

Literary Journalism Studies (LJS) is regarded as a major scholarly publication in the academic field of literary journalism, a genre also known as literary reportage, narrative journalism, New Journalism, reportage, literary nonfiction, creative nonfiction, and narrative nonfiction, among others.² The International Association for Literary Journalism Studies (IALJS), an organization founded in 2006 following the first International Conference on Literary Journalism in Nancy, France,³ created the journal in 2009 to inform and educate literary journalism scholars, practitioners, and educators about evolving trends in this growing field of research. Although the journal is published in English, its mission statement notes that the publication is “directed at an international audience” and “welcomes contributions from different cultural, disciplinary, and critical perspectives.”⁴

This study examined the journal’s content since its inception, to gain insights into its growth over the first decade of publication and to address the following research questions:

RQ1: To what extent does the journal evidence breadth in international scholarship as envisioned in the mission statement?

RQ2: Has the journal achieved breadth in researchers’ and authors’ academic disciplines?

RQ3: What are the main topic themes of the research published in the journal from 2009 through spring 2017?

RQ4: Is there a gender balance in the journal’s article and essay authorship?

Literature Review and Methods

The journal has published two issues annually since 2009. Data for this study were drawn from the corpus of *LJS* issues published from the journal’s founding in 2009, through spring 2017. The seventeen issues included each of the two issues published annually, from the first issue (vol. 1, no. 1, Spring 2009) through 2016, and the first issue of 2017 (vol. 9, no. 1). For this study of the journal’s research contributions, a total ninety-five articles and essays were identified from the seventeen issues for examination. Book reviews, book excerpts, and interviews were not included in the analysis.

Data for RQs 1, 2, and 4, that is, researcher-authorship, affiliated institution and location, disciplinary expertise, and gender, are in their essence, demographic data. To that end, each article and essay was coded for each researcher/author’s: (1) affiliated institution’s location; (2) affiliated institution; (3) disciplinary expertise; and (4) gender, available from author listings and the *LJS* biographical sketch that accompanies each article and essay.

Affiliated institution location was defined as the country in which the in-

stitution where each researcher/author works is located; with the *affiliated institution* recorded by the institution name.

Disciplinary expertise was defined as the individual researcher/author’s academic unit, as given in the biographical sketch that accompanies each *LJS* article and essay.

As a point of definition, a researcher’s disciplinary expertise could include areas such as journalism, mass communication, media studies, literary studies (U.S./English/French literature, etc.), social sciences, physical and/or biological sciences, etc. Because “journalism studies” can be considered a subset of the general category “communication studies,” this study conflated the two areas of research as one category.

Gender was coded male or female, also drawn from each researcher/author’s biographical sketch.

Data for RQ3, research topic and approach were collected from a review and analysis of each article’s content.

Norman Sims in “The Problem and the Promise of Literary Journalism Studies” in 2009 suggested studies might include: (1) international aspects of literary journalism, (2) historical frameworks of literary journalism, (3) literary journalism practices, (4) pros and cons of online literary journalism, and (5) literary journalism’s relationship to reality.⁵ Miles Maguire from the University of Wisconsin Oshkosh, in his 2016 research review, also listed several recent trends and topics in literary journalism scholarship and observed that research categories might include: (1) author studies, (2) national/regional studies of literary journalism, (3) international studies, (4) historical development, (5) “slow” journalism, (6) effects of digital technology, (7) ethics of literary journalism, and (8) narrative theory.⁶ Comparing the two sets of categories gives evidence that Sims and Maguire identified several overlapping categories of research. Based on their findings and observations, this research, for analyzing all research papers and essays, put forward thirteen categories to address RQ3: “What are the main topic themes of the research published in the journal from 2009 through spring 2017?”

Sims and Maguire’s categories were numbered 1 through 13 and used as the starting point for coding and analyzing each article and essay. Classifying each study into one category was not an easy task. Some research explored wide-ranging topics; thus, these classifications cannot be considered absolute in setting the boundaries of scholarship but can illuminate some interesting developments about the scholarship contained in the journal. A more detailed analysis of the research is found in the findings section of the categories that emerged from the analysis: (1) *national/regional studies* (different national manifestations or traditions in certain areas as well as comparative studies among different countries); (2) *function of literary journalism* (studies focusing on the role literary journalism plays in different nations or areas

under different cultural, historical, or political context, such as social reform, civic engagement, political significance, etc.); (3) *interdisciplinary approach* (approaches other than journalism or literature, that include anthropology, philosophy, and even biology); (4) *historical development/framework* (studies on important publishers, journalist figures and important works which contributed to the development of literary journalism or those who have broadened, primarily, the U.S. canon of this genre); (5) *narrative theory* (different narrative styles and theoretical frameworks and approaches); (6) *reality boundary* (devoted to discussions of the notions of truth, journalistic accuracy, subjectivity vs. objectivity, etc.); (7) *narrator, role of journalist* (discussions on journalist-as-a-narrator who deals with personal identity between self and the subject the journalist writes about, to what degree the narrator is involved in the subject and, even in some cases, the subject becomes the journalist); (8) *gender concerns* (studies on female writers or from a feminist perspective); (9) *Gonzolimmersion journalism*; (10) *research reviews*; (11) *(new) media platform studies* (studies on different media of presenting literary journalism pieces, from radio to internet); (12) *practice* (writer's workshop, writing techniques, relationship between scholarship and practice); (13) *teaching of literary journalism* (reflections and research on literary journalism pedagogy).

