because it's about being impartial, and therefore you have to bring different points of view. [...] There's so much you can do to try and be impartial, represent the theocratic point of view as well, but just by being there and giving out some of the news that the government doesn't want to hear, they're pushing a democratic cause. Not deliberately.

This inevitability shows an awareness that context informs ethical choices in journalism. The broadcaster as a context has an inherent orientation that is at odds with the political system in Iran. There is therefore no position of objectivity and impartiality vis-à-vis both the context of reception and the IB.

Apart from the IB as a relative contextual perspective informing ethical choices, another important perspective that can inform choices in this relativist orientation is that of *Iran's socio-cultural context*. Relevance is a key word here, as the right journalistic choice is contingent on contextual relevance. With IBs, the question is, relevant to whom? An important perspective in the relativist stance on ethical ideology is that of the audience. For many interviewees knowing what is relevant from the socio-cultural perspective of reception requires one to be "plugged-in" to life in Iran, as it were. This is especially true when it comes to a context such as Iran, which has gone through several rapid social transformations. As one interviewee notes, it is an incredibly

fast moving society and you know, it changes quickly, and then if you haven't lived there and if you haven't been, I mean, in contact with that society recently then you lose your touch and your relevance after a while. That's why I mean, it's good, I mean, always to have people fresh from the country, if you can of course.

This is of course not a purely ethical reflection but also a pragmatic one. Journalism must remain relevant to maintain audience share, a concern that is particularly pressing for IBs. But relevance is also an ethical matter; it has to do with the kind of choices that journalists make when faced with ethical dilemmas. One journalist indicated that her broadcaster had not done enough to maintain relevance by providing a perspective from inside Iranian society.

When hiring [and with personnel management] they [the management] need to be more careful to hire people who are experienced, familiar and knowledgeable with [...] Iranian language, culture and values, etc... This has not

been effectively done. The fact that key decision makers are not Iranian leads to bad decisions.

Journalists clearly acknowledge the importance of the socio-cultural context of reception in making good decisions, manifesting another contextual perspective in the relativist orientation of ethical ideology.

As was briefly discussed in the introduction to the context of Iran's media ecology (*vide supra*), there is a contradiction between Iranian society and the Iranian state. When journalists differentiate between Iranian society and culture on the one hand, and the *Iranian regime* on the other they also pick up on this contradiction. In this way the regime becomes another contextual perspective within a relativist-oriented ethical ideology. It should however be noted, that recognising the regime's voice as an important (relative) perspective in its own right is not a purely ethical but also a pragmatic consideration. Journalists understand the legitimacy of the news product to be in some respects contingent on its inclusion of official regime voices.

The tensions between IBs and the Iranian regime are ripe. Apart from regularly jamming their signals, the regime routinely blames IBs for aggravating or exaggerating social and economic problems. Yet the regime, and the political system it is established within, are recognised as important contingent factors that shape the broadcasters relative legitimacy. Legitimacy depends to an extent on the compatibility between media and institutions of the political system, and in so far it becomes a necessity for the media to take a step in the direction of the regime. This perceived need for congruence between media and political systems is obviously not without precedent (Hallin & Mancini, 2004; Siebert, Peterson, & Schramm, 1956). Consider the following reflection:

In order ... for us to be able to work more easily, for the media to be able to report more freely in Iran, they have to be compatible with the government a bit more. I think they have to be compatible. They have to... they have to understand what the audience want. I'm just a journalist. So I mean, the government, so long as it's part of my audience, yes [it needs to be considered].

The government or regime always distinguished clearly and markedly from Iranian society (no one the author interviewed believed that the Iranian government acted in the best interest of, or adequately represented the views of Iranian society), is thought to be an important voice that needs to be included. The government or political system more generally, no matter how much some respondents disagreed with its values and views, was considered an important and relevant context, that must inform a relativist ethical ideology.

