



AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Aalborg Universitet

Introduction

The places and spaces of news audiences

Peters, Chris

Published in:
The Places and Spaces of News Audiences

Publication date:
2016

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Peters, C. (2016). Introduction: The places and spaces of news audiences. In C. Peters (Ed.), *The Places and Spaces of News Audiences* (pp. 1-11). [(Article reprint)] London: Routledge. *Journalism Studies: Theory and Practice*

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

This article was downloaded by: [Chris Peters]

On: 17 September 2014, At: 11:37

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Journalism Studies

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rjos20>

Introduction

Chris Peters

Published online: 11 Mar 2014.

To cite this article: Chris Peters (2014): Introduction, Journalism Studies, DOI:

[10.1080/1461670X.2014.889944](http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2014.889944)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2014.889944>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

INTRODUCTION

The places and spaces of news audiences

Chris Peters

Having the means to access “news” at any moment without much hassle likely changes the experience of journalism for many people. Beyond this, one might even say that the way we interact with information on a daily basis transforms through this phenomenon. Considering such changes in what is often referred to as “everyday life” provides a useful starting point for research into media use. It guides us towards a number of considerations, from how we structure our day through certain habits and patterns of media consumption; to the development of technology and the formation of new rituals; to shifting dynamics of communicative flows across societies and their impact; and to the processes whereby the emergent becomes the familiar. Obviously such analyses are not bound to the disciplinary confines of media studies and the term “everyday life” enjoys a rich, if vague and complicated, twentieth-century history.¹ Indeed, a quick Google Scholar search of “everyday life” takes us on a whirlwind interdisciplinary tour of academia, from sociology to cultural studies, psychology to political science, anthropology to economics. There is good reason for this, in that thinking through consistency and change—patterns and disruptions—across the passage of time forms the analytic foundation for much scientific research. But while “everyday life” adorns the cover of many a noted book (e.g. Goffman 1959; de Certeau 1984), a comparable term is almost nowhere to be found. “Everywhere life” not only draws the Google equivalent of a blank stare, even writing it down or saying it aloud feels a little awkward. This is almost certainly no discursive anomaly but is rather indicative of the subjugation of spatial thinking to temporal analysis within academia (Soja 1989). While space has been “treated as the dead, the fixed, the undialectical. Time, on the other hand, was richness, fecundity, life, dialectic” (Foucault 1980, 70). Journalism studies is not immune from this tendency. Yet if we want to understand much of what *makes media use meaningful for people*, it is important to *accentuate not only its everydayness, but its everywhere-ness as well*.

This special issue on the places and spaces of news audiences presents an initial attempt to do this; to see how the everyday digital geographies of contemporary media, communication, and information flows intersect with the everywhere “lived” geographies of individuals, and how this impacts audience perceptions of news, of storytelling, of journalism. The past few decades have seen a tremendous increase in the number of different devices and platforms through which we can get journalism—from tablets to smartphones, Twitter, online news, and so forth—and the different possible places and moments of news consumption have multiplied in concert. Although it is not certain just how robust traditional practices such as reading newspapers or watching the evening news will be in the future, to whatever extent they may have been stable in the past, what does seem clear is that old audience habits are certainly becoming de-ritualized and it is unclear what will replace them (Broersma and Peters 2012). As consumptive possibilities gradually spread to any conceivable instant and every potential location we desire, it

seems fairly self-evident that conceptualizing the news media diet of audiences as something clearly distinguishable from other mediated forms of communication is problematic. Similarly, as the temporal and spatial architectures of media use are increasingly unshackled from the distributional constraints of unidirectional, programmatic mass media, audiences are slowly catching up to the possibilities. This changing ecology of digital media may appear quite disruptive, its scale and impact being perceived most strongly early on in its introduction (until such emerging practices and ways of living with media become habitual and taken-for-granted). Coming to grips with the impact this has on journalism requires a scholarship attuned to these different spatio-temporal affordances.