Findings: Global and Diverse Scholarship

In addressing RQ1, "To what extent does the journal evidence breadth in international scholarship as envisioned in the mission statement?" the research found that the journal's goal to have an international perspective can be discerned in several ways: Over the first near-ten years of publication there have been several special issues devoted to works from a particular nation, region, or culture. For instance, the Spring 2013 special issue focused on Norwegian literary reportage, and the Fall 2013, on African American literary journalism. A special issue on francophone literary journalism appeared in fall 2016. Even so, the findings show a heavy presence of North American research.

Locations of researchers' affiliated institutions. Data on the institutional homes of authors and researchers of articles and essays published in *LJS* over the first near-decade of publication identified colleges and universities in seventeen countries (see Table 1). More than half the represented institutions were in North America (the United States and Canada), but the remaining near 40% were institutions in countries on four other continents: in Europe, from Britain on the west, the Scandinavian north, and a rich mix of countries throughout the central, eastern and southern parts of the continent. Institutions in Africa, Australia, and South America filled out the remainder.

TABLE 1. Country of researchers' affiliated institutions by frequency

Country of location	Frequency	Percentage (%)
United States	50	46.73
Canada	11	10.28
Australia	7	6.54
Belgium	6	5.61
United Kingdom	6	5.61
France	6	5.61
South Africa	4	3.74
Norway	4	3.74
Brazil	3	2.80
Germany	2	1.87
Portugal	2	1.87
The Netherlands	1	0.93
Slovenia	1	0.93
Denmark	1	0.93
Finland	1	0.93
Poland	1	0.93
Sweden	1	0.93
Total	107	100.00

Nearly half of the institutions, with which researchers whose work has been published in *LJS* were affiliated, are located in the United States (fifty, or 46.73%), followed by Canada (eleven, or 10.28%), Australia (seven, or 6.54%), and, Belgium, the United Kingdom, and France with six, or 5.61%, each. This evidence suggests that the United States remained a dominant producer of the journal's academic work. The findings also indicate the journal tended to publish more scholars from institutions in North America and Europe (86.92%), and from English-speaking countries (69.16%). Notably, no scholars were identified as coming from academic institutions in Asian countries during the period of the study.

Despite the predominance of research coming from English-speaking countries, notably in North America (two, for 73% of the articles and essays), the journal also published more than a third again as much scholarship from non-English-speaking countries (thirty-three articles and essays, or 27%). Specifically, these countries included Denmark, Finland, Sweden, Norway, Belgium, France, Germany, Portugal, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Poland, Sweden, and Brazil. This scholarship concerned literary journalism in or related to the researchers' affiliated institutional locations.

Researchers' affiliated institutions by country and frequency. Of the top institutions affiliated with the research, twelve of eighteen were in the United States and Canada (Table 2). This is another indication of the predominance

TABLE 2. Researchers' affiliated institutions by country and frequency

Institution	Country	Frequency*	Percentage (%)
University of Wisconsin Oshkosh	United States	9	8.41
Université libre de Bruxelles	Belgium	6	5.61
Columbia University	United States	3	2.80
University of Lincoln	United Kingdom	3	2.80
University of South Carolina	United States	2	1.87
Boston College	United States	2	1.87
State University of New York	United States	2	1.87
Towson University	United States	2	1.87
University of Missouri	United States	2	1.87
University of Iowa	United States	2	1.87
Ryerson University	Canada	2	1.87
Wilfred Laurier University	Canada	2	1.87
Université Laval	Canada	2	1.87
Brock University	Canada	2	1.87
American University of Paris	France	2	1.87
Rhodes University	South Africa	2	1.87
BI Norwegian Business School	Norway	2	1.87
Oslo and Akershus University	Norway	2	1.87
Other academic institutions**	12 countries	58	54.20
Total	75	19	107
			100.00

* Frequency represents the number of researcher-authors from listed institutions.

** Only 18 of the total 75 institutions of highest frequency are listed by name in Table 2, with 49 of the total 107 researcher-authors affiliated with the top 18 institutions. Of the remaining 58 researcher-authors, the affiliation of 3 was not identified or applicable; 55 were affiliated with a single institution in 13 different countries.

of contributors from North America. Five countries were home to top-eighteen institutions and their seventeen affiliated researcher-authors (Belgium, United Kingdom, France, South Africa, and Norway). Another twelve countries were home to the affiliated institutions of the remaining fifty-eight researcher-authors: Australia, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, and Brazil.

From a closer look at the research produced in non-English-language environments, one notable finding emerged: The analysis showed that scholars outside English-speaking nations emphasize the influence of U.S. “New Journalism” on the journalists and writers in their own nations. In essence,

they consider the literary journalism in the United States to be what might be called a paradigm of literary journalism. For instance, Danish scholar Christine Isager of the University of Copenhagen examined the work of Danish author and literary journalist Morten Sabroe, who, as Isager said, “evoked Hunter S. Thompson’s American Gonzo paradigm in his own work on a regular basis”⁷⁷ and is “a Thompson wannabe.”⁷⁸ Norwegian scholar Jo Bech-Karlsen, however, argued against this U.S. “paradigm” of literary journalism in his exploration of the Norwegian nonfiction novel *Two Suspicious Characters*. Bech-Karlsen considered the book a Norwegian equivalent to *In Cold Blood* and argued that the Norwegian version “is the better of the two”⁷⁹ although it has not obtained the same standing in literary journalism’s canon.

