Between What They Say and What They Write:
Perspectives on Multilingualism and Creative Writing in Indian News

By

Alicia Wright

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

(Mass Communication)

at the

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

2020

Date of final oral examination: 8/14/2020

The dissertation is approved by the following members of the Final Oral Committee:

Lindsay Palmer, Associate Professor, Journalism and Mass Communication
Sue Robinson, Professor, Journalism and Mass Communication
Jo Ellen Fair, Professor Emerita, African Cultural Studies & Journalism and Mass Communication
Stephen Young, Associate Professor, Geography and International Studies
Laura Brueck, Associate Professor, Asian Languages and Cultures, Northwestern University

© Copyright by Alicia Wright 2020
All Rights Reserved

Acknowledgments

I want to express profuse thanks to my dissertation committee and the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Wisconsin-Madison. First, Dr. Lindsay Palmer, who possesses drive and encouragement, as my advisor and a scholar, that I hope I can emulate in the future. The drafts, emails, and extension requests she fielded from me — Dr. Palmer deserves an award for unwavering patience and superb advising! I have watched as a student—mouth often agape—at what Dr. Palmer achieves with such ease but that I know comes from intense commitment of her time and energy. Dr. Palmer invested so much in my project; without her nudging, and at times prodding, I could not have finished. Dr. Jo Ellen Fair, who started out as my advisor until she retired, has given me endless support when I wanted to call it quits and opened opportunities to help me explore academia. I relish memories in her Van Hise office overlooking campus while I vented my graduate student frustrations or nervously laughed off my academic confusions. Dr. Fair always put everything in perspective and reminded me that I am capable. Dr. Sue Robinson was one of my earliest guides in qualitative communication research at UW, and from the start, she has shown excitement and enthusiasm for the work that I do. Her teaching ingrained my methodological perspective and writing. Dr. Stephen Young served on my committee without much knowledge of my project or of me, yet he wholeheartedly came on board to guide me and give attention and consideration to my writing, not just in terms of his area of socio-political topics in South Asia but also in the other fields this project touches. Finally, Dr. Laura Brueck from Northwestern University — it's impossible to express my full gratitude to someone who has supported me from the start! Dr. Brueck helped build my foundation in literary studies, critical writing, and South Asian studies when I was a freshman at Hamilton College. Another scholar I'm in awe of for all she has accomplished and the ways she continues to support me as her student.

All of the people who participated in my research deserve huge thanks — the journalists I met and interviewed and the scholars who helped redirect my project along the way. This research was possible because of generous grants from the Fulbright Hays Doctoral Dissertation Research Abroad fellowship and funding from SJMC and UW-Madison. Adam Grotsky, the director of USIEF in Delhi, does an amazing job supporting students and researchers to India. Thank you to the Centre for Culture, Media and Governance at Jamia Millia Islamia for hosting me during my fieldwork and to Dr. Biswajit Das for serving as my in-country advisor.

I want to thank so many people from throughout the times and places I have lived. Laura Rice, Khatija Ahmed, and Alex Nicoll and their families have supported me since before I knew I would go to India or to graduate school. At Hamilton, Julie DiRoma, Gillian Jackson, Leina Masek, and Mandy Bowman Porter became family and to this day cheer me on. Dr. Chaise LaDousa, like Dr. Brueck, opened the gates to South Asian studies and is now a dear friend. At Syracuse University, Molly Kalan, Rachel Somerstein, Danny Stofleth, Wendi Bellar, Stephen Johnson, Tula Goenka, and many others helped me get my start in academia. Dr. Pamela Shoemaker pushed me to get a Ph.D. and told me to find strong women to stand with in the field; to this day, she continues to inspire me. In Delhi, Ana Gabriela Rojas Renteria, Christine Marrewa Karwoski, Gairan Pamei, Vaneesha Jain, Abhinandita Mathur and many other characters made a home with me and built a support system I would need more than I imagined.

Drew Kerr, Selina Sheth, Katie Lazarowicz, Thalia Gigerenzer, Kyle Chan, Harley Adams, Meagan Clark, Anant Raina, Akila Jayaraman, the whole Raina bunch, Dr. Saif Mahmood, Katrina Sanyal, Rebekah Blank Sood, Ronita Choudhuri, Jeremy Wade, Louise Judge, Vrinda Bhagat, Ajay Tokas, Gaurav Dhankar, Tisha Srivastav, Dipali — an amazing list of friends! In San Diego, Lisa Hurley, Serena Pelka, Maggie Thach Morshed, Sue Diaz, Katie Zanoni, Emiko Noma, Jennifer Smerdon Freeman, Jane Anyango, Hamsatu Allamin, Fatma Medhi Hassam, and of course, Khurshid Bano. Especially Khurshid — I'm so thankful that you, Shawana, Talia, and the rest of your family are in my life. In Madison, although many have moved on to new places, I am lucky for the people this beautiful little city gave me. Kat Casey, you were a game changer! You gave me a home in so many ways, from my yoga spot to a room to sleep in to your best friendship. You, Todd, Holden, and Jude are a huge part of my family now. I've survived through you! Beto Orellana Campos, Hyesun Choung, Mark Meder, JungHwan Yang, Jordan Stalker, Jackson Foote, Stephanie Lee, Meagan Doll, Sherry Harlacher, Cindy Burzinski, Garth Beyer, Lydia Odegaard, Rajiv Ranjan, Salah Algabli, Chris Wilen, and my Monona Yoga Center crew. Lisa Aarli keeps the SJMC alive, and Drs. Lucas Graves, Al Gunther, and Hemant Shah helped shape my ideas and studies. From my time in IRIS, Rachel Weiss, Anne Naparstek, Jinda Moore, Csanad Siklos, Mark Lilleleht, and Bradley Grochocinski were great co-workers, but way more fun as friends! Jessy, Kasey, and my entire AM family, late in the game but you were the final motivators I needed. I know I've missed names, but no less thanks to those!

To my family, you have all been patiently trying to figure out what in the world I'm doing all the time in school or in India or somewhere in between. To my dad, Dr. Kinsman E. Wright, Jr., thank you for giving me the education to start all of this, but more, thank you for loving me every minute of everything I do! I did it for you, and I love you! Mama, Cheryl Wright, thank you for keeping me grounded and answering your phone late in the night or early in the morning to pull me out of a panic. And for coming on our great adventure through India — you were a trooper! My uncle, Dr. Robert Wright — thank you for pushing me, and to you and Aunt Debbie for giving me another home in California. Uncle Mitch and Aunt Brenda Wooten — you never fail to support me and love me! Thanks to Melodi for feeding me big meals when I came home to visit. To my siblings, Lisa, Ingrid, Mike, Teddy, Amy, Denise, Genny, and Michael: thanks for mostly having no idea what I study but always being excited when I accomplish something big! To my nieces and nephews, Christian, Hannah, Megan, and Cruz, I did actually finish school before you all! You all keep making me proud. And to my new family, the Maitras: You have taken me in and at times been more excited about my achievements than even myself.

Finally, to Shupriyo Maitra: You didn't know where I came from or everything I had passed through to get here, but you wanted to jump on board and ride along with me. I would never have accomplished this without your love over the last two years. When we started as friends, you gave me a friendship I could never leave behind when I left Delhi, and I knew I was in trouble. I'm thankful for your spunk, your honesty, and your stubbornness to get what you want, whether a coffee grinder or a fiancée. Thank you for the liters of coffee you have poured for me while writing, for the meals you cooked in our sweaty little kitchen so I would eat, for waking up to my panicked screams or my grumpy tears ready to quit. I'm glad I've been quarantined with you, but I'm ready for us to head out for a new adventure! I love you!

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments i
Table of Contents iii
Abstract iv
1: Introduction to Translation Studies in Indian Media **1**
Language and Journalism 4
Multilingualism in Indian News 7
Translation and Its Academic Field(s) 11
Translation and the News 24
Methods 36
Chapter Overview 45
2: India through Language: History, Politics, and News **50**
Indian Language Politics 54
Hindi in Perspective: Multilingualism and Journalists 73
Conclusion 84
3: Journalism on Stage: Public Discourse of an Industry **86**
Method 91
Data Analysis 101
Literature Festivals 104
Media Summits 113
Association Meetings 120
Trainings 125
Conclusion 128
4: Interviewing the Writing: Creativity in Multilingual Processes **131**
Method 135
Data Analysis 139
Skill 141
Process 156
Creativity 168
Conclusion 173
5: Conclusion: The Possibility of Multilingual News **176**
Findings Revisited 180
So What? 184
Limitations 187
Future Research 190
Conclusion 194
References 197
Appendix 1 212
Appendix 2 213

Abstract

This study looks at the role multilingualism plays in Indian journalism. Through ethnographic observations and in-depth interviews, I examine ideas from the journalism industry that inform the norms and values in the profession related to translation. In event spaces like literature festivals and media summits, I observe public conversations that invite journalists as speakers, and I take note of statements on their varied use of languages and their processes of writing. I also pay attention to panels and talks specifically organized around issues in journalism especially related to language and translation work. I interview individual journalists about their own multilingual ability and whether that has been a valuable skill to their reporting. I ask them to trace their reporting and writing process to note specific junctures of multi-situational translation moments. They explain how they navigate interviews in the field and the expectations at work on how to translate. I then investigate the creative strategies these journalists describe for translating culture to the news. This project addresses the need for more focused research on news production in the Global South. The findings suggest that multilingualism enriches journalism and should become a regular feature in news products, but that the journalism industry and individual journalists in India struggle with hierarchies of language and perceptions of multilingual ability in their writing.

1: Introduction to Translation Studies in Indian Media

It hit me hard, the news that humid Delhi summer morning.

More specifically, the newspaper.

The night before, I moved out on my apartment balcony to escape my suffocating, windowless bedroom situated above an alleyway dotted with stagnant pools of monsoon rain hosting nightly raves of unwelcome seasonal tourists: dengue-ridden mosquitoes. On the front porch, with the ceiling fan whirling at high speed, I curled onto the small two-seater fainting couch, covered myself in a sheer dupatta[1] to keep the gluttonous bugs off my skin, and slept in relative comfort compared to indoors. It was a makeshift replica of the charpay[2]-in-the-moonlight scenes of Indian films and novels. The next morning, my alarm clock didn't ring; it smacked. At 6 AM, I heard a familiar thud against my apartment's front window above me and the rattle of the glass panes, but all too quickly to process, I felt the thud of our morning newspaper as it ricocheted onto my face. Our elderly newspaper delivery man had, for once, expert aim.

I had grown fascinated by the tangled system of newspaper delivery in my South-Central Delhi neighborhood. Early mornings, I sat on the balcony sipping coffee, catching up on headlines from the Internet of news back home as the men completed their deliveries. On my street, at least four different men (always men) cycled or scootered through my neighborhood, folding and throwing the subscribers' sheets. The younger men covered many of the upper level apartments, vaulting like javelin throwers the paper bundles in precise arcs to hit doors and

---

[1] A sheer cloth up to 5 to 6 feet long worn most commonly with more traditional clothing for Indian women, namely *kurta-pajama* or *shalwar-kameez*, draped over both shoulders from the front to cover the chest. Often times seen as a sign of modesty.

[2] A cot common in rural Indian homes. Used as seating and a bed inside or outside.

windows and then drop onto the marble of the second and third floor[3] balconies, lying in anticipation for a reader. Some, like my delivery man, with years of experience and the aches and pains of chucking newspapers to third then second then first floor balconies, missed the targets, leaving newspapers just out of arms reach on the roof extension of my landlord's porch below mine.

While the morning track-and-field arena of my street was fascinating to watch, I grew even more intrigued by the internal records each man kept of which home received which papers. Rarely referencing a chart or list, these men would carry many different publications, and customers could request other papers to see if the delivery man could procure a deal with the paper's neighborhood distributor. They delivered papers in English and Hindi mostly in the posh Central-East Delhi neighborhood where I lived. I received two English and two Hindi papers each morning: *Indian Express*, *The Hindu*, *Dainik Bhaskar*, and *Dainik Jhagran.* In other parts of the city, pockets known for other Indian regional identities might get papers in Bengali, Tamil, or Urdu. All the while, men like those on my street each morning parsed out the subscriptions and made deliveries no matter the language or whether they could read, write, or speak them.