This is not to say that efforts to theorize the dynamics of place and space have been entirely absent from the study of journalism, of course. Many of the classic ethnographies which helped establish the field were attuned to how the newsroom functioned as a place that captured and combined information from a variety of geographic locales before redistributing these back out (e.g. Tuchman 1978). Research into the content of news has also looked more closely into how the world is portrayed on the pages of newspapers and what this signals in terms of how different regions and places are represented and understood (e.g. Wanta, Golan, and Lee 2004). And much current research into news and journalism which centres on the breakdown of distance seems to implicitly recognize the importance of “where” when it comes to content, production, distribution, and reception in an increasingly networked, connected, and participatory digital age.

Yet for all the talk of the emerging and dynamic spaces of news, many of the examples that seem to investigate its significance for journalism employ conceptions that are quite two-dimensional, ignoring established theories of space or imbuing the concepts with dictionary-like meaning. A closer look reveals that the way space and place are treated in many analyses that brand themselves around their consideration is often based upon a Euclidian approach that makes these ideas synonymous with a “plottable” location, albeit one increasingly marked out by virtual coordinates (i.e. “going on to Facebook”). This sort of “GPS” perspective of space can easily miss the inherent sociality that produces it (cf. Lefebvre 1991) and often treats spatiality, sociality, and temporality as separate factors for analytic purposes. This risks mistakenly conceptualizing space as something that “pre-exists” human interaction—as a steady location in which “action” occurs or passes through.

This approach becomes especially problematic when it comes to figuring out what the foundational stakeholder of journalism, namely the audience, “does” with its media use, as new technologies allow users to blur familiar boundaries and co-create new communicative spaces. While media has always possessed this affordance to some degree, in the current changing media landscape even those especially sensitive to accusations of technological determinism must certainly acknowledge that something fairly fundamental has changed, and that former habits will have a tendency to transform. The ubiquity and personal proximity of recent digitalization increasingly means experiencing multiple places simultaneously and continuously and it is unclear how this impacts our perception and experience of information and the world in general. Here challenging questions arise, such as: How do familiar places like work and the home change from the lived materiality of new technologies? What about more abstract but supposedly social aggregates like communities or neighbourhoods? Do these change alongside non-relational, “non-places” like airports, commuter transport, motorways, supermarkets, and shopping centres

(Augé 1995)? If we think of places as layered, textured environments created by social interaction, human intervention, and technological extension in the broadest sense, how does news use fit into this broader equation? Do different potential places of consumption and habits within them change what news is and can news use change our meaning of different spaces? As social scientists and humanities scholars, the intriguing questions likely are not really about the absolute spaces and coordinates where such practices occur, but rather about *the integration of media use within everywhere life*.

Terms and concepts familiar to journalism studies scholars, like “public sphere” or “network society”, initially sound like they are closely attuned to such complexities of space and certainly have the possibility to offer such insights. But oftentimes scholarship which relies on these notions de-emphasizes such spatial aspects for other considerations. To briefly elaborate, public sphere is a potentially useful abstraction to shape understanding of how people learn about things and form opinions, which is without doubt of great relevance to journalism scholarship. But when we apply it to news consumption, the spatial significance is often lost or relegated, the focus is placed on the substance of content and orientation to discussion within it, and this becomes detached—or conflated—with experience. In a digital age, increasingly we look to participation via online or social media attached to journalism, say in comment fields, live blogs, and via Twitter, and deem this a virtual public sphere; but surely where, when, and why people are participating is as foundational to their experience and proclivity for engagement as the content they read or produce. The idea of network seems more sensitive to these issues, and is also a potentially useful metaphor to explain the flow of information and the shifting forms and infrastructures of communication. However, the predominance of trying to map how the network operates and discern its structure tends to drown out any useful consideration of the lived materiality of news use, and how this is spatially situated.