There is no doubt that U.S. literary journalism is rich in its collection of noteworthy journalists, writers, works, and traditions. However, research on literary journalism of writers from non-English speaking countries has found its place in *LJS*. For instance, John C. Hartsock examined Russian Nobel Prize winner Svetlana Alexievich’s writings.¹⁰ Pablo Calvi, the first non-native English speaker to receive a Pulitzer Traveling Fellowship, looked at Argentinian literary journalist Leila Guerriero’s work,¹¹ and Cuban-born Juan Orlando Pérez González explored the literary journalism in Fidel Castro’s Cuba.¹² Certainly the research Hartsock and other English-speaking researchers conduct would not be possible without reliable and accurate English-language translations from the original texts.

Distribution of researchers' affiliated disciplines. RQ2 asked, “Has the journal achieved breadth in researchers’ and authors’ academic disciplines?”

Journalism and communication studies remained the major disciplines of the researchers (see Table 3) who have published their work in *LJS* (seventy, or 65.42%). Literary studies, as a general disciplinary category, followed with thirty-two, or 29.91%, of the researchers/authors. The remaining disciplin-

TABLE 3. Researchers' disciplines by frequency

Discipline	Frequency	Percentage (%)
journalism and communication studies*	70	65.42
literary studies**	32	29.91
science***	3	2.80
social science****	2	1.87
Total	107	100.00

* includes journalism, mass communication, media studies, etc.

** includes English/U.S.-Canadian/Polish/Spanish/Dutch literature, literary theory, comparative literature, English and theatre studies, etc.

*** former science reporters or teaching a course combining journalism and science.

**** includes social and political studies, etc.

TABLE 4. Examination of co-authored, or collaborative research

Issue	Article	Theme/About	Authors	Country
2009 Spring	Differently Drawn Boundaries of the Permissible in German and Australian Literary Journalism	Comparative study between German and Australian literary journalism and issues of verifiability and authenticity	Beate Josephi	Australia
			Christine Müller	Germany
2009 Fall	Unraveling the Webs of Intimacy and Influence: Willie Morris and Harper's Magazine, 1967–1971	A study of a magazine that produced some radical examples of New Journalism	Berkley Hudson	U.S.A.
			Rebecca Townsend	U.S.A.
2010 Fall	The Chudnovsky Case: How Literary Journalism Can Open the "Black Box" of Science	A case study that reveals the possibilities of interdisciplinary approach and argues that literature plays a vital role in illuminating the moral complexities of contemporary health care	Mateus Yuri Passos	Brazil
			Érica Masiero Nering	Brazil
2011 Fall	Radio and Civic Courage in the Communications Circuit of John Hersey's "Hiroshima"	A study of how radio played a critical role in expanding the readership and amplifying the messages of a landmark work in the history of literary journalism	Kathy Roberts Forde	U.S.A.
			Matthew W. Ross	U.S.A.
2013 Fall*	The Afro-American's World War II Correspondents: Feuilletonism as Social Action	A study of the role literary journalism by war correspondents plays in civic life	Antero Pietila	U.S.A.
			Stacy Spaulding	U.S.A.
2014 Fall	Mapping Nonfiction Narrative: Towards a New Theoretical Approach to Analyzing Literary Journalism	A study that creates a model and theoretical framework for defining and analyzing a given literary non-fiction text	William Roberts	Australia
			Fiona Giles	Australia
2015 Spring**	Alexandra Fuller of Southern Africa: A White Woman Writer Goes West	A study of the works of an African female nonfiction writer who succeeded in American magazines and gained an international audience	Anthea Garman	South Africa
			Gillian Rennie	South Africa
2016 Fall***	Francophone Literary Journalism: Exploring Its Vital Edges	An essay that focused on francophone traditions within literary journalism	Isabelle Meuret	Belgium
			Paul Aron	Belgium
			Marie-Eve Thérénty	France
2017 Spring	The Ammo for the Canon: What Literary Journalism Educators Teach	A study that examines readings lists of literary journalism educators to discern if a literary journalism canon emerges and if the use of a "canon" serves as a tool of exclusion	Brian Gabriel	Canada
			Elyse Amend	Canada
2017 Spring	Recent Trends and Topics in Literary Journalism Scholarship	A research review of literary journalism scholarship intended as a guide to recent trends and topics in the field	Roberta Maguire	U.S.A.
			Miles Maguire	U.S.A.

* 2013 (Fall) is a special issue on African American literary journalism

** 2015 (Spring) is a special issue on women and literary journalism

*** 2016 (Fall) is a special issue on francophone literary journalism

ary categories were from the physical, biological, and social sciences. (This research did not place journalism or communication studies within the disciplinary category of a social science as it is often done.)