I offer this glimpse into a moment of news distribution to emphasize how interwoven languages, news production, and news consumption can be in an Indian media ecology. As mesmerizing as I found these morning scenes, I relished even more my time combing through the newspapers to read stories from far-flung corners of the city. I noticed articles in the English

---

[3] In India, as in other parts of the world besides the U.S., floors in a building are counted starting with the ground floor, or 0. Thus, the buildings may have 4 stories, but the top floor will actually count as 3. In the National Capital Region (NCR), as Delhi is sometimes referred to, zoning and building codes only allow for 4 levels, ground floor to third floor, although many contractors try to build a much smaller apartment on the roof called a *barsati*, invisible from the street, to maximize rent profit.

papers with italicized, Romanized quotes in Hindi, sometimes translated to English in the next sentence, usually when quoting a government official, while other times the sources' comments were left untranslated — a subtle assumption, perhaps taken for granted, that the readership, an English-language elite in India, would know enough colloquial Hindi to understand the source. One day, I read an article quoting a speech from Prime Minister Narendra Modi. As a world leader, the journalists always provided the verbatim quote and a translation. I knew Hindi, so I tried to trace the translation between the source and target language but to little avail; it seemed in some places I could connect the transformation, although it looked grammatically incorrect, but maybe I just couldn't understand. I clipped the article, bothered by how out of sync was either my Hindi proficiency or the translation. Later, I asked an Indian, Hindi-speaking friend to help me understand. He laughed — the quote was in Gujarati! PM Modi had delivered the speech in his home state, Gujarat, where it would make sense to speak Gujarati in a public address. Of course I wouldn't understand! This made me think about the assumptions and strategies that inform how journalists make decisions to quote, translate, and interpret in their writing. These processes seem endemic to writing, but maybe in journalism, writers negotiate language in both more tangible ways and in subtler writing devices.

This project examines multilingualism in Indian news production with a focus on the literary aspects of translating information in news writing. Throughout the ethnographic research that underpins this project, I encounter many moments of linguistic overlap, within the spaces of a New Delhi apartment and public auditoriums. In interviews with Indian journalists, I learn about the tensions they face in reporting and writing in multiple languages. The research reveals that the postcolonial notion of power in English-Hindi language dynamics still simmers in news

processes that influence the writing practices of Indian journalists working between these languages. Indian journalists contend with what multilingualism, inherent on some level to most Indians, meant in their ability to report across the region of India's northern Hindi belt. In this project, I lay out important tensions of multilingualism in writing and journalism in order to understand how a professional industry of Indian journalists conceive of and practice translation. I focus on meso- and micro-levels of the Indian news ecosystem to study overarching ideas on the value of multilingualism in Indian journalism that leads me to consider the experiences of individual journalists in their reporting and writing processes. In this chapter, I outline key concepts from literary and journalistic translation theory that guide this project.

Language and Journalism

Along the news supply chain in India, languages interact at macro-, meso-, and micro-levels (Shoemaker & Reese, 2013). The newspaper delivery man exhibits the micro-level individual engaged in a meso-level system of newspaper distribution in a macro-level society of urban North India. Let's proceed in reverse and on a broader scale, placing the Indian context within global circuits to arrive at the person of interest to this study, the individual Indian journalist. At macro-levels — societies — global information moves in multiple languages. Many political and economic institutions at the global scale (e.g., the UN and World Bank) conduct business, publish research, and announce policy first in English, signaling English as the authoritative global language (Apter, 2006). Measures of the most powerful international languages variously define language use among people, including contested notions of mother tongue/native speakers/heritage (Nagy & Brook, 2020; Ortega, 2020), multilingualism (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005), and language dominance or proficiency (Silva-Corvalán &

Treffers-Daller, 2016; Solís-Barroso, 2019). According to numbers, English leads as a spoken language, followed by Mandarin Chinese, Hindi, and Spanish, while Mandarin and Spanish surpass English then Hindi in terms of native speakers.[4] I present this macro-level scene in this study on India and Hindi because it shows Hindi's position among "powerful" global languages, yet Hindi is rarely discussed as a major spoken language among global information flows. Maybe from a geographical standpoint, Hindi-language density is seen as concentrated to India, although that ignores the diaspora, so the reach and dissemination of Hindi-language information does not appear as diffuse as English, Mandarin Chinese, or Spanish. This ignores a densely networked community of speakers, both within India and in the diaspora, involved in producing and consuming Hindi-language news or information originating from Hindi-language sources.

Next, moving to the meso-level, in the journalism industry and news organizations, languages interact. Journalism as a whole must consider English, Spanish, French, Hindi, and other language presses and the economic systems and professional principles that each language can uniquely circulate. Within newspaper organizations, very noticeably in India, one organization may own papers in English, Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, and/or other languages, thus the organization must manage the business of multilingual customers as well as the politics of multiple languages (Schäffner, 2012; Tsai, 2010; Udupa & Chakravartty, 2012). The meso-level

---

[4] Exact figures for "language use", whether language spoken, native language, or mother tongue, are hard to find and verify. The general rankings referenced here come from the article "Ranked: The 100 Most Spoken Languages Around the World" by Iman Ghosh on Visual Capitalist, 15 February 2020: https://www.visualcapitalist.com/100-most-spoken-languages/. The article culled data from multiple sources, including Ethnologue, a world population database managed by SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) International, a faith-based non-profit organization, though its website claims to serve "without regard to religious belief, political ideology, gender, race or ethnic background". Another source included *Lapham's Quarterly*. The United Nations in 2018 commissioned a research project on world languages and announced a report to be published in 2019; however, this never came to fruition. The UN did announce that 2019 was the International Year of Indigenous Languages (IYoIL) and released a report and database on endangered languages. In other words, from multiple databases and reports, these general rankings represent the state of languages, but perhaps as well as a Wikipedia article can do.

plays an important background role in this research in order to set up the context of an Indian media ecosystem and unique challenges in this multilingual milieu. The political economy of Indian media has transformed throughout the years on account of major junctures, such as neoliberal economic policies in the 1990s and influential Hindu conservative politics in the 2010s (Mosco, 2008; Mukherji, 2008; Thomas 2010; Thussu, 2012, 2013; Wasko, et al., 2011). This project acknowledges the complex nature of systems of information in India and how institutional norms and pressures from within (e.g., media organizations, industry associations and unions) and without (e.g., governments or social conventions) can greatly influence news products.

Finally, at the micro-level, the individual — newspaper delivery person, news reader, journalist — engages in multilingual ways, through an oral language in everyday interactions to a literary language to read or write a newspaper article; these languages are not always the same. Note, many other individuals participate at this level (and the macro- and meso-levels), for example, editors and sources; however, I present three here simply to illustrate a point about personal multilingual interaction. As evidenced in the scene that began the chapter, the delivery person keeps track of the English-, Hindi-, Bengali-, or other languages newspapers. The reader, having ordered the newspapers from the delivery person, chooses to read the news in a specific language, although any number of articles in the various sections of the paper may have translated content, like quotes, or be taken from a newswire translated from another language.

However, the individual of the most interest in this study is the journalist. The Indian journalist speaks and writes at least one language but often two or more. The journalist works in a chosen language that doesn't always match the language of a source, or the journalist writes an

article to be transformed into another language across the world (Davier, 2014; Tsai 2010). In this project, these moments of linguistic interaction and translation can impact how the journalist conceptualizes reporting and writing processes (Conway, 2015, p. 526). What makes the micro-level unique in the news supply chain is individual choice and agency in a creative process. An individual can choose to interact with languages, although some individuals have greater choices based on socio-cultural settings and opportunities (Budach, et al., 2003, p. 615). Journalists confront linguistic interaction professionally by choosing a language in which to write. For a monolingual journalist, the choice to write only lies in one language for them. Bi- and multi-lingual journalists can interact and write to varying abilities in multiple languages (Walkowitz, 2017, p. 11). Later in this chapter, I explore how these different abilities in language can define a person as author, translator, or both and how the role of creating through language, or authorship, intersects with cultural power. Next, I consider how multilingualism arises in the profession of Indian journalism.

Multilingualism in Indian News

For a multilingual country like India, translation in news appears to happen instantaneously through multilingual journalists and reporters, beholden to their families, hometowns, and educations for what seems like a seamless ability to code switch between first, second, or third languages (Conway, 2015, p. 530; Davier, 2014). Multilingualism takes on various definitions in the scholarly literature. For instance, Davier (2014) distinguishes multilingualism and "plurilingualism" (p. 54). The scholar describes multilingualism as a space of coexisting languages with individuals of varying linguistic abilities — some may live monolingually, using only one language in their everyday lives, and others may live

plurilingually. To that end, Davier (2014) calls plurilingualism the state of people engaging in multiple languages. In this study, I choose to use the term *multilingualism* more broadly than Davier. For my purposes, multilingualism refers to the linguistic environment in India, recognizing the distribution of language and literacy across the country that imbues some with opportunities to speak and learn multiple languages while others have no daily need to go between. Literacy has especially served to commodify language, and bilingualism or multilingualism in economic terms can traverse from an ability to a productive skill (Budach, et al., 2003, pp. 608, 612). Lingual ability, acquired by birth and through the opportunity of literacy, enables border-crossing between linguistic communities and facilitates communication (Longxi, 2014, pp. 244-5). Conway (2015) notes that linguistic identities and the communities formed around languages are not monolithic, as the multiple or plural impacts of other identifiers like gender, class, and education greatly influence language (p. 530). A multilingual person in this study refers to someone able to go between languages in some proficient oral sense — a person who can speak two or more languages without the need for a translator but who may be able to write and read those languages to varying functionality.

As a starting point, this project explores this *seamless* ability for multilingual journalists in New Delhi, considering to what degree multilingual ability plays into the everyday pressures of work in journalism. In positions of foreign correspondence or more broadly in careers working in multinational contexts, multilingualism counts as an asset to the employer, often listed as an extra bonus skill in job applications (Budach, et al., 2003; Hannerz, 2004). Thinking in terms of nations like India, where some level of multilingualism tends to be the norm for many citizens, workplaces like the newsroom can take for granted this skill to go between languages

and not regard multilingualism as an employee's asset in the same way as it may be regarded in monolingual countries (Bassnett, 2019). I trace the linguistic origins of Indian journalists and delve into their reasons for choosing particular languages to write in. At first glance, their multilingualism seems inherent, an inevitable trait of being Indian and a natural part of their everyday lives, but upon reflection, multilingualism provides mobility for journalists in their work but also complexity to their reporting.

To probe the *seamless* ability of multilingualism, I study the reporting processes and ideas on translative creativity as described by Indian journalists. This research examines if and how Indian journalists think about the work they do in translation, for example, whether Indian reporters writing in English pay attention to translation when moving from a spoken Hindi interview to an English-language article. The project also considers meso-level factors that influence the translation process for writers in Indian news: tools that guide and structures that constrict. By speaking to individual journalists about the multilingual reporting process, I seek to understand if these writers confront rules and expectations put forth by news organizations or the industry more broadly to address and account for linguistic transference in the news. I investigate how Indian journalists cope with moments of the "untranslatable" in their everyday work, if and where they seek help in translation, and what they consider to be underlying impacts of translated news in a multilingual country like India.