In scholarship, it is a necessary evil that we ignore some factors to stabilize our object of study and this selectivity is unavoidable rather than an intellectual shortcoming. The previous observations should accordingly be viewed not as polemic or admonishment but rather as invitation. Just as we in journalism studies frequently pause and take stock of key developments in terms of production, content, values, economics, and technology, we should devote comparable attention to taking a nuanced, processural approach to the spatialized aspects of news and experiment with different ways to operationalize them methodologically. The lack of attention employed to tease these out, when considered in conjunction with a general acknowledgement that an “audience” or “user” turn is necessary in journalism studies (see Madianou 2009; Bird 2011; Costera Meijer 2013), means that we are in danger of ignoring much of what grounds the financial viability and democratic remit of journalism.

The argument put forth in constituting this special issue of *Journalism Studies* is that a concomitant emphasis on both is an analytic necessary if we aim to understand the broader context of news and journalism within society. All economic, social, and cultural phenomena are the result of highly complex spatio-temporal articulations and interrelations. Journalism—not only in terms of its production and content but its often overlooked consumption—is no different. This point is at the heart of the seven contributions which form this special issue of *Journalism Studies*, and in this respect the common claim they make may seem quite uncontroversial on the surface: if we want to appreciate the changing ways audiences are engaging with news and information, (social) space is inseparable from the equation. Nevertheless, for all the apparent obviousness of this claim,

what the contributions in this issue demonstrate is just how complex a task embracing this idea can be; concomitantly, they illustrate the added richness of analysis which occurs when such “spatial thinking” is incorporated.

News Use in *Everywhere Life*

The so-called “spatial turn” in scholarship, which has had an increasing interdisciplinary influence over the past couple of decades (Warf and Arias 2008), incorporates a greater effort to approach analysis by treating space and time as equally crucial analytic considerations. Embracing such thinking means discarding the dominant understanding of space as something simply locational, and instead demands thinking of the sociality of space and meanings of place. This sort of “human geography” is an established but not hegemonic paradigm, indeed, even within geography—a discipline in which it seems reasonable to expect that space would be approached in a fairly nuanced and complex manner—the social aspect is still often overlooked for a more “absolute” mathematical conception of space which views phenomena as existing “pre-place” (Hubbard and Kitchin 2011). This seems a case of substituting positivistic simplicity for the “messiness” that shapes different places. As Urry (2004, 13) notes,

[P]lace can be viewed as the particular nexus between, on the one hand, propinquity characterized by intensely thick co-present interaction, and on the other hand, fast flowing webs and networks stretched corporeally, virtually and imaginatively across distances.

Applying this thinking to contemporary news consumption means not only thinking about the different ways that far-off places have become closer, but the materiality, meaning, and practices of situated moments of “news” use. Cresswell’s (2009, 1) helpful description of the tripartite components of “place” is useful in this regard:

Place is a meaningful site that combines location, locale, and sense of place. Location refers to an absolute point in space with a specific set of coordinates and measurable distances from other locations. Location refers to the “where” of place. Locale refers to the material setting for social relations—the way a place looks. Locale includes the buildings, streets, parks, and other visible and tangible aspects of a place. Sense of place refers to the more nebulous meanings associated with a place: the feelings and emotions a place evokes.

If we think about the significance and meaningfulness of media consumption for most people, not only in the current digitalized, online era but historically, much of this derives not only from its “time-shifting” qualities but from its parallel “emplaced” nature (Peters 2012). Mediated communication can be conceptualized in terms of its fit within the continuous and sensorial experience of moving through life (Pink and Hjorth 2012), and this awareness alerts us to the dynamics behind the personal integration of established and emerging platforms for news and changes which may occur. Old distinctions, such as personal versus mass communication, are being reconfigured in the digital age as the form and function of new technologies change the (a)symmetry of communication practices, interactional structures, and the lived materiality of their use (Lüders 2008). By considering the everywhere alongside the everyday, we place ourselves in a much better position to understand the purpose and meanings people actually make from their interactions with news and information.