Means-Oriented: The Perspective of Principles

Another ethical ideology widely reflected in interviews shows an orientation towards means or principles. In contrast to the relativist perspective just discussed, under a means-oriented perspective ethical choices are not seen to be relative to context, rather they are informed by principles held to be universal. The core principle here is objectivity as truth telling, which is manifested in various ways. Journalism involves continuously tracking, unveiling, and discovering the truth, the truth as understood in a realist epistemology. That is, there is an objective truth that exists independently of the subjectivity of any one observer, and the task of the journalist or the news organisation is to continuously progress towards the discovery of, to get as close as possible to that truth. As an ethical ideology the orientation towards means manifests itself along three parallel perspectives: journalism should foster inclusive discussion, should adhere to strict methods and routines, or commit itself to a specific understanding of impartiality.

Discussion is viewed as one principle in the general epistemic orientation of journalism towards the means of truth telling. Ethical dilemmas that emerge in relation to the discovery of truth are in this view discovered by allowing all perspectives, views and opinions to find expression. In discussion, and through the juxtaposition of all views, the truth will emerge. This does not mean that all perspectives are equally valid, but that it is only by contrasting different perspectives that we can discover the truth among them. This perspective finds expression in the eagerness and urgency with which journalists encourage regime voices on their program (despite the fact that most journalists are opposed to the regime). These voices are central to the discussion, to the process of unveiling that which is right and true. A principle obstacle thrown up in the pursuit of getting all voices on board is the unwillingness of Iranian officials to speak to IBs. As one journalist remarked:

We will really become happy if a pro-government supporter talked to us and specifically in our programme, unfortunately they [only] call us [in disguise]. I mean sometimes we are under the impression that it's organised [...]. Sometimes it's obvious they're reading from a piece of paper but we are more than happy that they are coming to our programme and it's interesting because when they call us they say something against the government and then live on air they change their view and, I don't know, some of them are under the impression that if they sound anti-government they have more chance to come to our programme but this is not the case. We tell them that: "if you tell the truth... if we know that you are pro-government you have more chances actually to come to our show because there are usually, for

example, three pro-government, seven anti-government voices.” So for the sake of balance and interest [...] we would like to have pro-government supporters because then we can have a debate and usually the most interesting parts of our show is when we have these debates, you know.

Being part of the effort to find what is true involves representing all different points of view. Balance is the key word here, balance understood by interviewees as the proportional representation of various perspectives. Truth is a function of the representation of all perspectives and points of view. Facilitating such discussions is an important method of truth finding in the means-oriented ethical ideology. Fostering inclusive discussion is also appreciated by audiences. As one journalist remarked, their work is successful precisely because they foster such discussion: “I think that makes us credible to people, because they want to judge themselves, they don’t want us to be the judge of everything. And that was our very strong point” Doing this is a matter of covering everything that can be reasonably covered, without pre-judgement. In this sense balance is said to be a less useful term: “Balance is not a useful term, it’s a term that I do not like, full, comprehensive coverage would be a better one.” Comprehensive coverage that juxtaposes different views and arguments, enabling audiences to make their own judgement also requires different views to become declared positions:

[F]or instance in covering “the American point of view” we will disclaim quite clearly “this is a statement of, the opinion of, the view of the US government, of the Secretary of state” or whoever. So information is kept balanced by stating clearly whose view is whose view. There are of course extreme points of view, we must make sure that we don’t err to the extremes but at the same time we must also make sure to cover both points of view. So for example we will cover a point of view offered by the US government by saying: “as the US government has said”.

In this means-oriented perspective discussion including all stakeholders is crucial to the truth tracking or epistemic task of journalism. The orientation is towards fostering discussion that is inclusive, and not towards fostering any particular outcome. It is held that journalists cannot of their own accord make the best possible judgement; rather good judgements are made intersubjectively through discussion. But journalists cannot do their part towards the accomplishment of truth without appropriate methods, tools and institutions.