By focusing on India and journalists writing there, this research contributes to the call for research from a non-Western perspective and from the Global South with large-scale and micro-level designs (Bassnett, 2014; Tymoczko, 2002). In studies of globalization, Appadurai (2000) calls for "grassroots globalization" that engage with vernacular discourses about the global

impact on local cultures and economies because discussions of globalization without the grassroots further marginalizes the issues of the poor from the concerns of their nation's interests in the global (2-3). This project addresses one aspect of the intricacies of such vernacular discourses in Indian news. I concentrate on the "local" in English-Hindi journalism in India, which can cover a large geographical and cultural distance, and the way that information flows in India between people and between languages in the reporting process, yet the implications of this project can apply to ideas about global information flows, particularly in how to address and mitigate linguistic dominance. "News translation can on occasion be considered both a silent witness to relationships between people and also a source of innovation in individual cultural systems," writes McLaughlin (2015, p. 567)

The act of translation in the news intersects with multiple layers of inquiry into the role of language, the role of language in journalism, the role of journalism in cultural understanding, and the ethical treatment of all of the above (Bassnett, 2019). The myriad mixing of Hindi and English, a latent language exchange in India, that emerges in singular texts like advertising and newspapers can impact everyday interactions and broader political opinions of the reading public (Sadana, 2012, p. 2-4). This research aims at one translational language situation in the reporting process of Indian journalists; reporting constitutes a multi-source translation situation (Davier, 2014, p. 63; Gambier, 2016, p. 900). The questions raised concern linguistic interactions and information flows between journalists, their sources, and their imagined target readers. By studying the creative agency Indian journalists exercise through their language choices, the project contributes to ideas on power and political influence. In summary, I broadly interrogate the demands of translation in the context of Indian news, noting the vernacular push-and-pull of

information disseminated in Hindi or English, or other Indian languages, and how that can influence India's participation in global news flows.

I now turn to an overview of translation studies as a field to trace a definition of translation and articulate what translation means in this study. From key theories that shaped translation studies, which includes both literary and journalistic styles of writing, I focus on several distinct theories of translation studies that guide the research questions. I follow three discursive areas that I refer to as skill, process, and creativity. Under *skill*, I examine the person(s) involved in translation by exploring what it has meant to possess the ability to translate; here I articulate more precisely who the Indian journalists involved in this study are. This leads to the question, *to what degree do members of India's journalism profession value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting?* Which introduces *process*; here I look at the functionalist approach of translation studies to understand how translation is done. *How do Indian journalists describe their writing process? What do Indian journalists describe as individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process?* Finally, through *creativity*, I investigate the role of cultural translation in news to understand to what degree Indian journalists engage critically and creatively with their written language. *What creative strategies do Indian journalists use in writing in order to fully translate different cultural meanings across languages?*

Translation and Its Academic Field(s)

Translation assumes *trans*, something from one to another, moving across or beyond, a transference of language. From the advent of the field of translation studies, which began to take formal shape in the 1970s, scholars have tried to define the term translation that applies to

translation studies or questioned whether the field should limit itself to a singular idea of translation (Tymoczko, 2005, p. 1083). Tymoczko (2005) calls *translation* an open or cluster concept, like the concepts of *language* or *game*, that classifies a phenomenon with an overall description made of many different executions (p. 1085). By no means does this idea of an open concept come close to clarifying a core definition of *translation*, but Tymoczko iterates that the field of translation studies has a unique challenge compared to other fields of study in that "the definitional impulse in translation research must not aim at total closure, for if the concept of translation is open or fuzzy, then the findings of most research will have open aspects (or, conversely, narrow limits of applicability) and the field as a whole cannot ever achieve a fully circumscribed nature" (p. 1085).

In communication studies, terms like communication and media have caused similar strife for academics, leading communications scholars to often clarify the reach of their study findings as sweepingly theoretical about a particular phenomenon or microscopically fixated on an element of the phenomenon (Jensen, 2013; Tymoczko, 2005, p. 1095). For this project, I turn attention to establishing the role of translation in journalism and the interdisciplinary overlap of translation studies with journalism studies (Biasla & Bassnett, 2009; Conway, 2015). To summarize, *translation* as a concept and phenomenon cannot have a cleanly packaged definition, but in order to understand the complicated nature of studying *translation* in terms of a product and/or an action, we must trace several ideas about translation that weave together branches of theoretical inquiry in the field. This section serves to show several ways *translation* has been defined, in order to clarify what products or actions *translation* refers to in this research, and then

traces how those definitions have influenced the development of translation studies since the 1970s.

Defining Translation

The concept of *translation* encompasses myriad forms of going between languages, and it is difficult to parse when exactly the moment of translative action occurs in an interaction. In the early years of translation studies as a field, scholars mostly referred to translation in the sense of taking an original text in a language, the source, and publishing the text in a different language, the target. Before moving further, it is important to take note of the meanings of source and target as they are key classifiers throughout the research. *Source* refers to an original form used to articulate something through a language — source can label the *source* language or the *source* text. *Target* refers to the product of the linguistic exchange, the *target* language or text. The early focus on source-to-target texts concerned language and linguistic inquiries (Tymoczko, 2005, p. 1084, 1088), leading to questions about equivalence in source and target texts or whether to call source-to-target texts versions of one another, independent texts, or parent-child texts.

Taking a source text into a target language — translation — basically, which we will see is far from basic, happens in two ways: (a) author(s) pens a source text that different person changes into target text; or (b) author(s) pens a source text and also changes it to target text. These two ways are loaded with intricacies that help trace several complications in defining the term translation, and I use each to introduce theoretical threads to explore in the next section. In this explanation, the term "author(s)" refers to the possibility that source texts can be a compilation of writings by multiple people, as for example, in religious texts like the Bible or Quran, though source authors in the genre of the sacred rarely take credit for authorship over the

divine (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005). For clarity, I use the singular form of author in the explanation in this part, recognizing the possibility of more than one. “Different person” in this part means the translator. I do not use the label of author to refer to the translator because of the contested definitions these two words, *author* and *translator*, have in relation to each other. Critics and scholars debate whether a person who translates something into a target text counts as an author or “just” a translator (Conway, 2017; Gambier, 2016).

Let’s consider path (a) that involves at least two people, or entities if we look at digital and automated processes (Darbari, 1999; Ehrensberger-Dow & Perrin, 2013, p. 78; Gambier, 2016; Walkowitz, 2017). This mode of translation assumes a type of relationship between source author and translator. I consider three general relationships. First, no relationship — the source author is dead or uncredited (e.g., religious texts), and translators undertake the target writing without input from the source. Translators rely on linguistic knowledge between the languages tailored to either historical information about the time and culture or to reinterpret for the modern era. This relationship complicates temporality, in terms of time and space, of writing (Bassnett, 2014, p. 4; Tymoczko, 2005, p. 1092; Walkowitz, 2017, p. 6), especially in long-deceased source authors who cannot comment on the moment of writing and translators who cannot experience the time of writing.

Second, a cooperative relationship — the translator consults the source author throughout the process because either the source author sought translation of the text or the translator sought permission to translate to a target language. This cooperative relationship can be fruitful and productive for the involved parties, and some scholars have referred to translation as *transcreation* because of the merit of the newly created target text both to transform the source

text and to stand apart as a unique work (Gambier, 2016, p. 888). The cooperative relationship can also be contentious and tenuous between source and target. The latter usually occurs when the translator in the target text takes liberties with or liberates from cultural aspects in the source text (Kothari, 2016, p. 58); these tensions are grappled with through feminist renderings of source texts or in postcolonial writings to non-English languages, for example.

Third, a separation — the source author does not work with the translator(s) for the target outcome; this is most often seen in fan fiction but also in unauthorized translations (Gambier, 2016, p. 893). The source author can comment on and critique a translation, can clarify or contest elements of the original rendered differently in the target text than intended from the source writing, but ultimately the target text remains as the translator wrote. Related to this relationship is the idea of *transediting,* which Stetting (1989) reasoned as a more accurate term for translation and that has particular connections to journalistic writing. In transediting, the translator, who in this concept also stands as an author, must both translate from source to target but also correct mistakes, discrepancies, or cultural incongruities, and the translator has the agency to do this because editing is inevitable in the process of compiling information from different places — in other words, research or journalism (Conway, 2015; Schäffner, 2012; Stetting, 1989; Valdeón, 2014). All three relationships raise problems in situations of oral narratives, where a source text doesn't have a physical form but, of course, a source author exists.

Now, turning to path (b), self-translation is comparatively easier to conceive of but not easier to do in comparison to the translative relationships through path (a). The tensions of textual, procedural, and ethical fidelities from the source to the target are as present and complex in self-translation. To reiterate, (b) refers to when an author (again, recognizing the possibility of

multiple authors) writes a source text and its target text form. In other words, an author self-translates, and the motivations to do so may be vast (Walkowitz, 2017, p. 22). Embedded in self-translation is the multilingual ability to render one's work into another language. One motivation may be to address wider audiences. This is seen often from authors of non-dominant languages, languages other than the more commonly spoken languages like English, Spanish, and Mandarin Chinese and many non-Western languages (Walkowitz, 2017, p. 11). A Tamil-language author who knows English and Spanish decides to translate their original source writing into English and Spanish to hopefully reach a wider global audience. Another motivation hearkens to the postcolonial standpoint in writing when an author translates into less common languages, or more bluntly, out of and away from English (Kothari, 2016). Scholarship has advocated for translations between non-dominant, non-Western languages (Baker, 2006; Bassnett & Trivedi, 2002; Pym, 2011), and thus some authors from non-Western countries who write primarily in English aim to confront the colonial influence through language in their writing by translating into either their native language or other local languages.

These two paths of translational authorship highlight how defining translation in terms of a process must account for many different approaches (Schäffner, 2012; Tymoczko, 2005). Defining translation in terms of the medium of the source or target product further complicates this open concept. Throughout this section, I have referred to "text", but I briefly introduced oral narratives in the author-translator relationships. Translation happens in other ways besides literary texts on paper; it can refer to translation in film through dubbing or subtitling (Gambier, 2016); via literary adaptations or abridgments for theater or radio (Valdeón, 2014; van Leeuwen, 2006); in live interpretation of political speeches or events (Bassnett, 2014; Mason, 2012); and in

news via wire services or interviews (Davier, 2014). The target text may emerge from the source as a semantic equivalent, preserving language in a one-to-one transfer or transcoding, or an aesthetic equivalent, preserving a "feeling" emoted from the original (Kothari, 2016). Conway (2015) summarizes how all of these elements taken into account through the linguistics and culture of language, writing that translation is "a type of mediation or negotiation that goes beyond the rewriting of texts" (p. 527).

Again, translation is an open concept (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005; Kothari, 2016; Tymoczko, 2005), and thus, its form in this project remains somewhat open within the medium of news writing. I limit the scope of media to print journalism, which can mean printed or digital for daily news or magazines. I focus on a particular translation moment within a multi-source translation situation (Davier, 2014, p. 63; Gambier, 2016, p. 900) of news reporting. Namely, the moment occurs after an interview in a source language when a journalist writes news into a target language (Davier, 2014, p. 59). This follows the path of (a) with at least two individuals involved; it applies the relationship of either cooperation or separation. In cooperation, the journalist would confirm a translated quote with the source; in separation, the source would not have a say in the published quote in the target language. Questions of self-translation arose during fieldwork as well, although this was not the initial aim of the research. With processes and relationships intact to discuss translation within this project, I next connect several theories from translation studies to multilingual moments in news writing and emphasize how translation involves cultural reworking alongside linguistic transfers.

Translation and Culture

In the 1970s, translation studies as an independent field began to morph, notably during a 1976 Nobel Foundation-sponsored symposium on translation in Stockholm (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005, p. 11-12). Without doubt, translation and its study existed long before the symposium, usually within literature and linguistics departments and not in its own coherent, formalized academic field (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005). Initially, studying translation concerned the idea of linguistic equivalence — how well did a translation map the source language into the target — but scholars of translation understand that linguistic equivalence alone will never fully map or describe the process of source-to-target texts (Bassnett, 2014; Conway, 2017, p. 710; Delabastita & Grutman, 2005;). Every language possesses unique elements of grammar, vocabulary, and connotation: sentence structure in one language reverses in another; one language has a word to describe an idea that doesn't exist as a concept in another language; and two languages use the same word for very different meanings (Bassnett, 2014, p. 3). Translation studies conceives of a broader idea of equivalence that is *dynamic* in that language is not the main concern of the translational process but rather matching culture and temporality from source to target (Nida, 1964/2004). In another aspect of the field, scholars conceive of both the theoretical space to methodically study translations and a practical vocational environment to teach ethical translation processes (Pym, 2009).