Historically, or so we would like to believe, the story of everyday life for many people included definitive moments of news consumption, in regular, set places. The industrial practices of journalism, in fact, were (and sometimes still are) distributed around these spatio-temporal routines: newspapers were delivered to the home before breakfast or to embarkation points for public transit before the morning and evening commutes. Television news buttressed the transitions from work to home (early evening news) and home to bed (nightly news) and the set was frequently the radial point in the central “living room” in most houses. Radio news updates, in terms of both duration and frequency, centred around commuting patterns and the automobile. To understand these habits and the sociology of news media distribution/consumption demands seeing the synergy between these patterns and their enactment. What stands out about the “Golden Age” of mass communication is that there was a certain stability and predictability to media consumption, and the notion of ritual—habitual, formalized actions which reinforce the “symbolic power” of media institutions—provided a good fit to explain the significance of these practices.

Today, these scenarios seem increasingly anachronistic, at least with Western societies. The places, spaces, times, and further social aspects of news consumption are all changing, but we know very little about the impact this has on journalism’s various audiences/consumers/users/citizens or on how people process, access, and discuss information. This shortcoming is quite troublesome in an age when, according to many authors, the spaces of everyday life are all becoming mediated (Livingstone 2009; Couldry 2012). News is increasingly mobile, instantaneous, and available “on demand”. It is participatory and personalized; locational and localized. Accordingly, this special issue aims to provoke discussion on these themes through a series of theoretically-engaged contributions that are all grounded in empirical research projects. Mimi Sheller employs insights on the materiality, mobility, and infrastructure of digital social media to show how the mobile production, dissemination, and consumption of news produces new spatio-temporalities. Zizi Papacharissi looks at how the hybrid forms of news co-production produce affective news streams which function as social spaces that support marginalized and liminal viewpoints, what she calls “electronic elsewheres”. Gerard Goggin, Fiona Martin, and Tim Dwyer highlight how the locational capabilities of mobile media devices to determine, sense, incorporate, and conjure with the relative locations of reporting and audiences have emerged as key to news-gathering and dissemination ventures. Kim Christian Schröder provides insights into the cross-media challenges facing news audiences, as they seek access to, navigate in, and make sense of the multitude of news sources across print, broadcasting, online, and mobile media platforms. André Jansson and Johan Lindell look at how individuals navigate and orient themselves through representational spaces and flows, and how their media practices amalgamate with other activities in everyday life. Luke Dickens, Nick Couldry, and Aristeia Fotopoulou demonstrate how community reporting practices lead to the emergence of new, inter-local spaces of news production and consumption and discuss how such practices, while emerging from the place of local community, also extend across wider communities of interest. Shakuntala Banaji and Bart Cammaerts look at the experiences of news by a diverse group of young European citizens, decentering the technologies of watching or reading news to reposition the relationships between political news-seeking, trust in journalism, meaning-making, and socio-economic status within a framework of local experiences of politics and civic life.

These insightful contributions highlight two distinguishable but overlapping lines of research—the mobility and flow of everywhere life; and the politics and scale of everywhere life—which are shown to be promising avenues for further exploration. The remainder of this introduction uses the papers comprising this special issue as a foundation to flesh out these themes further in relation to the “places and spaces of news audiences”. While these lines are by no means exhaustive nor exclusive, together they form a useful interdisciplinary starting point to introduce the key ideas in this issue, combining perspectives from human geography, audience and reception studies, mobilities research, the sociology of media, new and digital media studies, and political communication. The seven papers bring these traditions into conversation with journalism studies, interweaving key considerations on issues surrounding engagement, citizenship, identity, and belonging.