In another means-oriented perspective of ethical ideology, what is important is not facilitating discussion, but the *methodical approach* to the work of journalism supported by appropriate institutional structures. Here strict discipline in the adherence

to methods and routines are viewed as the most appropriate way of responding to ethical dilemmas. Truth is also understood in realist terms, but rather than discovering it through discussion it is unveiled through a methodical work process. Commenting on the institutional affordances of her IB one journalist said:

the good thing about it is that [...] there is a system in place and when people join they might have... I mean, everybody of course they have their political views, but then you make clear to them [...] that] this is how we work here and, you know, these are the editorial values [...]. At the same time the system [is such that] you've got your editor of the day who should approve [your] piece. [...] it's like a constant process of training them and, um, making sure that, you know, they act based on editorial values.

Here judgement cannot be left to audiences, as it would be under the foregoing means-oriented perspective of fostering discussion. Rather, it is the working methods and routines that are essential. It is however not uncommon for the position of the journalist and her institution to become problematic themselves, particularly under conditions of dislocation. This is where a third perspective in the means-oriented approach to ethical ideologies comes to bear. This is the *principle of impartiality*, or non-alignment. If ethical dilemmas cannot be solved by advancing dialogue or methodical routine, they can be resolved by the journalist bracketing their own particular views and preferences.

This final means-oriented perspective is built around the principle that journalists should assume a view "from nowhere". Also sharing a realist epistemology, truth is the result of the dispassionate observation and work of the journalist rather than a result of the dialogue between opposing views, or methodical working practices. As one news professional puts it: "We don't take sides and [...] that was our very strong point." But impartiality as non-side-taking means being impartial with respect to something, not being impartial with respect to nothing. Unlike the dialogic perspective of giving all points of view, impartiality does not imply that no position should be assumed, it means being impartial with respect to those things that we can reasonably accept people having different views on. Impartiality also means assuming as given those perspectives that we can already recognise *a priori* as true. There are some issues which are black and white, and being impartial also means standing up for these: "What about Human Rights, how do we take a stance on this question. We need to also take into context the rest of the world, how do we cover human rights abuses elsewhere, should that not be relevant to the way we cover them in Iran?" Impartiality is understood as bracketing one's own preferences. Excluded are those things that already count as universal, that already pertain to a

more general good, such as human rights. The means orientation of these ethical ideologies holds that what is crucial to journalism under conditions of dislocation is to follow a particular set of principles, regardless of their final consequences. Next we will turn to another orientation, one that relies on the consideration of ends in ethical decision-making.

Ends-Oriented: The Didactic Perspectives

The third dimension of ethical ideologies that emerged as salient out of conversations with journalists working for Persian language IBs was an orientation towards ends. Here, this has been called the didactic perspective, because it understands as the guiding end of newswork the education and emancipation of audiences and development of Iranian news media. The journalist understands her role as helping to advance certain developmental or emancipatory goals. Variations in socio-cultural context do not matter a great deal, because contextual variations are simply a sign of something yet to be attained. Unlike the means-oriented approach, with its focus on truth, ends are not discovered but worked towards. These ends are multiple, and include encouraging the emancipation of Iranian journalism, prompting changes in Iran's media system, elevating the expectations of audiences, and educating and inspiring Iranians through exciting and edifying content.

One end manifesting this ethical orientation was the *emancipation of Iranian journalism* to western standards of objectivity and impartiality. One important attribute of the objectivity norm, as interviewees understood it, was that it set an example; it acted as a didactic device. Leading by example has emancipatory implications, it leads to the transfer of a set of values and expectations about journalism, news and the media. As one respondent observes about other media available inside Iran:

They always like [our content], they always found us [to be] balanced, fair, impartial [...]. We do that and I think that was something that Iranians didn't used to have – at least in television that lots of people could have access to. So, the main [alternative to us] is the State channel, State TV and the different channels and of course they take sides heavily.