The further findings indicated the journal has published a limited number of interdisciplinary studies (see Table 4). Mateus Yuri Passos, a former science journalist, and his colleagues, in their article "How Literary Journalism Can Open the 'Black Box' of Science" argued that by adopting narrative resources and a journalistic model, "literary journalism offers an important way for explaining the complexity of the scientific world to a lay audience."¹³ Amy Snow Landa, from the University of Minnesota, described an approach to teaching investigative journalism and bioethics and noted that it may be the first course offered at a U.S. university that combines "journalism" and "bioethics" in its title.¹⁴ She argued there is growing recognition within bioethics that "studying the narrative techniques used in literature can help bioethics scholars develop their own narrative skills."¹⁵ Bruce Gillespie from Wilfrid Laurier University explored ways literary journalism can serve as an interdisciplinary bridge and noted, for example, that "it is time for greater

collaboration between ethnographers, literary journalists, and literary journalism scholars . . . to enrich disciplines with similar goals, techniques, and products through collaboration and exchange."¹⁶ As Gillespie noted, their similarities are reflected in writings that "are based on in-depth qualitative research, emphasize lived experience[s] and apply the techniques of literature (e.g., narrative arc, character development, rich description, subjectivity, point of view, and emotionality) to nonfiction . . . to make the material as engaging as possible for a general, non-academic audience."¹⁷

Details of ten collaborative articles by twenty-two co-authors are listed in Table 4. Three of the articles are authored by researchers from different disciplines: "The Chudnovsky Case: How Literary Journalism Can Open the 'Black Box' of Science"; "Francophone Literary Journalism: Exploring Its Vital Edges"; and "Recent Trends and Topics in Literary Journalism Scholarship."

Findings: Thematic Directions in Research

The answers to RQ3, "What are the main topic themes of the research published in the journal from 2009 through spring 2017?" gave some interesting results (Table 5). Of the total ninety-five articles and essays, the topics most often explored were: *national/regional studies* (twenty-eight articles and essays, or 29.47%), *Gonzolimmersion journalism* (ten, or 10.53%) and the *function of literary journalism* (seven, or 7.37%), followed by six

TABLE 5. Article and essay research focus by frequency

Focus	Frequency	Percentage (%)
National/regional studies	28	29.47
Gonzo/immersion journalism	10	10.53
Function of literary journalism	7	7.37
Interdisciplinary approach	6	6.32
Historical development/framework	6	6.32
Narrator, role of journalist	6	6.32
Narrative theory	5	5.26
Reality boundary	5	5.26
Gender concern	5	5.26
(New) media platform studies	5	5.26
Practice of literary journalism	5	5.26
Research reviews	4	4.21
Teaching of literary journalism	3	3.16
Total	13	95
		100.00

articles and essays, for 6.32% each, that used *interdisciplinary approaches*, provided a *historical development/framework*, and examined the *narrator/role of the journalist*. (As earlier noted, this research can only approximate such classifications and recognizes that the risk of ignoring nuance exists.)

(1) *National/regional studies*. The journal published several special issues devoted to a specific country or region linked by language or culture. For example, the *LJS* Spring 2013 issue delved into Norwegian literary reportage and explored the similarities and differences between Norwegian and U.S. literary journalism; the *LJS* Fall 2013 issue focused on African American literary journalism, noting that “the African American presence . . . has not been studied nearly enough,”¹⁸ as editor John C. Hartssock wrote in his introduction to the issue. The Fall 2016 issue was devoted to francophone literary journalism and provided “extended glimpses into the similarities and differences between anglophone and francophone literary journalism.”¹⁹

Beate Josephi and Christine Müller explored the differences between German and Australian notions of literary journalism “when it comes to claims of verifiability and authenticity”²⁰ to better understand different cultural responses to the genre; Pablo Calvi compared Latin American narrative journalism during the 1950s through the 1970s with Anglo-American “New Journalism” of the same period.²¹ Bill Reynolds examined Canadian writer Tom Hedley’s work and argued that he is “one of the central—if not the central—promoter of Canadian New Journalism,” and his writings deserve better attention.²² As earlier noted, John Hartssock examined the work of Nobel Prize winner Svetlana Alexievich’s writings. Other research included Bernhard Poerksen’s study of German-language “New Journalism.”²³ Thomas Vaessens did the same for Dutch writers.²⁴ Finally, the journal published Nick Mulgrew’s work on South African narrative journalism.²⁵

(2) *Function of literary journalism*. John Pauly suggested that literary journalism can provide those “imagined commons in which our hopes for humane, peaceful, and equitable social relations dwell,” adding that it “gives voice to the drama of civic life,” something that conventional journalism cannot do adequately because “human experience is revealed most compellingly and authoritatively through artful storytelling.”²⁶ Thus, examining literary journalism’s function as a social agent of change produced interesting scholarship. For example, Cheryl Renee Gooch’s analysis looked at a black journalist and literary writer who used his works in 1904 to challenge racial injustice and promote black advancement.²⁷ Nancy L. Roberts noted that during the Great Depression in the United States, “many female social activists . . . turned to literary journalism as a way to tell the stories of the poor and oppressed”²⁸ through participant and immersion research. Roberta S. Maguire’s research

explored the work of African American novelist Albert Murray. According to Maguire, Murray wrote literary journalism pieces to counter New Journalism’s failure to deal with race in the United States and claimed that writers like Tom Wolfe “did not help to correct, and in fact reinforced, the prevailing view of blacks as a race apart, or marginalized, from the mainstream.”²⁹