The Mobility and Flow of *Everywhere Life*

In a world where convenient updates are not just the norm but an expectation, how informational flows transect and shape the day has significant impact on the spatio-temporal expectations of journalism and its real-time integration. As I have argued elsewhere, it changes what news “is” (Peters 2012). Sheller goes one step further and argues that the constantly updated flow of “news now” and mobile news “‘prosumption’ practices such as agglomeration, curation, crowd-sourcing, updating, tagging, and sharing” go far beyond just remaking news. Indeed, she argues this is a more fundamental change, as “the rise of on-demand, on-location, participatory capabilities has also changed the content, form, style, and temporality of news as event.” She rightfully points out that the “mobility” of mobile phones is not by itself remarkable for journalism, as newspapers have traditionally acted as a mobile interface that interacts both with the reader and with the surrounding social space in which it is consumed. What is telling about the data-sharing possibilities of contemporary digital technologies like smartphones is that they change the spatio-temporality of news events themselves; reporting becomes contemporaneous and “may even precede the full unfolding of ‘the news’”. These changes in news circulation, she argues, transform “the very ground beneath our feet: ambient flows of news re-situate how we understand where we are, who we are connected with, what our ‘present’ moment actually is. The now-ness of news, in other words, offers a new sense of the present.”

Papacharissi picks up on similar themes about “ambient news streams” (see also Hermida 2010), and how the interactive possibilities of personal media allow people to infuse personal meaning into storytelling and, though its mobile nature, traverse public and private spaces. This altered “experience of involvement”, both for consuming and producing news, leads to different forms of engagement and differing degrees and modes of attachment (Peters 2011). More specifically, Papacharissi examines “how the affordances of technologies change both the scale and experience of space while at the same time reproducing a degree of familiarity that permits audiences to somehow claim (their own) place”. By this she refers not just to control over how one connects to others, or how one experiences public and private spaces and the movement between these, but how audiences find their place within news stories. She explains that,

geo-social, hybrid, and mediated environments can be understood as *elsewheres* that presence alternative viewpoints, voices, and stories. For citizens, the liminal form of space

is crucial, as it permits them to access content in transition and find their own place in the story, alongside journalists, who already possess an institutionally assigned place in the story.

This recognition of the complexity of liminality also alerts us to the increasing importance of location and movement—as opposed to just frequency of use—when it comes to practices of consumption. Goggin, Martin, and Dwyer argue that this is a cardinal aspect of engagement, as “audiences now expect to be able to search and aggregate news based on locational indicators and also to position themselves *vis-à-vis* events and places, via location annotated posts to social media”. They look beyond the mere technological capacities of mobile technology to explore “locative news” as “a new way of marshalling, mediating, and making sense of place; evidenced in the new kinds of information created through projects of emplacement”. However, they note that audience experimentation with locative forms is often held back by clunky design and other factors. They provide a cautionary note that there is still a “yawning chasm between, on the one hand, the social imaginaries of locative news, and, on the other hand, the materialities, path-dependency, industrial settings, political and cultural economies of the places and spaces of mobile audiences and their unfolding futures”.

This is similarly reflected in Schrøder’s findings about mobile news consumption in Denmark, which show that while its reported use is on the rise, its function as an in-depth platform is far less significant. And even if these uses are changing, he raises a wise caveat for researchers, namely that the serious future methodological “challenge for the study of the places and spaces of (news) media use derives from the difficulty of—ethnographically—tracing the footsteps of individuals as they traverse the terrain of everyday life”. Modernizing the uses and gratifications perspective via the concept of “worthwhileness”, Schrøder points to the necessity of longitudinal, multi-method studies that investigate news use within our broader media repertoires and alongside “a multitude of other processes that are more indigenous and often more vital to everyday life”. In this respect, we should keep in mind that mobile phones are only one aspect of a more broadly accelerated mobilization of life that encompasses goods, services, ideas, information, transport, travel, and communications (Elliott and Urry 2010).