It is the practice of IBs that stands in contrast to many other news outlets available in the country. Their presence in itself teaches something about the value of objective journalism, of bracketing journalists' and news organisations' own views and preferences. IBs create a contrast between themselves and domestic media, which makes visible the intrinsic merit of their ethical ideologies and wider journalism culture. They bring fresh western formats, styles of presenting, professionalism, and high quality, attractive content, which change the *expectations* audiences have

of their domestic media. In this sense these IBs are understood to have a *developmental impact on domestic media systems*. As one respondent explained:

I think education is not just [for] people to understand the values of impartial news broadcasting, it is to understand how a TV channel should look like. For instance, when we interview experts, like other channels, we give them three, four minutes, never more. Whoever they are, it doesn't matter. It is policy. Iranians, at the beginning, were not used to it. They were complaining, you are rude to people, you interrupt them, you don't give them enough time. But now they are understanding that this is the best way of broadcasting, because if you give somebody five minutes, that person concentrates and uses that five minutes to the best of his ability, and only mentions the main important points about their story. If you give them 50 minutes, they can still talk.

This presence of new and different formats and styles transforms audience expectations, at least that is the rationale presented by many interviewees, and that is what the goal of journalism should be. Another journalist remarked similarly:

So I'm saying it's kind of changed people's expectations. And you see that by seeing [how] they choose between [channels]. So what I've heard; it's not scientific, I mean, it's not scientific research, but what I've heard is that some people have switched from listening to the official news to [our channel].

By transforming the expectations that audiences have about the quality of their media they create the incentive for other media to change, not only their content, but also their styles and formats. In this way, the orientation towards ends produces formats and content that is thought to stimulate Iran's media ecology as a whole to change.

While format is thought to alter expectations, content is thought to be more directly educational, *changing public views about issues* of public concern in a positive direction. When drawing on an ends-oriented ethical ideology in responding to ethical dilemmas, journalists often cite the emancipating capability of the content they deliver. For example, the status of women in society is something that is addressed not only through the format but also through the content of programming:

[W]e are a TV station. And it is a professional, young, slick channel, and that is very educational for people. Women are playing a big role in this channel, and that is why, for a lot of Iranian women, this channel is a novelty. It made a lot of Iranian women interested in politics, which is very important. These are all educational [achievements].

The content choice itself delivers a political education to Iranians, and as an end this justifies the means. Many other content choices are mentioned, and also thought

of as having generally educational ends. These include documentaries on human rights issues, the civil rights movement in the USA, the workings of constitutional monarchies, the American judicial systems, or nuclear safety. In this ends-oriented dimension of ethical ideology it is thought that journalism has a didactic role, transforming society through information and inspiration. As one journalist commented: “[We have] shown programmes on the civil rights movement, could it be inspirational? Why do we select stories? Recently we have covered a lot on Burma and Aung San Suu Kyi, this is news that is simply news, we don’t make it.” What this journalist meant was that covering different issues that are also topical can serve as inspiration for self-emancipation. The choice of news content, therefore, is oriented towards an end and has a didactic purpose. The end is to transform Iranians and their media system. This ends-oriented approach of emancipation also extends to the level of journalism culture itself. International broadcasting could thus even have emancipatory effects on the professional culture of journalism inside Iran itself. As one journalist explained:

So, we are doing educational work on many levels and I’m very pleased, because I think a new generation of journalists are also learning TV journalism. We are educating people and we are training hundreds of people in this organisation. They may leave and work for other organisations. Our correspondent in Jerusalem has become head of Euro News Persian channel just two weeks ago. I’m very pleased that our correspondent is now head of Euro News channel. [...] So, in that sense we are also training a lot of journalists who are learning the values of impartial broadcasting and the values of TV journalism, and they take it to other channels.

Conceived broadly the ends-oriented perspective of ethical ideology offers another way of addressing ethical dilemmas in journalistic decision making. Under this perspective journalists pursue ends through their work. These ends can be multiple, such as teaching the virtues of impartiality, transforming audience expectation, education and inspiration on particular topics, changing Iranian journalism culture or training journalists.