As noted, Pablo Calvi’s comparative work on Latin American literary journalism and U.S. New Journalism supported his argument that Latin American writings served as “a form parallel and supporting of politics”³⁰ that had “a political-programmatic quality that Anglo-American nonfiction has lacked.”³¹ As Calvi asserted, U.S. New Journalism was always “subject to the needs and pressures of the market.”³² Juan Orlando Pérez González’s work on Cuban literary journalists suggested that, despite “the institutional, political, and ideological obstacles they had to overcome,”³³ they stayed away from propaganda-oriented reporting style in their writings, as a way to challenge state-owned, party-controlled media and bring up new interpretations of this country.³⁴

(3) *Historical development/framework*. Professor Nancy L. Roberts cautioned that while widely recognized names and works in literary journalism history are important, scholars and educators “shouldn’t overlook other, less elite sources—where we may find not the ‘usual suspects’.”³⁵ Roberts cited seminal figures, such as Tom Wolfe, who, for example, with E. W. Johnson included only two women in their *New Journalism: An Anthology*. The deliberate omission of women in important edited editions should force scholars and others, as Roberts urged, to look elsewhere, such as in women’s magazines and other sources, to find those writers whose rightful place in literary journalism history has been “devalued.”³⁶

To enrich the historical framework of literary journalism, other scholars found rich sources in places normally overlooked. Katrina J. Quinn, for example, explored the nineteenth-century epistolary journalism, which is “often overlooked by scholars” and should be considered “a form of narrative literary journalism.”³⁷ Both Joshua M. Roiland and William Dow studied works of African American writers whose important work has been overlooked. Roiland argued that Langston Hughes’s reporting for the Baltimore *Afro-American* is “historically significant”³⁸ and could “broaden the US canon that heretofore has consisted predominantly of white writers.”³⁹ Roberta Maguire pointed to William Dow’s work in her introduction to the *LJS* Fall 2013 special issue on African American contributions to literary journalism: Dow in his contribution to the issue argues that many of Richard Wright’s writings have been, in Maguire’s words, “miscategorized as travel writing” and “are best read as literary journalism for their conjoining of literary and journalistic

technique.”⁴⁰

(4) *Narrative Theory*. As to narrative theoretical frameworks, William Roberts and Fiona Giles argued that the study of frameworks presented a rich vein of scholarship because “this genre [called literary journalism] currently lacks a fixed working definition and normative terminology.”⁴¹ Employing David L. Eason’s typology of ethnographic realism and cultural phenomenology, Roberts and Giles argued for a theoretical framework “that is suitable for defining and analyzing any given text in this genre.”⁴² One important piece of research by Swedish scholar Cecilia Aare presented a model that examines “the interplay between different kinds of narrator (voice) and different kinds of perspective (point of view).”⁴³ As Aare observed, Eason’s two-type division of U.S. New Journalism “has for a long time been one of the starting points for theoretical discussions.”⁴⁴ Aare’s work expands Eason’s model and creates a typology that split literary journalism into five groups: “reconstructed third-person narration”; “touched-up, third-person narration”; “dimmed first-person narration”; “consonant first-person narration”; and “dissonant first-person narration.”⁴⁵ Aare’s innovative approach offers a much more nuanced theoretical framework for scholars to explore literary journalism.

As for narrative styles, Stacy Spaulding’s research put forth the notion of “urban community narrative,” referring to the work of writers who “document city life, history, culture, and identity.”⁴⁶ As Spaulding argued, such narratives are “important sites of civic memory—explaining the city’s traditions; profiling its citizens, politicians, heroes, and villains; . . . celebrating shared values and mourning shared tragedies. . . . illustrating the role narrative journalism can play in the city-citizen connection.”⁴⁷ Christopher P. Wilson in his research examined “off-stage” or “underwater” narratives found in Joan Didion’s *Miami*, claiming she employed an oblique form of storytelling as a way to present a clearer picture of “the distortions in contemporary political rhetoric that scandal epitomized.”⁴⁸

(5) *Reality Boundary*. Articles categorized as “reality boundary” studies focused on literary journalism and notions of truth, journalistic accuracy, and the subjectivity vs. objectivity question. Ruth Palmer, after analyzing three book-length examples, argued that the blurring of lines between the literary journalist and real-life subject gives way to uncertainty because it leaves “readers uncertain as to where facts end and interpretation begins.”⁴⁹ Michael Jacobs examined Tom Wolfe’s documentary method in *The Electric Kool-Aid Acid Test* and observed that Wolfe managed to access a surrealism because his subjects were “engrossed in unreality”⁵⁰ of their own through their near-perpetual drug use.