In reconceptualizing equivalence, Nida (1964/2004) asserts that dynamic equivalence deals with cultural translation well beyond linguistics, in that it requires the translator to pledge fidelity to either the source text or the target text. Through dynamic equivalence, the target text is judged on how it reflects not just language but also the temporality in terms of time and place

from which the source text originates. Formal equivalence refers to aligning the target text to match the frame of the source, to make it clear that what has been produced is a translation from a source (Nida, 1964/2004; Venuti, 2004, p. 122). Formal equivalence uses the source culture to guide the translation. Pragmatic equivalence transforms the source text into something more natural to the target (Venuti, 2004, p. 122); it considers the target readership in order to develop a translation suited to the target culture, almost seamlessly blending into the literary catalog of the target language not as a translation. Although formal and pragmatic equivalences appear diametrically opposed in theory — the former concerned with fidelity to the source and the latter to the target — in practical terms, equivalence fluctuates throughout the translation process at different translative junctures working from a source text. Gambier (2016) writes, "Translators consider and balance diverse factors during the translation process to achieve a communicative purpose, and their translations materialize as functionally adequate in the target culture" (p. 890). Thus, if translators seek equivalence, they set an intention to cater towards the source or the target, but ultimately, their product is the target text.

Scholars point out that translation works to bridge two disparate cultures divided not just by language, and to do so requires finessing elements of culture unknown to the target; in this view, not all elements of culture resonate and land in the target (Conway, 2017, p. 719). Formal equivalence is difficult for some translators to achieve in the translation of ancient texts because the translators have not existed during the ancient era and the language of place can shift (Conway, 2017, p. 714; Walkowitz, 2017, p. 6), as we will note through linguistic migration in India in Chapter 2. Translation researchers working through interdisciplinary fields like critical-cultural or postcolonial theories challenge the idea of equivalence further by considering

translators who do not work to bridge the source and target but rather to challenge the source through the target (Baker, 2006).

A different vein of translation studies sets aside the concern of equivalence which concerns the products of translation, the source and target texts, to take up functional aspects of translation (Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey, 2013). Also at odds with the notion that translation means simply transcoding in linguistic equivalence, *skopos* theory expands from the fidelities set forth through dynamic equivalence to focus on translative action and influences (Vermeer, 1989/2004, p. 222). Of importance to skopos theory is the productive aim of doing translation, *skopos* (from Greek) referring to the function of the translation or the target text (Bazzi, 2014, p. 133; Vermeer, 1989/2004, p. 221). Equivalency requires the target text to always be judged in comparison to the source (Bassnett, 2014, p. 6), but skopos theory prioritizes the target. To take on translation from the standpoint of skopos theory requires a translator to set an aim or envision the function of any resulting text; the translator may set the aim or receive a commissioned aim. Vermeer articulates three senses and aims of *skopos* within translation: translation process and its goal; translation result and its function; and translation mode and its intention (p. 224). Vermeer reasons that no action can be aimless and if said to be aimless must actually be inaction because it does not fulfill the requirements of action (p. 224).

An important element of skopos theory recognizes that the aim of a translative action may not coincide with the original aim of the source text or with the receptive function of a translation's audience (Conway, 2017, p. 716). Additionally, both source and target can play central roles to the aim of translation; these orientations are not mutually exclusive (van Leeuwen, 2006, p. 235). Skopos theory gives agency to the translator to set an independent

intention for the product of translation and through which to decide the way to do translation. Equivalence can constitute an aim of translation, but skopos theory acknowledges that the function of translation in different styles or genres of writing cannot always be equivalence (Venuti, 2014, p.122). Skopos theory dismisses the need to remain faithful to the source (Bassnett, 2014, p. 6) and invites translators to take liberties with their translations. Thus, genres like theatrical adaptations and satire fall into the gambit of translation.

The freedom that skopos theory afforded to translators introduced a new concern to translation studies. Into the 1990s, translation studies dealt mostly with English as the target language. From that perspective, the translative process could move in several directions. If the aim is to make the translated work relatable to an English audience, translation requires more than just linguistic transfer, such as cultural translation. This process can rewrite elements of the source text to Anglicize the target text. If the aim is to depict the source for the English audience, translation includes cultural explication of things unknown or unfamiliar to the English-reading audience. These potentially divergent streams of translative action and *skopos* complicate questions about fidelity and agency. Should translators maintain some allegiance to the source while catering to the target? Venuti (1995/2014) warns against the first direction of translation to make the source more palatable to English audiences (in Bassnett, 2014, p. 14). He calls for a multicultural ideal through translation, a give and take between the source and target so that both exist and are understood. Along a similar line, Bhabha (1994/2020) describes vernacular cosmopolitanism, a sort of co-existence of multiple cultures without the need to create common identity but instead acceptance of a universal diversity in humans (in Huat, 2020, p. 53). Foreignization, a process by which either difference is accentuated or erased, upholds the

supremacy of English language by either exoticizing the milieu of the source text or acculturating the source text into the target (Venuti, 2004). In journalistic writing, this process of foreignization influences how journalists' writing may perpetuate social fissures, even in subtle forms of translation.

Foreignization upends the notion that translation serves as an honor or homage to a source text, a notion anyways never accepted among many translators. However, scholars have wrestled with the idyllic multiculturalism that Venuti suggests can remedy the extremes of cultural dominance and cultural subjugation in translation (Myskja, 2013). The ability of translation does address the invisibility of the subaltern. The translator exercises power in how to shape the discourse of the source to the target, and if a translator is from outside of a subaltern community in translation, then the subaltern community continues to be filtered through someone else's eyes. The translator should be self-reflexive and aware of the aid and violence they enact (Baker, 2010; Conway, 2015; Kothari, 2016). Writers see very different purposes for translation and call for translation that challenges English supremacy of translation work. Texts, their translations, and any other forms need to be "unforgotten", as Walkowitz (2017), describes it (23). Foreignization will not remedy literature into a multicultural catalog; instead, the recognition of all versions and translations as important contributions should exist in the catalog on equal footing.

Enter the scene feminist theories of translation, postcolonial translation (Conway, 2017; Kothari, 2016; Merrill, 2012; Spivak, 2005), and political translation, to name a few. Each of these, as well as myriad other approaches to translation, possess rich intellectual, interdisciplinary, and overlapping histories. I only offer the simplest explanation of several.

Feminist theories of translation challenge the patriarchal stalwarts of literature, often confronting and rewriting source texts that have subjugated women and other non-male-identifying genders (Harvey, 1998/2004; Spivak, 2005). Postcolonial theories of translation aim to elevate marginalized and oppressed voices by prioritizing writing by the formerly (or currently) colonized rather than by the colonizers and to dispute colonial accounts that exoticize and infantilize the colonized by translating the experiences of the oppressed into translations (Conway, 2017; Kothari, 2016; Spivak, 2005). Embedded within both feminist and postcolonial translations is the political — scholars have considered how translation has enabled political statements, fomented conflict, and opened space for dialogue (Baker, 2006).

Underlying all of these theoretical junctures is the nature of authorship and whether the translator takes some ownership of the text and if so to what degree does the translator wrest power over the text. Researchers in translation studies have drawn on scholars from many other fields to grapple with these concepts. However, many in translation studies also worry about the pedagogical consequences of a field in such flux — how to equip students of translation to translate. A key avenue of translation studies borne out of these critical-cultural perspectives that speaks not just to theorizing but to the doing of translation calls for self-reflexivity (Kothari, 2016; Toury, 1995). Descriptive translation studies calls for translators to include with their translations the description of the translation process — what questions confronted the translator, what *skopos* did the translator set out for the target, what challenges did the translator face. In providing such context with the target text, translation can mitigate the damage of colonialism and power differentials while also acknowledging and preserving the history of oppression often embedded in source texts.

Through defining translation and tracing major threads of translation studies, I have skirted many complicated subjects of the field — authority, signs, politics, cultural barriers, discourse, hegemony (Weinberger, 2013, p. 27). Translation studies constantly grapples with issues of equivalence and fidelity and how translation's relationship to the source or target can complicate ideas of power and agency. The definitions aimed to describe translation processes, and the translational moment central to this project, revealed how vast the concept of translation is and how many different media may fall under the umbrella of translation. One such medium is journalistic translation in news writing. The next section discusses the literature central to translation in news that incorporates the broad ideas presented here.

Translation and the News

The field of translation studies has included news translation as a vehicle to study translation practices but not without debating the meaning of "news translation", another loaded category. Journalism requires exchange similar to the translation process: the transfer of facts and information to the written context of media (Conway, 2017, p. 713). Translation has a stake in each part of this journalistic exchange. Information and facts transfer from source to journalist; the journalist transfers that information to the written word; and the written media then transfers to an audience. If we buy into the idea that at each of these translational situations, the journalist simply relays the information on to the next target, then journalism fits the early theoretical bill of translation — a linguistically equivalent communication exchange. As presented in the section before, translation entails a negotiation of language and culture, and negotiations require a scale to balance the deal. Through the act of writing, journalists negotiate the balance of language and culture in reporting information. This requires skill developed into a writing process informed by

a journalist's choices and creativity. In this section, I further elaborate on the aforementioned concepts of skill, process, and creativity that guide my research questions.

Skill

Journalists write news. They investigate, interview, and research in order to create, or author, a piece of consumable writing (at least in print). Ask a journalist what they do — if the answer starts and ends with, "I write news"—then that is a boring journalist. Journalists must sell news (Conway, 2015, p. 529); yet, they do not sell news in the way that neighborhood delivery men chucking papers to Delhi apartment balconies sell news. Journalists know that their skills satisfy various players along the line of news production — most directly, the sources they consult and the readers seeking information. In reality, journalists recognize the myriad skills they deploy to meet reporting deadlines. Watch a journalist writing to meet a deadline, hands flying across a keyboard and the tapping noise growing louder as the minutes dwindle — words-per-minute typing is a skill. A journalist in India knows how to file Right-To-Information (RTI) requests with courts to access First Information Reports (FIR) from police on crimes they report about — a trained skill earned either in journalism school or on the job. These are only two skills of many that journalists enact while investigating and reporting.

However, journalists in any news context do not always count language or their linguistic ability as part of their job skill. In fact, Biesla and Bassnett (2009) point out that journalists often shirk away from the label of translator, noting that as separate entities of interpreter or writer, the two have additional constraints on them beyond just language—real time, rapid response, multi-source texts (p. 15-6). Tsai (2010) calls translation, not a skill separate from news reporting, but an integral part of journalism (p. 194). However, perhaps the hesitation to include translation as a

skill emanates from the complicated identities that overlap with multilingualism (Kothari, 2016, p. 81), mentioned earlier in the chapter. Identifiers like linguistics, education, and profession contribute to creating a translation situation (Ehrensberger-Dow & Perrin, 2013, p. 81), and I argue that journalism entails a communicative environment in which cultural translation is inherent. In other words, I argue that journalists "negotiate their way through a complex semiotic world by putting the tools of translation (broadly conceived) to work" (Conway, 2017, p. 723).

While I briefly introduced multilingualism in Indian news earlier, I want to emphasize that the multilingual media ecology is not rare or unique to India. Bakhtin asserted long ago that Western scholarship took for granted the idea of multilingualism, as if very little could happen outside Western language (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005, p. 11). Journalism research today hasn't gone much further, as studies of English-language media rarely include a section about the language context, but studies on non-Western media need a cultural translation section. Because multilingualism in some degree is common in non-Western contexts, this may explain why the act of translation in news within these cultures is taken for granted and overlooked (Davier, 2014, p. 60). Especially in the context of multilingualism in which languages are particularly compartmentalized — for example, a person is literate in a language for professional use but speaks a different language at home — fluency in the intimate home language may not be put forth as a language for skill that is needed in oral exchanges outside of the home (Davier, 2014, p. 56). Because a person has gained literacy in another language, other language skills seem subservient to the language of work (Davier, 2014, p. 66), but also the multiple ability to engage in another fluent language seems inherent and does not register as translation (p. 60).