Discussion

The dislocation of IBs and the concomitant experiences of journalists make them interesting cases to examine, precisely because the disruption of context and its associated culture problematizes the issue of coherent ethical ideologies. In the case of IBs we are speaking of different contexts, different media systems, and differ-

ent journalism cultures. What then are the ethical resources journalists draw on to navigate these differences? Findings reveal that journalists are oriented along three different ethical ideologies. When confronted with the competing demands of different contexts journalists routinely adopt a relativist ethical ideology. This is illustrated by views that hold the right response to a particular dilemma is contingent on the various particularities of different contexts: that of the IB, that of Iran's society and culture, and that of the regime. Another ideology that featured prominently within interviews was that of a means-oriented epistemic approach. Hereunder truth can only be sought by the appropriate means and through principled adherence to them. For instance: Facilitating comprehensive discussions, strict adherence to journalistic routines and working methods, as well as committing to a particular interpretation of the objectivity norm, were identified as the core perspectives that relate to this means-oriented ethical ideology. All means-based ideologies are epistemically oriented, that is, committed through a particular set of means to the discovery, unveiling, and delivery of truth. The third prominent ethical ideology identified was the orientation towards a particular end. In the case of Persian language IBs these were variously: Elevating the quality of Iranian journalism, transforming the expectations of audiences, providing an impetus for change in Iran's media environment as well as educating and inspiring audiences on particular topics. The diversity of ethical ideologies present within the newswork of IBs can be understood as a reflection of the competing cultural demands that a dislocated and global journalism has to meet.

All three ethical ideologies provide resources that help journalists to decide how best to respond to the challenges of dislocation. They were all represented throughout the discussions with journalists that this paper is based on. Differentiating between means and ends oriented ideologies rather than treating them both under the same category of idealism as suggested by Hanitzsch (2007) proved fruitful. All three orientations were present throughout the interviews in a way that we could call systematic, though not necessarily coherent. This challenges the rather important assumptions that a journalism culture enjoys internal coherence when it comes to ethical ideologies, that ethical ideologies might vary with journalistic cultures, but that ideology is consistent within one culture (*Vide supra*, see also: Lull, 1995). Logically, different ethical ideologies exclude each other: It is not coherent for example to draw on a relativist ideology at one moment, and draw on a means-oriented ideology that is based on universal premises in the next. But how important is this coherentist assumptions, and can the global journalist do without it?

On a pragmatic level it is not unreasonable to expect journalists to adopt a pick and mix approach to the resources deemed useful in responding to ethical dilemmas.

A distinction can then perhaps be made between ethical ideologies of journalism understood as pragmatic resources on the one hand, and understood as universal normative resources on the other. Coherence of ethical ideologies is of course imperative if they are to lend universal normative validity to the judgements of journalists. But as pragmatists do, we can also treat ethical ideologies themselves as fallible and contingent, to be improved and transformed in the future, allowing us to focus on the practical demands faced by journalists in the present (Bernstein, 2010). Of course journalists working hard to do a good job (and for that matter people more generally) are hardly troubled by such conceptual incoherencies. The strong concern for internal coherence remains, for now, one that occupies the minds of journalism scholars and theorists. A pragmatic approach to journalism's ethical ideologies might focus on questions of usefulness and appropriateness of ethical ideologies as resources for action, instead of coherence as a conceptual imperative.