Regarding truth claims, Lindsay Morton emphasized the value of epistemological inquiry in the scholarship of literary journalism through her analy-

sis of Lorraine Code’s works. As Morton noted, the importance of such inquiry lies in the fact that Code’s approach to epistemology “has the potential to enhance confidence in the genre’s claims to represent reality both reliably and responsibly.”⁵¹

(6) *Narrator, role of journalist*. When journalists act as narrators, their own characteristics may be reflected in the subjects and stories about which they write. Robert Alexander noticed the problem in examples of literary journalism. He detected an “uncanny” correspondence or “doubling” between the subjects of the stories and certain characteristics of the literary journalists.⁵² As Alexander found, when a first-person narrator prevails, there can be a blurring of truthfulness. Of course, literary journalism offers more flexibility for journalists to go beyond a conventional approach. Alexander observed, “It is the ‘literary’ element of literary journalism, finally, which permits the literary journalist to confront and acknowledge those aspects of his or her self, repressed and alienated in conventional journalism, in the Other into whom they have escaped.”⁵³

Norwegian scholar Steen Steensen, in his examination of *The Bookseller of Kabul*, delved deeply into the controversy over the book’s truth claim and ethics after one of the book’s subjects sued the journalist-author. To avoid similar future conflicts, the journalist changed the narrative from a third-person to a first-person narrator. As Steensen argued, the “humble I” narrator, “characterized by open subjectivity, self-reflection,”⁵⁴ is a more ideal narrator and more aligned with the Norwegian literary journalism tradition of reportage that empathizes “the journalist’s presence as eyewitness,”⁵⁵ because it makes no absolute claim to objectivity or truth.

(7) *Gonzolimmersion journalism*. *LJS*’s Spring 2012 issue was dedicated to Hunter S. Thompson, to commemorate the fortieth anniversary of the publication of his *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*, the most representative work labelled as Gonzo journalism. Earlier, the Spring 2010 issue looked at Gonzo journalism practice in Germany, Finland, and the Netherlands, examining the transnational influence of Hunter’s style in Europe. As already noted in the discussion of RQ1, Isager examined how the Danish author and journalist Morten Sabroe in his own work imitated Thompson’s style. While this enabled Sabroe to become recognized as a literary journalist, it also opened his writings to criticism of being derivative.⁵⁶

Patrick Walters discussed Ted Conover’s method of immersion as a literary journalism technique, by which Conover “involves himself in a participatory way . . . but avoids being a spectacle . . . much like an anthropologist, but with a storytelling purpose.”⁵⁷ Holly E. Schreiber examined Stephen Crane’s 1894 *New York Press*’s “An Experiment in Misery,” with the goal of “both

celebrating the genre's strengths and exposing its weaknesses."⁵⁸

Norwegian scholars Kristiane Larssen and Harald Hornmoen focused on ethical and moral issues that often concern immersive journalism. Larssen and Hornmoen noted that "the uncertainty surrounding ethical and moral issues tied to methods applied in literary journalism persists today,"⁵⁹ especially when "entering the private sphere of vulnerable sources."⁶⁰

(8) *(New) media platform studies*. This literature focused on studies of how past and present media platforms have become venues for literary journalism. Kathy Roberts Forde and Matthew W. Ross, for example, discussed the role radio played in expanding the readership of John Hersey's *Hiroshima* in the United States and how the broadcasting of Hersey's work exposed millions of U.S. citizens to the horrors of atomic warfare.⁶¹

LJS's Fall 2016 issue provided its first "Digital Literary Journalism" column, the goal of which is to encourage literary journalism scholars to explore the digital frontier. Jacqueline Marino was among those who recognize the digital environment as a positive space in which to situate literary journalism. She cited the *New York Times*' Pulitzer Prize-winning piece "Snow Fall," as a long-form journalism piece that "found a suitable home in the digital world."⁶² Marino's research includes the results of an eye-tracking study that suggested readers spent the most time "fixating" on meaningful text, that is, "words that still fulfill a purpose, one that images and sound cannot supplant."⁶³

David O. Dowling also offered positive observations about "digital" literary journalism in what he calls the "literary journalism's digital renaissance."⁶⁴ Dowling, whose study paid attention to mobile platform and mobile audiences, argued those devices with their "leaner aesthetic orienting multimedia elements . . . increased automated activation via scrolling."⁶⁵ Dowling argues that this made the readers' immersive experience better, and "even more potent than in the first wave of products following 'Snow Fall'."⁶⁶

Some scholars expressed concern about literary journalism's move to multiplatform presentations. Miles Maguire questioned the value of insisting on multimedia approaches. While noting that literary journalism has "lagged behind its apparent potential"⁶⁷ in multimedia production, he argues that a "way . . . the opportunities of multimedia may be deceptive is that the opening of possibilities for cross-platform storytelling may not result in stories being told in more satisfying ways."⁶⁸ Similarly, Amy Wilentz said the digital era is "an era of great potential but that also poses many problems for us"⁶⁹ because there are so many distractions from words themselves. Her take on "Snow Fall" is that it is storytelling that is "overburdened with links and attachments that the narrative, moving quickly but with little character devel-

opment. . . could not support."⁷⁰ She argued in the instance of "Snow Fall," literary quality and depth are "sacrificed to surface appeal."⁷¹

(9) *Practice*. What is the relation between the scholarship of literary journalism and the practice of literary journalism? In 2011, the journal's editors reviewed a study by Matthew Thompson, who is both a literary journalist and a scholar in this field, and observed that for Thompson, "scholarly inquiry is an attempt to better understand his practice."⁷² Other research included David Dowling's look at the contribution of the University of Iowa's Iowa Writers' Workshop and its influence on literary journalism. Dowling argued that it has had a "profound influence on literary journalism within the broader world of creative writing" yet has "received little notice."⁷³