Journalism research on translation has often turned to news agencies as sites of production, news wires for content, or to foreign correspondence as producers (Bassnett, 2014; Hannerz, 2004; Mason, 2012; Tsai, 2010). In these spaces, translation work is very present and accounted for, and news agencies will administer language tests on journalists to gauge their suitability for the job (Davier, 2014, p. 56). At this scale, multilingualism is a requirement. In the context of a newsroom in a multilingual society, say India, it is important to confront the erasure of multilingual ability as a skill when the production of news actually requires a great deal of translation (p. 53). When multilingualism for news translation is brought to light as a skill, Ehrensberger-Dow and Massey (2013) find that writers (in their study the writers were students of translation experimenting on news translation) who reflect on their translation competency could self-conceptualize and describe their multilingual ability in terms of skill-based actions (p. 106). To recognize a skill set afforded through multilingualism also highlights that journalists each have individual motivations, behaviors, and habits that influence how they make meaning out of the words and symbols they must interrogate every day (Ostertag, 2016, p. 265). Again, this complicates the idea of multilingualism as a skill in journalism, yet Ostertag's (2016) point on individualism underscores that, skill or not, multilingualism absolutely influences journalists' writing.

One reason journalists hesitate to place translative skill in their wheelhouse hearkens back to the early focus of translation studies on equivalence. Equivalence calls for fidelity, a complex value for an industry grappling with truth and fact. Gambier (2016) finds that journalists think of translation in terms of linguistic equivalence catering to the source text (p. 901); the truth then lies in the source and cannot be re-contextualized with information for the

target audience. Instead, if journalists understood translation in terms of dynamic equivalence and skopos, then news writing, reexpressing quotes from sources for the news audience to easily comprehend, is translation (Conway, 2017, p. 723). Comprehension of information and synthesis are two skills thought of in the space of journalism, authoring, or writing; here these two skills fall under translation as well. Conway (2015) writes, "When journalists decide how to render speech in another language (where 'speech' ranges from individual statements to entire stories), they take into consideration two sets of assumptions, those that shape how the speech circulated in the community where it originated, and those that are likely to shape it in the community that includes their audience"(p. 530). This mirrors the ideas of formal and pragmatic equivalence.

Another pushback to news writing as translation involves the focus of a source text (Conway, 2015, p. 521). In many cases, there is none, but as we determined earlier, source exists in oral narratives — interviews for journalists. Schäffner (2012) insists that journalists and scholars should call news writing for what it is — translation. One way to emphasize the inherency of translation as a writing process in journalism is to consider another phenomenon of writing and its use in news — the metaphor. Bazzi (2014) explores the use of metaphor in news translations in Arabic, finding that news is latent with meaning through translative choices in terms of metaphor (p. 126). Bazzi points out that these translations toy with the linguistic and cultural equivalence of the original news stories and affects the credibility of the source to deliver unfiltered news, although perceived credibility can remain intact because the audience probably never reads the original. Rather than denying the role of literary devices, like metaphor and translation, in news writing, Biesla and Bassnett (2009) assert that journalists and news editors need to be treated as experienced and seasoned translators, not only in the sense of

linguistic knowledge but also literate in ethical and political dynamics of language (p. 56-7). The denial of translation's role can have consequences for journalism and leads to important questions about risk, mistranslation, cultural biases, and false equivalency (Davier, 2014, p. 55). Translation defined as a part of news writing or a skill of news writing can infuse multilingual reporting contexts with awareness of autonomous decision making in writing and elevate self-reflexive reporting (Gambier, 2016, p. 895).

This discussion illuminates that journalists are translators by nature of their job as writers, but some industries of journalism still question the influence that multilingualism has in reporting. In the case of India, this notion of skill with translation guides my first research question: *to what degree do members of India's journalism profession recognize and value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting?* Just as other skills in information gathering and typing mechanics influence how journalists do their job, multilingual ability understood as a skill could suggest that translation has a crucial part in reporting processes. I next turn to investigate the skopos, the aim and function, of news writing in relationship to language and the writing process.

Process

To construct a news story brings to bear on the writer her own personal skills, her training as a participant in an industry, and the guidelines and rules set forth by media organizations. All of these elements influence the process of working in translation. Journalism, like translation, is a "social practice, defined by one's behavior" (Ostertag, 2016, p. 267). Allen (2013) writes, "Translators, like authors, are the product of social structures and circumstances; translators, like authors, play a role in bolstering or challenging those structures and continually altering the

linguistic and narrative tools brought to bear on them, as well as the attitudes and norms that produce them" (p. 101). What is more, while institutional norms attempt to filter the individuality that an institution's members can bring to the profession, according to Ostertag (2016) the individual can prevail over the institution (p. 265). As translation, journalism grapples with the *skopos* of writing — articulating what the aim or function of the writing is (Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey, 2013, p. 107). From formal equivalence, journalism's *skopos* would cater to the source, with the source in this context including institutions. Journalism through pragmatic equivalence aims to fulfill the call from the target, the audience. As I have shown, as in literary translation, formal-pragmatic equivalences create a continuum, so journalists vacillate between institutional pressures and fidelity to the readers to aid, as in translation, "movement through language, but is also the movement itself, the process of stepping into another world" (Kothari, 2016, p. 44).

Put simply, institutions influence a journalist's translation process. Merrill (2012) studies practical processes and theory together to understand the interplay of politics with aesthetics for authors and translators in their writings. Mufti (2016) calls for the need to understand the nationalization of literature and language in a postcolonial context and argues for a renewed examination of institutional influences on writing (p. 97). Mason (2012) studies the porous identities of translators and the institutional guidelines developed for translation, namely in organizational settings like the United Nations or through newspapers, and finds that institutional guidelines play little part in the patterns of translator behavior (p. 410). Mufti (2016) looks at translated literature while Mason (2012) considers live speech translation; even though Mason (2012) finds that institutions do not provide translators with guidelines, both scholars are

suggesting how institutions have embedded cultures and values that weigh on translation. Mason (2012) specifically identifies the institutional settings, but Mufti (2016) refers to institutions more broadly on a societal level. In other words, the process of translation has external factors bombarding against it at many levels and directions.

Organizational guidelines for translation or for writing in media may be provided through industry associations, but in reality, tracing a coherent institutional process of writing, reporting, and translating is near impossible (Gambier, 2016, p. 900). If any guidance, advice, or rule is provided from an organization, it tends to be general, leaving journalists to their own devices to grapple with questions of language and translation (Davier, 2014, p. 62). So, while the *skopos* of news translation for media organizations and the industry may exist, it is vague. Rather than this being a detriment to the writing process, in actuality, it opens space for journalists to independently define their *skopos* and process distinct from institutional orders.

A writing process suggests that a journalist takes some steps to ideate a story topic and reach a finished publishable product; similarly, a translation process can contain steps to move from one language to another. Kothari (2016) writes, “Translation is implicated in the exercise of perpetuating taxonomies, for translators draw from the available kit of equivalences” (p. 44). In other words, not only can journalists take procedural steps to translate, they may also have tools to draw from that help the translation process along — these could be as simple as a dictionary to something more complicated like their own lived experience in language. Kothari (2016) describes the utilization of these two tools as “linguistic translation” (translation proper) or “ethnographic translation” (metaphoric translation) (p. 59). An example of the use of tools in the process of translation would be to include a glossary or footnotes to a text (Grunebaum, 2013, p.

168); in journalism, the glossary or footnote could take the context of text printed in Romanized phonetic script to a language accompanied by a parenthetical translation. Including or excluding the source language is a procedural step often dictated by news organizations, and these taxonomies create an insider-outsider understanding for the reader (Grunebaum, 2013, p. 168). However, readers of news seldom reflect on the translation process (Gambier, 2016, p. 900), whether because news organizations rarely publish source and target quotes (to save page space, although digital spaces are changing this) or because the journalist has engaged in a level of creativity to cater to the target text experience (Mason, 2012).

In writing, creativity lies deeply in word choice. In translation and in journalism, journalists approach words in translation through dynamic equivalence to weigh source meaning against target reading (Conway, 2015, p. 530). To varying degrees, journalists focus on translation in terms of words and in terms of culture (Ehrensberger-Dow & Massey, 2013, p. 107). A telling study on newsrooms in Geneva, a linguistic nexus of French, German, and English, shows how word choice and cultural translation makes space for journalists to creatively influence the target reading (Perrin, 2012). Perrin (2012) finds that journalists engage in *stancing* when translating from one language to another. What Perrin means by *stancing* is "the practice of taking and encoding a particular position" (p. 135). He suggests that *stancing* incorporates individuals' socio-political opinions into their writing, sometimes in subtle ways by playing with word meaning and translation choices. He finds journalists regularly take a stance in their writing, and when working in translation, journalists find ways to embed stance in the process of conveying information from one language to another. Stances can be described as individualistic

but are heavily influenced by individuals' social standing, institutional affiliations, and other factors.

With these various ideas on process and how the act of writing imbues translation situations with meaning, I explore the process of writing more concretely in Indian newsrooms. This notion of process guides my second set of research questions: *How do Indian journalists describe their writing process? What do Indian journalists describe as individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process?* Through this research question, I also ask Indian journalists about *stance* through examples of any difficult lexicon they regularly encounter in their writing and try to explore where confusions and challenges stem from in the language. The individual process of writing in journalism, like the paths of translation explored earlier, foster creative ways to achieve *skopos*. Implementing creativity through writing involves agentive action that can nudge power dynamics between journalists, their sources, and imagined target readers. In the next part, I dive into how creativity in translation and journalism complicate the responsibility of journalists to respond to the institutional pressures on their reporting while infusing their own individual stances and identities through writing.

Creativity

As journalists grapple with translation throughout the writing process, they cultivate varying organizational and individual practices to creatively engage multilingually. In some newsrooms, journalists aim to communicate through translation what is at stake in the news without the entire cultural rundown (Davier, 2014, p. 64). They can also insulate the target audience by localizing information and limiting foreign news, choosing not to translate (p. 66).

Still in other newsrooms, translation allows journalists to bypass conservative, suppressive gatekeepers to get information to a public (Khanjan, et al., 2013, p. 88). This all involves creative use of language and agentive decisions about how translation should act in the news.

News sources (politicians, PR representatives, citizens on the street) provide quotes. Journalists choose quotes to include in a story. The quotes now interact with other bites of information in a different context than when the quote was uttered, and thus, meaning can change. Allen (2013) cautions against thinking of language simply as "information" and making translation also merely a new form of information (p. 100). Thus, while journalists may be simply conveying information to the public through media, the act of working with language introduces creative agency. Merrill (2013) might describe the journalist as a "storywriter", not taking ownership of the written text but rather documenting the telling in conjunction with other tellers, or sources (p. 143-5). However, the journalist is still a writer, and as Merrill (2004) points out, writing and translation eliminates all previous ideas and words (p. 139-40). The elimination of everything previous into something new requires creativity. Baker (2006), studying translation through narrative theory, explains how narratives build on one another and always include ways that the new narrative layer rewrites or redefines something from before. Thus, the story can never traverse a truly linear path, and the junctures where narratives develop and shift reveal covert ways that the writers in a narrative's genealogy make creative decisions about how to move the narrative forward.

Elimination and destruction is violent, and many theorists have argued that translation is violent (e.g., Baker, 2006; Venuti, 2004). The power of journalists' translative action lies in how important the information is to the readers and how distant the source information culture is from

the reader (Delabastita & Grutman, 2005, p. 19), all factors in gatekeeping and agenda-setting. The ability of journalists to reflect on writing and to contemplate the impact of translated words, or to even recognize the translation situations of reporting, demonstrates discursive consciousness (van Rooyen, 2013, p. 501). This discursive consciousness signals the journalists' negotiations with power (Conway, 2015, p. 522). In line with self-reflexivity in translation, journalists able to articulate what is at stake at various stages of reporting, junctures of multi-source translational situations, mitigate the power they exercise over information. This awareness of power grows with experience in such a way that the focus and process of translation becomes more intricate beyond reflecting on linguistic translation to think about cultural translation (Ehrensberger & Massey, 2013, p. 119). To hone translational skill in journalism coincides with exercising responsible power.