As the process of globalisation gathers pace, and as journalism becomes increasingly global, it will also become increasingly dislocated. The search for journalism's foundations, be they universal or particular, is part of the wider effort to know what kind of journalism culture, what kind of ethical ideologies will supply the global journalist with the resources needed to respond properly to the ethical dilemmas she faces. As this paper has shown, journalists who are already in a situation of dislocation are managing to do their work (by their own judgement quite well) by drawing on a bricolage of ethical ideologies. Should the lack of internal coherence trouble scholars in the way, and to the extent that it does? The dichotomy between particular and universal might present us with a false choice, but more importantly it certainly sets us up with a question that we will not answer conclusively any time soon. Raising the question of coherence however does direct our attention to a few important issues. Journalism researchers and scholars would do well to continue investing their efforts to understand the challenges faced by journalists who are already in a very real sense global and dislocated between journalism cultures. In lieu of establishing universally agreed foundations for journalism, perhaps it is better to ask from a perspective of pragmatism whether the ethical resources available equip journalists adequately for the challenges of migrating between different contexts, cultures and traditions. This then is perhaps less a question for normative ethics, and its strict demands for coherence, and more a question of pragmatic ethics and for the kind of applied media ethics which is already well established (For an overview see: Ward, 2009). Instead of looking to settle matters of universalism and particularism once and for all, we can ask, with pragmatic fallibilism, what kind of choices and actions might be appropriate for journalists faced with the challenges

of dislocation, and which resources would be most useful for journalists to respond appropriately to the ethical demands of newswork under conditions of dislocation.

Conclusion

Journalists who are faced with the different and in many ways incompatible cultures of two contexts, one of their workplace and the other of their audience, draw on a range of ethical ideologies to make decisions in their day-to-day work. Roughly, these ideologies map onto three directions: relativist, means- and ends-oriented. They all offer useful and pragmatic means for making decisions in the newsroom. From a strictly normative point of view different ethical ideologies are not compatible with one another; they are based on different ideas about what makes a decision right or wrong. But it is also important to recognise that practitioners do not share to any comparable degree the theorist's and scholar's concern for coherence. If we understand ethical ideologies pragmatically, as resources that enable journalists to do their work, instead of normatively, as resources with strict demands of coherence, we can shift our attention from a concern with journalism's universal or particular foundations, to a concern with the resources useful to the global and dislocated journalist.

REFERENCES

- Aberbach, J. D. & Rockman, B. A. (2002) "Conducting and Coding Elite Interviews", *Political Science and Politics*, 35 (4), 673–676.
- Alexander, L. & Moore, M. (2008) "Deontological Ethics". In: E. Zalta (Ed.): *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008 ed.), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/ethics-deontological/>, 30 August, 2011.
- Alikhah, F. (2008) "The Politics of Satellite Television in Iran", pp. 94–110. In: M. Semati (Ed.): *Media, Culture and Society in Iran: Living with Globalization and the Islamic State*. London: Routledge.
- Appiah, A. (2003) *Thinking it Through: An Introduction to Contemporary Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aronson, J. (2004) "A Pragmatic View of Thematic Analysis", *The Qualitative Report*, 2 (1).
- Barracough, S. (2001) "Satellite Television in Iran: Prohibition, Imitation and Reform", *Middle Eastern Studies*, 37 (3), 25–48.

- Berglez, P. (2008) "What is Global Journalism? Theoretical and empirical conceptualisations", *Journalism Studies*, 9 (6), 845–858.
- Bernstein, R. (2010) *The Pragmatic Turn*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Blumler, J. G. & Gurevitch, M. (2004) "State of the Art of Comparative Political Communication Research: Poised for Maturity?", pp. 325–343. In: F. Esser & B. Pfetsch (Eds.): *Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Campbell, V. (2004) *Information Age Journalism: Journalism in an International Context*. London: Arnold.
- Cottle, S. (2009) "Journalism Studies: Coming of (Global) Age?", *Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism*, 10 (3), 309–311.
- Deuze, M. (2002) "National News Cultures: A Comparison of Dutch, German, British, Australian and U.S. Journalists", *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 79 (1), 134–149.
- Dzur, A. W. (2002) "Public Journalism and Deliberative Democracy", *Polity*, 34 (3), 313–336.
- Ettema, J. S. (2007) "Journalism as Reason-Giving: Deliberative Democracy, Institutional Accountability, and the News Media's Mission", *Political Communication*, 24 (2), 143–160.
- Forsyth, D. R. (1980) "A Taxonomy of Ethical Ideologies", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39 (1), 175–184.
- Garnham, N. (1992) "The Media and The Public Sphere", pp. 359–377. In: C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Gheissari, A. & Nasr, V. (2006) *Democracy in Iran: History and the Quest for Liberty*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hafez, K. (2011) "Global Journalism for Global Governance? Theoretical Visions, Practical Constraints", *Journalism*, 12 (4), 483–496.
- Hallin, D. C. & Mancini, P. (2004) *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2007) "Deconstructing Journalism Culture: Toward a Universal Theory", *Communication Theory*, 17, 367–385.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2009) "Comparative Journalism Studies", pp. 413–427. In: K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Journalism Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Mellado, C., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I. et al. (2011) "Mapping Journalism Cultures Across Nations: A Comparative Study of 18 Countries", *Journalism Studies*, 12 (3), 273–293.