(10) *Teaching of literary journalism*. David Abrahamson, the former president of the IALJS, reflected on teaching literary journalism after receiving an inquiry from a New York University professor who asked him about key readings that might illustrate the six concepts of literary journalism. The concepts, Abrahamson noted, are character, setting, plot, theme, voice, and structure, "which anyone contemplating literary journalism might usefully bring to bear."⁷⁴ Abrahamson provided the suggested readings in his reflections. Brian Gabriel and Elyse Amend examined literary journalism syllabi from thirty-three respondents who had an average of 9.7 years of teaching experience.⁷⁵ The research findings included suggestions for reframing and reconstructing reading lists to broaden the scope. And, in a separate article, Richard Lance Keeble suggests that journalism students explore the literary dimensions of all forms of journalism, "not just those hived off into 'literary journalism' programs."⁷⁶ As he noted, these dimensions include "descriptive color, deep background details, fascinating dialog, scene setting, insightful analysis, eye-witness evidence, and so on."⁷⁷

Authorship: Gender Balance

The fourth question, RQ4, asked, "Is there a gender balance in the journal's article and essay authorship?"

The data suggest that slightly more work by male scholars (fifty-eight, or 54.21%) has been published than work by their female counterparts (forty-nine, or 45.79%) in the journal's first years (Table 6).

TABLE 6. Researcher demographics by gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	58	54.21
Female	49	45.79
Total	107	100.00

In 2015, *LJS* took a step toward addressing a historic disparity when it published a special issue, “Women and Literary Journalism.” Editor Leonora Flis noted that, despite progress, “the persistent, ongoing problem of gender discrimination has affected the careers of some of the female writers in this special issue.”⁷⁸ Included in the issue was Isabelle Meuret’s research on female reporters and war journalism, an area typically dominated by men. From her study of three women who were war correspondents, Meuret found the femininity of these writers “was used to serve their journalistic calling and access an almost exclusively male public sphere.”⁷⁹ These writers “resorted to emotional journalism as a strategy to alienate their inner selves and get closer to their subjects.”⁸⁰ Other studies by female scholars have included Vanessa Gemis’s research on the work of female journalist and writer Simone Dever, who published “under a male pseudonym,” Marc Augis.⁸¹ She did so because in 1930s Belgium “few women dared embrace a career in journalism.”⁸² As Gemis noted, Augis’s career sheds light on “the poetics of aviation advertorial writing” in French-speaking Belgium “through the angle of gender.”⁸³

Conclusion

This analysis of the content of *LJS* examined all research articles and essays published in *LJS* from its founding in spring 2009 through spring 2017, to address four research questions: To what extent does the journal evidence breadth in international scholarship as envisioned in the mission statement? Has the journal achieved breadth in researchers’ and authors’ academic disciplines? What are the main topic themes of the research published in the journal from 2009 through spring 2017? And, finally, is there a gender balance in the journal’s article and essay authorship?

The study found that the journal has tended to be heavily dominated by North American/European contributions and contributors. Perhaps not surprisingly, scholars from the United States remain the main source of literary journalism research in the journal, with Canadians in a somewhat distant second place. The literary journalism “paradigm” (if there is one) is still a U.S.-centric one, especially as it concerns the influence of New Journalism on the journalists and writers of non-U.S. countries. In terms of disciplinary approaches, the study results suggest that journalism and communication scholars’ work prevails, although attempts at interdisciplinarity have been made. As to research topics, national/regional studies, immersion journalism, and function of literary journalism were among the most studied areas.

From a theoretical and methods perspective, the present study’s categories may provide a starting point, but future scholars may need to review and establish categories that are more exhaustive or fewer in number.

This research also found that scholars hold positive perceptions about the impact of digital platforms on literary journalism but also expressed concern that technology might diminish the quality of literary journalism production. Finally, concerns about gender imbalances in the journal were noted.

In conclusion, *LJS* in its tenth year of publication is still a relatively young journal. The results of this brief research may provide current and future scholars and editors with insights to broaden the scope of scholarship. Certainly, as a primarily English-language journal, difficulties in translation will always restrict contributions from non-English speaking scholars. Still, creative editorial outreach may encourage scholars from around the world to submit to the journal. In this way, all scholars of literary journalism studies will have access to meaningful points of view and may gain a richer understanding of just what literary journalism is.

Notes

¹ *Acknowledgements*: This research was conducted during Xiaohui Wu’s academic visit in the Department of Journalism of Concordia University in fall 2017. She wishes to express her thanks to the department for providing access to academic resources and to Professor Brian Gabriel, whose insight and expertise improved the research. She also thanks Professor Gabriel for allowing her to attend his literary journalism course, rarely taught in China, and exposing her to the genre, its writers, and its historical framework.

² “Mission Statement: *Literary Journalism Studies*,” 128.

³ IALJS, “About Us.”

⁴ “Mission Statement,” 128.

⁵ Sims, “The Problem and the Promise,” 7–16.

⁶ Maguire, “Recent Trends and Topics,” 140–51.

⁷ Isager, “Playful Imitation at Work,” 79.

⁸ Isager, 79.

⁹ Bech-Karlsen, “The 1933 Norwegian Nonfiction Novel,” 40.

¹⁰ Hartsock, “The ‘Elasticity’ of Literary Reportage,” 82–123.

¹¹ Calvi, “Leila Guerriero and the Uncertain Narrator,” 118–30.