The Politics and Scale of *Everywhere Life*

The notion of being able to experience the far-away clearly and instantaneously is something we now take for granted. Indeed, one could query whether the “far-away” is still “far” or now both “near-and-far” due to the ability to transcend geographic scale with increasing ease, precision, and quality. This and the flip side of this scalar equation, namely the coverage of “the local”, is the focus of much journalism studies scholarship when it comes to how different places are presented *within* the news. However, if we switch focus to depart from the perspective of the audience, the idea of place takes on added significance beyond the textual. For the reduction of space is felt and experienced differently and is not uniform.

This is quite evident in the contribution by Jansson and Lindell, whose study of the dynamics of news navigation in Sweden demonstrates a clear differentiation “in terms of how individuals navigate and *orient* themselves through representational spaces and flows, and how their media practices *amalgamate* with other activities in everyday life”. While they find that cosmopolitan and local orientations to the world are largely

reproduced in a new media age, they note this is differentiated in terms how media options are amalgamated within the places of everyday life. Opportunities for consuming and circulating news while on the move are unevenly distributed in social and geographic space and their study raises a thought-provoking observation, namely that “the ways in which they [media practices] are carried out *in space*, contribute to the social classification of media users and their lifestyles”. This relates to the socially contingent “power geometry” (cf. Massey 1991) of media use; people are placed differently in relation to geographic scale, in terms of movement, communication, and the control they exert over both. As Jansson and Lindell note, “the very same technological affordances that enable media users to expand their views towards *cosmos* and the distant other (if they have any such ambitions) are the affordances that may tie people closer to the *hearth*”.

In this respect, then, the political is inextricably associated with the scale of everywhere life and questions of power. Dickens, Couldry, and Fotopoulou address this theme quite explicitly by looking at how practices of content generation and gaining skills in media production change the experience of locality, in a very positive sense, for community reporters. Looking to the new spaces of news circulation, they investigate how the “news production/consumption” practices of these reporters is not a case of “a centralised valorisation of ‘user-generated content’ or ... a decentred hyperlocalism” but is “a more complex relationship whereby local stories are produced and linked within an inter-local exchange; yet it is often audiences’ feelings of *not* being recognised in national news agendas that drives them to generate *and consume* news stories more locally”. In considering their findings, perhaps we can draw a parallel with Smith’s (2008) observations that spatial patterns, like exports and migration, are not simply cases of linear movement but are aspects of relative space that are quite political. The flow of information via journalism (and its uneven development in certain areas) is in this respect no different. Dickens, Couldry, and Fotopoulou find the localized practices of being a community reporter seem “to *change* how locality is understood, and in the process build a different material geography of news production/consumption”. If “legacy” media institutions are gradually losing their symbolic power as a “meeting place” for information, we might view these community reporting practices as trying to recreate this on a local level by “restructuring” the mediaspace, employing “inter-local” connection practices and exchanges, grounded in a critical consumption of news practices.

These sorts of “information-rich” socio-economic neighbourhoods and “information-poor” ghettos are explored even more explicitly in the final article in this issue, where Banaji and Cammaerts question the relationship between socio-economic status and the local experiences of politics and civic life for European youth *vis-à-vis* news use. Drawing upon a wide set of data, they find a substantial interest in politics and civic engagement among all youth especially “in the world around them, specifically in relation to their local communities, leisure spaces (or lack thereof), school, employment and housing prospects”. However, they note significant divergences in terms of access to political power, including media representations. Banaji and Cammaerts find that “youth who are most pathologised by news and who perceive themselves as being negatively represented both personally and via association with a particularly stigmatised locality or cultural space, are also most likely to have negative views about the news”. Their results challenge the “crude” assumption that “all citizens are equal, live how they wish to live and are equally powerful actors in the public sphere should they only choose to be”. Tuan (1977) observes that feelings of personal freedom are closely tied to the power to move and having sufficient

room to act. These phenomenological ideas on the self-perception of spaciousness appear to parallel the descriptions of informational representation and lived (geographic) realities described by the different youth demographics in Banaji and Cammaerts' piece. Simply put, it seems that geographic descriptions do not only represent different places, through its representation news socially produces the spaces of everywhere life.