- Kelly, J. & Etling, B. (2008) *Mapping Iran's Online Public: Politics and Culture in the Persian Blogosphere*. Boston: The Berkman Center for Internet & Society.
- Khiabany, G. (2008) "The Iranian Press, State and Civil Society", pp. 17–36. In: M. Semati (Ed.), *Media, Culture and Society in Iran*. London: Routledge.
- Khiabany, G. & Sreberny, A. (2006) "The Politics of/in Blogging in Iran". *Paper presented at the IAMCR in Cairo in 2006* (cited with Authors' consent).
- Lasch, C. (1990) "Journalism, publicity, and the lost art of argument", *Gannett Center Journal*, 4 (2), 1–11.
- Livingstone, S. (forthcoming) "Challenges of Comparative Research: Cross-National and Transnational Approaches to the Globalising Media Landscape". In: F. Essler & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*. New York: Routledge.
- Lull, J. (1995) *Media, Communication, Culture: A Global Approach*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Mohammadi, A. & Sreberny, A. (1994) *Small Media, Big Revolution: Communication, Culture, and the Iranian Revolution*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Morse, J. M., Barrett, M., Mayan, M., Olson, K. & Spiers, J. (2002) "Verification Strategies for Establishing Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research", *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 1 (2), 13–22.
- Rahimi, B. (2003) "Cyberdissent: The Internet in Revolutionary Iran", *Middle East Review of International Affairs*, 7 (3), 101–115.
- Ryan, M. (2001) "Journalistic Ethics, Objectivity, Existential Journalism, Standpoint Epistemology, and Public Journalism", *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 16 (1), 3–22.
- Schudson, M. (1995) *The Power of News*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Seib, P. M. (2002) *The Global Journalist: News and Conscience in a World of Conflict*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Seib, P. M. (2005) "Hegemonic No More: Western Media, the Rise of Al-Jazeera, and the Influence of Diverse Voices", *International Studies Review*, 7, 601–615.
- Siebert, F. S., Peterson, T. & Schramm, W. (1956) *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of what the Press Should be and Do*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Sinnott-Armstrong, W. (2008) "Consequentialism". In: E. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2008 ed.), <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2008/entries/consequentialism/>, 30 August, 2011.
- Ward, S. J. A. (2009). "Journalism Ethics", pp. 295–309. In: K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.): *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. New York: Routledge.
- Weaver, D. (1996) "Journalists in Comparative Perspective", *The Public*, 3 (4), 83–91.
- Weaver, D. (1998) "Journalists Around the World: Commonalities and Differences", pp. 455–480. In: D. Weaver (Ed.): *The Global Journalist: News People Around the World*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.
- Weaver, D., Beam, R., Brownlee, B., Voakes, P. & Wilhoit, V. (2007) *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. news people at the dawn of a new millennium*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Zelizer, B. (2005) "The Culture of Journalism", pp. 198–214. In: J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (Eds.): *Mass Media and Society* (4 ed.). London: Arnold.