¹² Pérez González, “Revolution Is Such a Beautiful Word!,” 9–28.

¹³ Passos, Nering, and Carvalho, “The Chudnovsky Case,” 27.

¹⁴ Landa, “How Literary Journalism Can Inform Bioethics,” 59.

¹⁵ Landa, 47.

¹⁶ Gillespie, “Building Bridges,” 67–68.

¹⁷ Gillespie, 68.

- ¹⁸ Hartsock, "Note from the Editor," 5.
- ¹⁹ Reynolds, "Note from the Editor," 5.
- ²⁰ Josephi and Müller, "Differently Drawn Boundaries," 67.
- ²¹ Calvi, "Latin America's Own 'New Journalism,'" 63–78.
- ²² Reynolds, "Recovering the Peculiar Life and Times of Tom Hedley," 79.
- ²³ Poerksen, "The Milieu of a Magazine," 9–26.
- ²⁴ Vaessens, "Making Overtures," 55–72.
- ²⁵ Mulgrew, "Tracing the Seam," 9–30.
- ²⁶ Pauly, "Literary Journalism and the Drama of Civic Life," 74, 75, 76.
- ²⁷ Gooch, "The Literary Mind of a Cornfield Journalist," 79–87.
- ²⁸ Roberts, "Meridel Le Sueur," 45.
- ²⁹ Maguire, "Riffing on Hemingway and Burke," 19.
- ³⁰ Calvi, "Latin America's Own 'New Journalism,'" 78.
- ³¹ Calvi, 77.
- ³² Calvi, 78.
- ³³ Pérez González, "Revolution Is Such a Beautiful Word!" 10.
- ³⁴ Pérez González, 11.
- ³⁵ Roberts, "Firing the Canon," 82.
- ³⁶ Roberts, 83.
- ³⁷ Quinn, "Exploring an Early Version of Literary Journalism," 33.
- ³⁸ Roiland, " 'Just People' Are Just People," 17.
- ³⁹ Roiland, 18.
- ⁴⁰ Maguire, "African American Literary Journalism," 13; see Dow, "Unreading Modernism," 59–89.
- ⁴¹ Roberts and Giles, "Mapping Nonfiction Narrative," 101.
- ⁴² Roberts and Giles, 101.
- ⁴³ Aare, "A Narratological Approach to Literary Journalism," 111. See also Eason, "The New Journalism and the Image-World." 191–205.
- ⁴⁴ Aare, 133.
- ⁴⁵ Aare, 133–34.
- ⁴⁶ Spaulding, " 'Love Letters to Baltimore,'" 46.
- ⁴⁷ Spaulding, 46.
- ⁴⁸ Wilson, "The Underwater Narrative," 11.
- ⁴⁹ Palmer, "The Hoax," 86.
- ⁵⁰ Jacobs, "Confronting the (Un)Reality of Pranksterdom," 133.
- ⁵¹ Morton, "Rereading Code," 48.
- ⁵² Alexander, " 'My story is always escaping into other people,'" 58. Alexander observed that, in some cases, as in Thompson's *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*, the journalist and subject are one that "may express itself in a rupturing of the writer's persona." When the journalist and subject are melded, the writer can still find his or her persona in the subject.
- ⁵³ Alexander, 63.
- ⁵⁴ Steensen, "The Return of the 'Humble I,'" 62.
- ⁵⁵ Steensen, 64.
- ⁵⁶ Isager, "Playful Imitation at Work," 79.
- ⁵⁷ Walters, "Ted Conover and the Origins of Immersion," 27.
- ⁵⁸ Schreiber, "Journalistic Critique through Parody," 31.
- ⁵⁹ Larssen and Hornmoen, "The Literary Journalist," 83.
- ⁶⁰ Larssen and Hornmoen, 94.
- ⁶¹ Forde and Ross, "Radio and Civic Courage," 31–32.
- ⁶² Marino, "Reading Screens," 142.
- ⁶³ Marino, 145, 148.
- ⁶⁴ Dowling, "Toward a New Aesthetic," 104–105.
- ⁶⁵ Dowling, 101.
- ⁶⁶ Dowling, 101.
- ⁶⁷ Maguire, "Literary Journalism on the Air," 48.
- ⁶⁸ Maguire, 62.
- ⁶⁹ Wilentz, "The Role of the Literary Journalist in the Digital Era," 31.
- ⁷⁰ Wilentz, 39.
- ⁷¹ Wilentz, 40.
- ⁷² Editors, "When a Journalist's Scholarly Inquiry Informs," 73.
- ⁷³ Dowling, "Beyond the Program Era," 54.
- ⁷⁴ Abrahamson, "A Narrative of Collegial Discovery," 88.
- ⁷⁵ Gabriel and Amend, "The Ammo for the Canon," 86, 82–99.
- ⁷⁶ Keeble, "The 2011 Keynote," 86.
- ⁷⁷ Keeble, 86.
- ⁷⁸ Flis, "Women and Literary Journalism," 7–8.
- ⁷⁹ Meuret, "Rebels with a Cause," 94.
- ⁸⁰ Meuret, 82.
- ⁸¹ Gemis, "Occupation: Flying Parcel," 40.
- ⁸² Gemis, 40.
- ⁸³ Gemis, 49.