To have agency in constructing a message means to be creative, and, as Nayar (2011) writes, "one of the most significant modes of agency-formation and assertion is the *language* of protest that is creative, reflexive, subversive" (p. 75). In the previous section, I quickly introduced Kothari's (2016) notion of ethnographic or metaphoric translation, using social experience to aid in the process of translating. Through translation in journalistic writing, we must acknowledge that the journalist does not just translate proper but imbues stance and creativity to news stories. Still, the journalist cannot have absolute authority over the ultimate meaning of the text and must negotiate the ethics of reporting as well as authenticity to the source; the author's creativity exists individually but can change and be influenced (Merrill, 2004, p. 147-8).

I explore the motivations of Indian journalists to engage in this type of work and how they describe the media industry. *What creative strategies do Indian journalists use in writing in order to fully translate different cultural meanings across languages?* This departs from the previous question that takes stock of the socio-organizational influences that come to bear on journalists. This question tries to get more to what is at stake for journalists to have their own writing styles and practices. This line of inquiry is especially relevant in a project not reliant on the newsroom structures that stabilize the work but rather more focused on individuals who may work directly for media houses or who survive mostly on freelance writing projects. Also, this theoretical strand helps incorporate the evermore-influential nature of digital news in India where journalists frequently work for print newspapers and startup online news sites.

Methods

This study follows a second-wave paradigm shift in translation studies that uses ethnography and qualitative methods to understand communities of practice (Ehrensberger-Dow & Perrin, 2013, p. 78). I approach Indian journalists as cultural translators and inquire about the step-by-step creation of writing. By noting information about their educational backgrounds, the tools (dictionaries, online translators, etc.) used to translate, and the rules they adhere to under editors, I map the personal development of the research subjects' writing styles and their habituated practices in reporting.

The morning scene described earlier in this chapter happened some years before I began this project. I arrived in New Delhi in 2015 on a pre-dissertation fieldwork fellowship for the summer; this made for my sixth trip to India, having spent summers prior studying Hindi in Jaipur and interning in Delhi after college. With very little idea how a project could take shape, I

moved into a flat near Central Delhi, the hub of India's Central government and of New Delhi's state government. Fortuitously I moved in with three journalists — two foreign correspondents and an Indian videographer. During that summer, I explored the city, helped these journalists on assignments, attended any media-related lecture or event I could access, and sought out academic departments and centers to help me better understand the media ecology. I embarked on long-term dissertation fieldwork in October 2017 until April 2019 in New Delhi, India.

This section details the methods implemented for this research, namely ethnography and in-depth interviews. As mentioned earlier, I focus on the micro-level of analysis, the individual journalists, still taking into account and interrogating the meso- and macro-levels of journalism production. My research responds to calls to study different parts of media production processes by focusing particularly on the process of translation (Conway, 2015; Ståhlberg, 2002). In the first part, I describe the field side — a rather large, unbound city and mediascape — with particular attention to the fluidity of New Delhi and its journalists and the way its location interplays with language in news. Then I introduce the interview subjects, who were described theoretically in the previous sections, and others I came in contact with during ethnographic observations; it is nearly impossible to give a general description of Indian journalists because of the overlapping linguistic presses, so I approached journalists based on the nature of their writing. I finish this section reflecting on the many challenges I faced as an ethnographer, taking the space early on for reflexivity as it undoubtedly influenced my approaches and actions during research.

Field Site

Indian media as a national news system is difficult to articulate because of the disparate language communities that exercise political power in different regions of the country. In reality, it is a densely tangled network of a variety of rich (financially, historically, and content-wise) language-based media industries. Chapter 2 delves more into India's language and media history. English-language news coming out of India caters to global international news systems, but English-language news within the country serves an elite, educated strata of the population, mostly residing in major metropolises. To make clear, I focus in this project on the action of interviewing in one language (Hindi or English) and writing in another language (English or Hindi, correspondingly), although because this project considers Indian journalists' perceptions and not the content they produce, it can refer to any two languages in exchange. The journalists present in the spaces I observe mostly write in English and report from New Delhi, so they have at least functional knowledge of Hindi by living in the city. However, based on family and education, they may have proficiency in other languages that influence their reporting and who they can interview.

Community extends beyond static locations today, so the site of ethnography looks less like the pushpin in a map and rather like unbound, fluid spaces created by information flows, for example, media messages and language moving from producers to consumers and back (Spitulnik, 2009). Thus researchers can develop a field site in more abstract ways. Couldry (2003) points out that media can contribute a rethinking of the idea of "places" in ethnography (p. 41). A challenge is to define a field site while still maintaining a grounded context to study and systematically extract data (Murphy & Kraidy, 2003, p. 7). In this project, the field sites are

the paths of information gathering and reporting that Indian journalists undertake on a daily basis and the discursive spaces that encourage journalists to reflect on translation dynamics in the media industry. I located my field site in the city of New Delhi, India's national capital and a union territory with some equivalent rights as states. However, as with the nature of information flows, the site includes reflection on many other far-flung regions of North India's Hindi belt. Indian journalists working in New Delhi for nationally published or online publications find stories well outside New Delhi's city limits, and many of the experiences they reflected on during interviews took place in much smaller cities and towns.

New Delhi spreads across what is called the National Capital Region (NCR), which crosses the state borders of Uttar Pradesh and Haryana, and splits power between an elected territory government and the Central (national) Government in the union territory and the two state governments in the respective zones of Noida and Gurugram. In local parlance, Delhi is described by its directional zones and the over-the-border NCR zones: North Delhi, South Delhi, East Delhi, West Delhi, Noida, Gurugram. Like a dot in the center to mark Central Delhi, Connaught Place (CP) is a formidable structure — two concentric circles, the Outer and Inner Ring, of two-story white stone built in British colonial style. It is a shopping hub now, but at one time several media houses called CP home to their newsrooms. Some media houses still remain just beyond the circles of CP in larger office buildings, whereas others have found cheaper rents in Noida or opted for co-working space and remote work like some newer digital outlets. Southwest of CP comes Central Secretariat, the government sector of the city where both the national and state governments have their ministry buildings, the Lok Sabha (Parliament) and diplomatic homes. This area was once known as Lutyens' Delhi after the British architect who

designed many of the government buildings and colonial bungalows; if not still owned by wealthy families connected to the British, these old bungalows now house foreign diplomats, top Central government and military officials, or state houses of India. The government-controlled media, namely its broadcast provider Doordarshan and the state newswire Press Information Bureau, have buildings in the Central Secretariat zone near Mandi House. The western portion of Central Delhi holds Chanakyapuri where many of the largest, strongest embassies have their bases and consulates, and where some of the international wires maintain workspace.

For many journalists in New Delhi, going to the office is optional, many working from home rather than hours-long metro rides out to the far-reaches of Gurugram and Noida. Journalists working on the political beats are mainly English-language reporters and situate themselves near Central Secretariat, spending days in coffee shops near or inside ministry buildings ready to break news as the Delhi government initiates new schemes and laws. The Central Government of India censors the media with sanctions regarding what information comes out about national political decisions, most notably through Section 124A, the sedition law, of the Indian Constitution that restricts publication of information that might insight dissent towards the government (Freedom House, 2015).

In this project, the field sites are the paths of information gathering and reporting that Indian journalists undertake on a daily basis. While the places that structure their lives and impose norms and standards on their actions do need to be considered, I forego the ethnography in a newsroom. Ethnographic research in newsrooms have revealed important patterns and influences on reporting (U. Rao, 2010; Robinson, 2011; Ståhlberg; 2002), and in the context of India, several scholars have spent significant time in Indian newsrooms of various languages (U.

Rao, 2010; Ståhlberg, 2002). Instead, I ventured into other spaces of institutional influence to journalism: media summits and literature festivals. There I observed how journalists talked about their profession and its relationship to language to see how Indian journalists presented their translational work to the target public.

Interview Subjects

Having laid out the geographical terrain of a field site to situate the reader in the vast terrain of New Delhi, I attempted to circle back to the center of the city as a symbolic focal point of media action. In reality, media work happens all over the city throughout the day. However, to return to the people of interest to this research, I now want to introduce the Indian journalists, though I will provide more details in Chapter 4 when I analyze the interview data. Journalism studies addressing translation work often focus on the fixer-reporter relationship, but in my research, I address what scholars have marked as a lacuna in journalism translation research, the challenge of local reporters who also negotiate language for their disparate local audiences (Chaudhuri, 2010; Davies, 2006).

Upon entering the field site, I decided to take time to learn about some of the Delhi-based journalists making waves over in-depth investigations. They typically wrote long-form reports for magazines or buzz-worthy series in newspapers, and in turn, attended major literature festivals or sat on panels presented at the various cultural centers. These spaces typically held public lectures, book launches, and film screenings several nights a week, so these journalists stayed in transit between buildings. In thinking about translation, I thought that to begin with these journalists with major stories would perhaps allow for richer conversations about multilingualism and process as investigative journalism often allots time to the reporter to

transcribe interviews and draft pieces versus daily breaking news cycles. While it is important to understand the role of translation in near-instantaneous news cycles, for this project, I wanted to focus more on the perceptions and ideas from journalists able to take time in the experience of translation and writing.

In the beginning, I amassed a list of potential interlocutors based on suggestions by researchers and journalist friends or from feature stories in Indian magazines and newspapers I could detect had a significant multilingual method to reporting. Fortuitous events similarly put me on the path to meeting more people for interviews, although it also broadened the parameters of who to contact. In one case, a major publication out of Delhi posted a call for Hindi translation interns, detailing a program in which interns would begin to translate the publication's archives from English to Hindi. I contacted the coordinator, and after a short interview gained access to the chief editor. This led to further contacts within this single publication as, during the course of fieldwork, the initiative shifted from an internship program to now encompass an entire Hindi edition of the monthly.

While the places that structure their lives and impose norms and standards on their actions do need to be considered — i.e., the newsrooms — I forego the typical set up of an ethnography to shadow journalists of various news organizations to get to the root of writing in journalism, cognizant of the organizational influences and pressures. What this contributes to the project is a multi-sidedness to ethnography, building a system of understanding writing. I cannot ignore the pressures outside of a journalist's own process that influence writing and translation. However, I did not want to limit my interlocutors to a single newsroom but rather allow this project to unfold more as a general survey of multilingualism in New Delhi's news system. Thus,

while I conducted interviews with several people within the same organizations at times, I also actively sought out freelance journalists who had experience writing to the demands of a variety of publications.

Challenges

A final area I want to unveil in my project allows space for reflexivity in rethinking the challenges in the field. The act of fieldwork necessarily raises the question of ethnographic authority (Clifford, 1983, p. 120), and the researcher should engage reflexively at all points in qualitative analysis in order to keep the researcher's experience from dominating the arc of research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 10). To take into account all the previous questions of the types of data, the methods of collection, and the approach to analysis provides a basis for researchers to guard against superficially inserting themselves into the data through "a spiral of endless self-interrogation" (Couldry, 2003, p. 49). Through this project, I have attempted to both address the important theoretical implications of multilingual news and translation processes in India and also to explain myself and my process throughout the research to try to bring more understanding to the significant challenges faced in doing ethnography and fieldwork.

Especially in the context of intercultural research in which Othering poses a threat to the conclusions of the research, a method that requires the researcher not only to observe and participate but also to calibrate her own opinions and interpretations in the process of observation is imperative. Postcolonial attitudes have often looked at the Western academic observer with suspicion (Frow & Morris, 2000, p. 319; Murphy & Kraidy, 2003, p. 4), and the case remains that the researcher does have an element of privilege over the research subject and can overpower the data and analysis. Acknowledging the multiplicity of identities and positions that

researchers and subjects bring to bear in the context of the field, Tedlock (2000) emphasizes how the multiplicities can be socially constructed, relevant in different situations, and therefore important to reflect on but not to overburden the purpose of the study (p. 471).