Place, Space, and Information in *Everywhere Life*

The articles in this issue raise our attentiveness to the importance of space and place when it comes to audiences/users of journalism, and identify a number of key shifts that bear further investigation. This is not to claim that we are undergoing, necessarily, an entire transformation of the media field. However, this issue underscores the importance of the "spatial turn" when addressing significant questions regarding the public-private dichotomy and its reconfiguration; the flow of news and information, especially as it pertains to social issues and civic awareness on different scales; and the uses of (news) media for structuring, patterning, or ritual purposes. These questions relate to prominent issues of connection, engagement, enjoyment, affordances, and storytelling that are already being explored by a number of scholars *vis-à-vis* news use. Overhanging all of this are the rapid changes we have witnessed with technology, which does not determine social identities, knowledges, and experiences but certainly has a profound influence "that shapes and controls the scale and form of human association and action" (McLuhan 1964, 9).

This special issue was convened around the coupling of "audiences" and "space", but its results point to the complexity of this relationship. The idea of "space" is not at the absolute forefront of every article in this special issue, instead appearing as a poignant consideration that arises from time to time. Similarly, most contributions point to the difficulty, both conceptually and methodologically, of separating audiences from producers. Many also highlight the danger of simply substituting an amalgamation of the two concepts, which can ignore the motivations and experiences of media use and fairly substantial power relations that shape the particularities of access to, and control over, media. These challenges are not insubstantial, and their presence within this special issue reinforces a broader academic point I wanted to make when I went about assembling the different contributions that comprise it. If we are to overcome a tendency in journalism studies to have production and content dominate the consideration of audiences, if analysis is to avoid privileging temporal concerns over spatial, if the possibilities of technological development should not obscure the actual lived materiality of its use, this means, almost by definition, that scholarship will be messy.

We must embrace the necessary subtlety and multifaceted aspects of change this demands, I would argue, rather than forcing the point. The assorted flavour and conceptual terrain of the articles in this issue point to having space as a consideration, but avoid making it a substitute concern rather an augmenting one. It is something to be contemplated alongside and intertwined with (really, inseparable from) more familiar tropes such as media use; audience consumption, participation, and co-production; and the temporal flow of information. Indeed, advocating for the importance of space does not mean casting aside everything we know. Rather, it points to increasing this as a key concern, especially if we want to understand the flow, material integration, and (social) significance of news and information consumption. Increasingly, the idea of being able to

communicate whenever, wherever, and while in motion is unremarkable, and the fact that one can combine and mix forms of auditory, oral, written, and visual communication while “on the go” is expected. In such a seemingly “fluid” mediascape, thinking “spatio-temporally” helps us distinguish the unique from the routine, the extraordinary from the ordinary, the significant from the mundane. This is imperative if we wish to capture the diverse meanings, connections, structures, and experiences that audiences create out of the mediated content they consume, engage with, and augment. Day-by-day, month-by-month, year-by-year technology moves forward and its development and integration, and the impact of this development and integration, mean considering the fundamental shifts this imparts on how people conceive of informational integration within their everyday and everywhere lives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks to Stuart Allan for alerting me to Highmore’s (2002, 1) discussion of the term “the everyday”, and also to Marcel Broersma and Kirsten Kolstrup for their comments on this piece.

NOTE

1. As one might expect, the scholarly usage of “everyday life” is quite disparate and it is not often clear what distinguishes the analytic use of the term from what we might call “the everyday” itself. Highmore (2002, 1) notes the term is used with “unspecific gravity” to denote everything from literal day-to-day practices, to “everdayness” as a value (positively or negatively qualified), to that which goes unnoticed. He notes that elements of boredom, mystery, and rationalism form a central constellation that configures the idea of everyday life in Western modernity.