In the beginning phase of research, I felt both overwhelmed and underestimated. On the one hand, I seemed to have an endless list of potential research subjects to talk to, but as I began to explore more clearly how to approach the interviews, I realized I needed to seek out specific types of news writers, as I explained in the above section. As I will detail more in Chapter 3, the number of events and meetings to attend for industry discussions kept growing as each news organization or major event management company launched some version of a literature and media festival. While entering these spaces was important, it also sprouted major doubt in my legitimacy as a media researcher. One of the most common questions addressed to me when introducing myself to potential subjects or informants: are you a journalist? It became a crushing point for me. In some cases, I could detect a sense from reporters thinking that I could not understand the media industry if I had not been a journalist. In other cases, a clear hierarchy lay before me that I did not fit into the echelon of journalists and did not deserve the same access.

Inevitably, a researcher acts as an outsider, even if working within a "native" context. Thus, the researcher must enact hybridity and realize her "biculturality" as a researcher conducting significant inquiry into everyday life but also carrying on her own everyday life in the field (Narayan, 1993, p. 672). In this sense, the notion of the participant observer is problematic because, while expected to act as a detached observer, the action of participation allows the researcher to experience the emotional involvement of the behavior (Tedlock, 2000, p. 465). Rather than feigning some artificial neutrality and distance as a participant observer, a

researcher can easily implement reflexivity and transparency by employing the observation of participation in which the researcher's experiences and the subjects' experiences interplay in the study (Tedlock, 2000, p. 465-6). I began to develop ways to overcome the timidity bred from a sense of rejection by some of the early journalists I approached during research. I found new arenas for research, like journalism workshops, where I could enter as a participant and as a researcher. By participating with a room full of journalists, whether I worked as a journalist full-time myself, others saw me within their community of work and expressed great interest in taking part in my research. I sought out opportunities to show some authority in my role as researcher while gaining greater access to contacts in the journalism industry; thus I took on the role of organizer for a new journalism summit where I interfaced with research organizations actively pursuing media projects and with journalists invited as speakers for the summit.

Chapter Overview

With each major portion of a research project now introduced in this chapter — theory, questions, methods — I want to proceed with an overview of what is to come in the text. In Chapter 2, I pick up from the earlier section in this chapter specific to Indian media. To give a deep context to the linguistic media ecology central to this project, I further engage with scholarship related to translation of South Asian languages and specifically translation and multilingual markets of Indian news. This helps foreground the contexts of discursive spaces that I explore in Chapter 3. While I study specifically the meso- and micro-levels of Indian journalism, an understanding of the multilingual markets and cultures at play in India make clear the external factors acting for and against journalistic translation.

In Chapter 3, I draw on my field notes from attending a variety of industry venues – trainings, summits, and meetings – to understand how Indian journalism as an industry (or to be fair, New Delhi political journalism) talks about language interactions in the news. There is a significant debate among journalists and writers as to how to address language barriers and information. Formats of journalistic writing have transformed and broadened, such as a growing popularity for long-form reporting and online vernacular platforms. This chapter calls on participant observations during the course of fieldwork at a series of literary festivals, media summits, and labor organization meetings as well as a training for women journalists in India. In North India alone, the occurrence of literature festivals to attend grow innumerable, and now an industry has boomed alongside these festivals specifically for media and journalism summits. I both attended and helped organize journalism summits in order to witness the discussions around how to cater to English-language and vernacular press audiences; notably, a major assumption arose that invited speakers and journalists would have the facility of English with the likelihood of speaking Hindi. Concerns targeted an audience demographic of non-Anglophone speakers. These observations note the discussions that revolved around split reading publics in India and attention to multilingual information but highlight the discrepancy in the industry favoring English journalists over multilingual writers primarily publishing in Indian languages other than English.

Continuing through ethnographic observations, I entered ever more private spaces, including meetings, like the National Women in Media India annual meeting, and training courses. I again observed how the conveners addressed language divides in the conduct of the meetings and trainings as well as how the content of the discussions introduced anxieties of

language. Not only did the organizers attempt to program language diversity into their agendas as well as open linguistic access, but also attendees sometimes tested the limits of accessibility to highlight the cultural linguistic aspects of media. Throughout Chapter 3, I pass through these spaces of ethnography in order to get a sense of the industry dynamics in terms of language. I deliberately chose these public and publicly private spaces of interaction because they transcended the newsrooms. I sought information beyond the organizational guidelines and rules, and by catching journalists talking with other journalists from a variety of publications in these events, I noted more candid remarks that hint at the industry's expectations and practices of writing rather than promotional statements attending to their news organizations.

In Chapter 4, I go from talking about the industry to the individual. I use my interview transcripts with a number of journalists, editors, and translators in New Delhi working for publications across media to try to dig into individual practices writing across languages. During my research, I interviewed editors, writers, and translators for national digital dailies, print monthlies, and international news organizations. In these in-depth discussions, the journalism professionals discussed the growing need to reach audiences outside of the English-elite in New Delhi, Mumbai, and Bangalore and the ever-present anxiety about reporting from Hindi sources into English stories often illegible to the subjects of the news.

The interlocutors led me through multiple models of working multilingually and revealed arenas of “freedom” in how journalists document their sources in multiple languages. Some news organizations maintain stringent control over the reporting process; reporters must submit full interview transcripts alongside bilingual stories - one in English and one in Hindi. Other publications give complete freedom to the writer to record interviews or not, to transcribe

interviews or not, to take notes in Hindi or not; in other words, the journalists owe minimal accountability to the veracity of their sources verbatim claims. Some journalists work alongside local translators in the same language in order to build credibility within rural communities. Others navigate their reporting fields solo with their variable language skills. I explore the methods for reporting in a multilingual environment and the concerns journalists express about their abilities to deliver translated stories.

Furthermore, I endeavor to extract from these interlocutors their own strategies of reporting political news and maintaining meaning and context in translation. A lacuna exists in this area of research in journalism studies, probing translational creativity and agency in writing for news. While the larger project calls forth political implications that, in future studies, can be tested through multilingual differences, I want to present the findings on multilingual Indian journalists and translational creativity, especially in light of the expanding and changing modes and forms of writing news. In particular, I discuss the discomfort or dismissal that many journalists expressed when asked about translation that circulated back later to the care taken in word choice and writing.

The final chapter synthesizes these spaces of observation to return to the theoretical threads of equivalence and function in relation to skill, process, and creativity to discuss how Indian journalists engage in multiple languages and imbue creativity in news writing through translated information and quotes. The research does not conclude by drawing a unique and tightly defined “Indian way” of translation writing in news. In fact, the process of multilingual writing is much more confused and ad hoc. Instead, I focus on the challenges India faces as a multilingual nation with multilingual information flows. I incorporate the context of South Asia

with a large scholarly body of work on language interactions in news flows out of other regions like Europe and East Asia, and I propose that this project grow to look at audience reactions to multilingualism in news and how that might influence a reading public more equipped and open to interactive languages within news.

2: India through Language: History, Politics, and News

Four papers delivered on the balcony every morning: two in English, two in Hindi. One day a week, all four papers ran strikingly similar first pages — not the front page, but the first page. Political parties took out full-page advertisements to announce a new government scheme or congratulate a politician for some accolade. Almost like a folder, except that the last section of the paper with sports news and continuations of small news stories from earlier pages were still printed on the attached page. The first page opened to the "real" front page with headlines and major news. However, below the fold, most likely lay a duplicate, shrunken advertisement emphasizing the party's big news. Sprinkled throughout the paper that day were more ads paid for by other political parties or their allies harping similar announcements. To top that, the news organization still ran reported articles about the same lauded government project. Political advertisements found space on newspaper pages everyday, but once a week, it was hard to decipher news from ads in the pages.

Another fixture, at least two or more times per month, the English-language daily *The Indian Express* runs a small section at least twice a month within the opinion pages, bottom left corner of the right-hand page, called "The Urdu Press" (Appendix 1). In this section, senior journalist Seema Chishti writes short synopses of a few key issues covered in, ostensibly, the Urdu-language press. Each section of three to four paragraphs covers an issue as commented on in the editorials from Urdu-language papers or the Urdu editions of larger publications. Maybe the originals were published in Urdu, but new readers do not find a note in the column that explains whether the content Chishti references comes from Urdu-language articles or from English-language editions of otherwise popularly known Urdu-language newspapers.

On the page, a reader encounters direct quotations from the editorial pieces in the likes of *Daawat*, *Siasat*, *Roznama Khabrein*, and *Inquilab.* Are these quotes translated to the target language of English from a source language Urdu text? Occasionally, a transliterated word appears. For example, under the heading "FIRECRACKER BAN", Chishti includes a quote from a column by Aakar Patel in *Inquilab* on October 15, 2018, that ends with the statement, "But the judges want to bring about a change, with just one step (*ek jhatke mein*)." The transliteration of that final phrase is important; *jhatke* connotes a particular emphasis to this "step". The word in Hindi-Urdu means a shock or tremor, used often with the idea of an electric current or earthquake rumble. Hindi-Urdu speakers will understand the latent context that *jhatke* offers to the mood of the editorial.[5] Within this same paragraph, the columnist includes another culturally charged word in its original Urdu without any translation: *qurbani.* This word refers to sacrificial slaughter, often of goats, in Muslim communities during festivals and holidays, and while the term's definition in Urdu is simply "sacrifice", it has a particular link to Islam when used in South Asia and many synonyms more colloquial to Hindi.

I introduce this column in one newspaper as an example of how in India language can stand in for community identities that play out in news media. Journalists reside within these communities, identify with particular language communities based on both mother-tongue and everyday usage. In their work, they intone news through a chosen professional language to a readership engaging in that language, but before publication, they may interact in other languages to garner information. Language serves not just as a mode of information transmission

---

[5] Special thanks to Dr. Rajiv Ranjan, Michigan State University, for a fruitful discussion about this word and context as well as alternatives based on the translation. Dr. Ranjan, an expert on Hindi pedagogy and South Asian languages for second-language learners, has contributed his thoughts on various words and connotations referenced throughout this chapter.

but also as an issue in the news itself. Hindi-Urdu, Hindi-English, or Hindi-[insert any other regional language here] fissures consistently enter political debate and news space in India; the former dyad especially has a complex historical divide related to identity, nationalism, and religion (Brass, 2005). The issue of language and including excerpts from "other" language presses on editorial pages signals the fraught differences throughout various communities defined by languages. Within the borders of a single nation-state, communities consume different information through news, as evidenced by a column like "The Urdu Press" in an English paper. Even more, as seen in the 20 September 2019[6] column that includes an issue about defining national languages, there are politics and emotions to how people identify to their language. Chishti's column reveals how Indian journalists contend with journalists in other languages and how they bridge source language communities to target language communities. Undoubtedly, Indian journalists engage in this linguistic job process like foreign correspondents do (Hannerz, 2004), but, an important distinction is that Indian journalists are not foreign, diplomatically speaking, in the environments and communities they source for their stories.

More specific to this project, I am concerned with two moments in the multi-source translation situations of reporting: source interaction, i.e., when journalists engage in interviews, and writing the target language news. Indian journalists working for English-language publications conduct interviews, what I call the source interaction, and engage in a critical cosmopolitan exchange in which they, as English-language scribes with multilingual skills, exist in otherness to the sources they speak to in Hindi. Although they can identify with the linguistic community of a Hindi speaker, journalists possess many other identifiers, like class and

---

[6] https://indianexpress.com/article/opinion/columns/the-urdu-press-beyond-the-stars-6011377/

geography, that may influence a linguistic interaction. Through the act of translating, these journalists must engage the place of cosmopolitanism in their reporting to transmit information from a source population to a target reading population. The role of creativity in the writing process for Indian journalists engages power and agency to navigate pressures from media organizations, industry and political institutions, and socio-culturally defined publics. In representing various language publics within a story, journalists take on the source culture and inhabit space distinct from the reading public of the urban news cycles in order to present the source palatably to the audience.