REFERENCES

- Augé, Marc. 1995. *Non-places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso.
- Bird, Elizabeth. 2011. “Seeking the Audience for News: Response, News Talk, and Everyday Practices.” In *The Handbook of Media Audiences*, edited by Virginia Nightengale, 489–508. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Broersma, Marcel, and Chris Peters. 2012. “Introduction.” In *Rethinking Journalism: Trust and Participation in a Transformed News Landscape*, edited by Chris Peters and Marcel Broersma, 1–12. London: Routledge.
- Costera Meijer, Irene. 2013. “Valuable Journalism: The Search for Quality from the Vantage Point of the User.” *Journalism* 14 (6): 754–770. doi:10.1177/1464884912455899.
- Couldry, Nick. 2012. *Media, Society, World: Social Theory and Digital Media Practice*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.
- Cresswell, Tim. 2009. “Place”. Elsevier. Accessed September 1, 2013. <http://www.elsevierdirect.com/brochures/hugy/SampleContent/Place.pdf>
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Elliott, Anthony, and John Urry. 2010. *Mobile Lives*. London: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. *Power/Knowledge*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Goffman, Erving. 1959. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Anchor.

- Hermida, Alfred. 2010. "Twittering the News." *Journalism Practice* 4 (3): 297–308. doi:[10.1080/17512781003640703](https://doi.org/10.1080/17512781003640703).
- Highmore, Ben. 2002. *Everyday Life and Cultural Theory: An Introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Hubbard, Phil, and Rob Kitchin, eds. 2011. *Key Thinkers on Space and Place*. London: Sage.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 1991. *The Production of Space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Livingstone, Sonia. 2009. "On the Mediation of Everything: ICA Presidential Address 2008." *Journal of Communication* 59 (1): 1–18. doi:[10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01401.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.01401.x).
- Lüders, Marika. 2008. "Conceptualizing Personal Media." *New Media & Society* 10 (5): 683–702. doi:[10.1177/1461444808094352](https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444808094352).
- Madianou, Mirca. 2009. "Audience Reception and News in Everyday Life." In *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, edited by Karin-Wahl Jorgensen and Thomas Hanitzsch, 325–337. London: Routledge.
- Massey, Doreen. 1991. "A Global Sense of Place." *Marxism Today* 35 (6): 24–29.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Peters, Chris. 2011. "Emotion Aside or Emotional Side?: Crafting An 'Experience of Involvement' in the News." *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism* 12 (3): 297–316. doi:[10.1177/1464884910388224](https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884910388224).
- Peters, Chris. 2012. "Journalism to Go: The Changing Spaces of News Consumption." *Journalism Studies* 13 (5–6): 695–705. doi:[10.1080/1461670X.2012.662405](https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2012.662405).
- Pink, Sarah, and Larissa Hjorth. 2012. "Emplaced Cartographies: Reconceptualising Camera Phone Practices in an Age of Locative Media." *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy* 145: 145–155.
- Smith, Neil. 2008. *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.
- Soja, Edward. 1989. *Postmodern Geographies: The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu. 1977. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tuchman, Gaye. 1978. *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*. New York: Free Press.
- Urry, John. 2004. "The Sociology of Space and Place." In *The Blackwell Companion to Sociology*, edited by Judith Blau, 3–15. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Wanta, Wayne, Guy Golan, and Cheolhan Lee. 2004. "Agenda Setting and International News: Media influence on public perceptions of foreign nations." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 81 (2): 364–377. doi:[10.1177/107769900408100209](https://doi.org/10.1177/107769900408100209).
- Warf, Barney, and Santa Arias, eds. 2008. *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Chris Peters, Centre for Media and Journalism Studies, University of Groningen, The Netherlands. E-mail: c.j.peters@rug.nl. Web: <http://www.rug.nl/staff/c.j.peters/>