This chapter provides the backdrop of an Indian linguistic collage — languages overlapping, intersecting, and never touching — to understand how language has influenced politics and the Indian media system(s) and how Indian journalists have developed writing processes in their multilingual profession and state. First, I trace histories of language politics and linguistic communities in India; this involves reflection on the postcolonial development of independent India and how language had significant presence in early politics of the nation. A key figure that emerges out of these linguistic politics in Indian history is the bilingual regional elite, and I propose that contemporary journalists fill this role. I look at how Indian journalists in this role may be poised and prepared for it through the journalism educational institutes that have arisen in the country since 1947 and the growing focus on linguistic journalisms within journalism schools and universities. The historical and cultural contributions of a place and society develop unique forms of journalism (Ståhlberg, 2006).

Second, I excavate some unique qualities of Indian journalism that lend the field to a study on translation in the reporting process (Rao, 2007; Rao & Wasserman, 2015; Ståhlberg,

2006). I consider the myriad contexts in which Indian journalists work and the challenges against journalistic work in India. I look at how the industry has created standards and protections for Indian journalists to do their reporting, but I also consider how Indian journalists across different language presses may face disparate opportunities and dangers to news reporting. This context shows how journalists contend with meso- and micro-level pressures on the job rooted in multilingualism.

Indian Language Politics

India sits at a juncture between more conservative, nationalistic political rhetoric focused around a fixed "unifying" identity - namely Hinduism - and a secular argument for diversity and global interactions and progress (Guha, 2005; Ram, 2011; Sen, 2005). Under such polarized notions of how India functions as a nation among other international powers, information silos into extremes, pumped to the public through an Indian media ecology saturated by hundreds of 24-hour broadcast news channels, thousands of publications in equally numerous languages, and radio airwaves tightly monitored by the government (Thomas, 2010; Thussu, 2012). In this milieu, India contends not only with rightist, leftist, or progressive stances but also with the layer that multilingualism adds to how news and information spread.

To study language within the profession of journalism in India requires a foundational understanding of language politics in the country and how identities and communities formed and changed around languages. Language politics have deep entanglements with India's progress constructing democracy, but worth noting, one single issue — linguistic identities in this case — cannot fully represent and articulate a nation's history (Tillin, 2013). In fact, this overview shows just one of many histories of Indian democracy building. As journalist Anand Giridharadas

(2011) writes in his book *India Calling*: “But this is India, and there was always a layer below the layer below the layer” (p. 173). Pre-independence from British rule, language had a role in social life across the South Asian region but did not serve as a predominant identifying feature of communities. This has changed over the past 200 years, and in India today, politicians and leaders have reimagined language as markers of identity connected to other identifiers like religion and homeland. Crucial to this project, journalists today operate within a socio-political context filtered in part by language identities, themselves marked by language as well as confronting language.

Issues of caste, class, geographies, and religion contributed prominently, and often more significantly than language, to a struggle for a unified country of India. Language politics in early independent India offered a moment of clarity in how to accommodate diversity in the nation. Language communities often sought recognition and representation over sovereignty or secession (Mitchell, 2009, p. 21; Pelinka, 2010, p. 482). For a new federal system of governance in India, in which the central Government of India grappled with the balance of control and influence on its newly organized states after a bitter partition at independence, these political ambitions were welcome exercises in how to accommodate diversity in the nation. Even so, within national borders hosting innumerable languages, language politics don’t always pan out idyllically in a deliberative forum or offer inclusive categories of identification; such is the case for India. Language politics at times have aided the agendas of certain communities playing to identity politics in order to define “Indian” in Hindu national terms (Mitchell, 2009). Hindi, sanitized of Urdu, incorporated more Sanskrit, a language tied intimately to Hinduism, so Hindi stood in for Hinduism.

The history of language politics necessarily includes the formation of linguistic identities and communities. One's (in)ability to engage in a language sets one apart from participation in various ways. Yet because of India's language diversity, "go-betweeners", as I broadly call them, bridge language divides in order to allow different populations to converse. The go-betweeners have existed in various forms as translators for ages — they are bilingual, trilingual, even multilingual speakers. India depicted as a multilingual country comes with an assumption of multilingual citizens without the need of go-betweeners. Census data helps perpetuate this when in reality, a vast majority of the country functions unilingually, in other words predominantly communicating in one linguistic register even if a person knows several. Unilingualism can feel multilingual as one passes through different geographic and social regions, but that passing between regions and geographies assumes a privilege of movement unavailable to many, such as women and lower caste communities. Therefore, an individual's multilingual ability subsumes certain privileges (literacy) and locations (urban-rural) in India. Many Indian journalists, by proxy of their profession, can serve as a spotlight to understand these multilingual identities.

Indian journalists inevitably have linguistic identities by way of citizenship, region, and profession. Based on their spoken and written abilities, journalists have identities that differentiate them from non-journalists. They are included as go-betweeners, those individuals able to proficiently engage across languages. The engagement of journalists puts everyone's linguistic identities on guard; every interaction has an effect on an individual that may cause them to rethink their own stances and identities. Especially journalists reporting bilingually, their source interaction can commence within similar identity groups, but their ability to cross to another language group then differentiates them from the former and can cause both source and

journalist to reflect on what their interaction means in terms of voice and agency in a more national context.

This section considers India's multilingual history with particular interest in the development of linguistic identities. Because this project points mainly to Hindi-English moments of translation, I focus particularly on these two, but in order to understand these two languages today, it is imperative to consider other lingua franca in India that have heralded an era of Hindi and English reign, particularly, Urdu and Hindustani. Scholars conceptualize multilingualism in India as a spectrum or continuum (Pollock 1998, in de Swaan, 2001, p. 65) — major languages exist at populous points and disseminate, dilute, and mix as one moves to peripheries and into new language zones. This continuum metaphor applied to the journalistic context in this project becomes clearer as this section progresses. I proceed with a brief history of India's national language creation. This includes a glance back to the nineteenth century to understand the development of Hindi as a stand alone language that rose to political significance during the independence movement and involved grappling with English as an official medium of communication to mitigate the reluctance to adopt Hindi. Following this history, I concentrate on the idea of linguistic identity and how people come to accept languages as identifiers. This uncovers how individual language identity influences a person's everyday interactions as well as work. This returns us to the journalist, identified both personally and professionally by language.

Indian History in Language, Indian Language in History

An important predecessor to summarize a history of India's linguistic politics: for centuries language played very little role in political rule or as a unifying identity (Brass, 2005; Mitchell, 2009, pp. 2, 10, 14-5; Tillin, 2013, p. 208). Language had a utilitarian function, which

is not without discriminating definitions[7]; languages existed for law, for religions, for commerce, for art. To understand language as a tool rather than identifier is key to tracing the development of language politics in South Asia. Other categories of identification, like caste, certainly influenced the use of language, but language did not serve to segregate or oppress. People learned languages for certain functions, not for an overall collective, communicative understanding. Common language existed, but common language incorporated fusions of functional languages without the specialized vocabulary.

Prior to British rule, the South Asian region — encompassing modern-day India, Pakistan, and Bangladesh, and to some extent areas of Nepal, Bhutan, Sri Lanka, Afghanistan, and Myanmar — functioned as a tapestry of kingdoms not secured by borders, tax systems, and laws, but heavily influenced by trade roots via land and water eventually solidified by alliances with the British (Albinia, 2008). This tapestry of kingdoms that eventually succumbed to British colonial rule included a collage of languages. Because many of these kingdoms consisted of land commandeered by Mughal rulers, the royal language of Urdu, with its Persio-Arabic script, served specifically to record the literary arts of courts but mixed with the local styles of speech so that no one language served the entire region; rather a mix of distinguishable and mostly comprehensible vocabulary emerged as Hindustani. Realistically, Hindustani and Urdu were equivalent languages, one with a script (King, 1994; Srivastava, 1995). Hindustani stretched across a lateral swatch of the region, covering the center geography and heading west, and melded into Urdu and offshoots of languages closer to Persian and Arabic. Hindustani served as

---

[7] "Utilitarian function" aligns with definitions of caste in India — certain groups could perform certain tasks dependent on the caste identifier. Caste for an individual is determined by birth. However, while language connected to utilities, it was not the concept of importance in a person's identity. A person could only be one caste but could know multiple languages in order to navigate a functional world.

connective tissue for various functional languages. To the east, Hindustani gradually morphed through local languages until Bengali reigned. South of the Hindustani patch, the major languages of Dravidian decent (Tamil, Kannada, and Telugu) superimposed elements of the Sanskrit script but eventually masked Hindustani with their distinct origins. Throughout South Asia, languages have never easily started and stopped at borders - village, state, or national. Rather, as mentioned before, they have existed on a continuum or spectrum with axes in multiple dimensions (Pollock 1998, in de Swaan, 2001).

Much of the turmoil of the independence moment in India in August 1947 has rightfully been attributed to British colonial oppression and looting of the region. However, on the language front, the British, fascinated by the royal court language of Urdu, actually contributed to upholding language traditions in South Asia. During poetry recitations and concerts in the princely palaces and forts across the region, the British admired the cadence of the language and the calligraphy ornamenting the arches and walls. British colonial leaders patronized Urdu scholars in order to learn the linguistic traditions of Urdu. In other parts of the region (modern-day South India) during this time, the European conquerors (Portuguese and French) studied Sanskrit with Hindu priests, similarly fascinated by the script and unique sounds of the ancient religious language; notably, Hinduism extended well beyond the southern region of the area, and many adherents only knew Sanskrit through spoken prayers offered at temples and usually through a Brahmin priest (Albinia, 2008; Sen, 2005). As another constituency of the British Raj (kingdom) arrived in the subcontinent — Christian missionaries — Urdu, Sanskrit, and the surfeit of other languages used in South Asia for varying purposes posed a threat to their proselytizing dreams. Through convent schools, missionaries installed English education in the

region, and an expanding echelon of educated, English-speaking elites graduated into British administrative and military circles, now groomed to engage coherently with British official (Albinia, 2008).

In the mid-nineteenth century, a delegation of Hindu priests convened to develop their own elevated version of Hindustani to compete with Urdu, what they saw as a Muslim language being bolstered by the British (King, 1994, in Srivastava, 1995). They considered the establishment of a Hindu-ized language as an oppositional step against the British; the colonial power supported Urdu study, which linked them to supporting Islam in the minds of the Hindu priests, and adhered to Christianity through English. To develop their own language variety, they believed, meant to create a unique script and purge Hindustani of overt Persio-Arabic, read as Islamic, vocabulary. The Hindu leaders fashioned characters resembling the Sanskrit script, their specialized Hindu language positioned farther away from Hindustani than Urdu was on a continuum of language but reflective of their Hindu heritage; the script became known as the Nagari script. They wrote Hindi dictionaries that replaced Persio-Arabic words with those more likened to Sanskrit. In other words, in this language movement, Hindi should be considered Hindu. The Hindi-language movement marked the shift from functional language as a tool to cultural language as an identifier through Islamizing Urdu in order to divide Hindustani in a region living rather harmoniously in religious diversity. The effort to install Hindi as a viable language to the masses involved first a call for elites to write literature in Hindi (Srivastava, 1995). By the early twentieth century, the success of the movement was evinced in the growing publications of literary and academic works in Hindi; however, Urdu continued to dominate in newspaper print (p. 224). Still, the more significant contribution that the Hindi movement made

during the 1920s as talks of independence gained voice against the British was to define something separate from the colonizers, to create through language “a loosely unified nation, not a coherent nation” (p. 228).

Even so, as the independence movement gathered speed, a common language eluded members of the Indian National Congress (Congress), the main organizing party of the movement. Many Congress leaders, like the pillars Mohandas Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, and Muhammad Ali Jinnah, were children of missions-educated British civil servants who sent their children to English-medium schools and university in London, but these Anglo-Indian children returned to India critical of colonial rule. They were exposed to other parts of the British Raj, in England and South Africa, that more clearly revealed British oppression and inequality. They penned criticism against the British and began to call for freedom from the British (Chaudhuri, 2010; Mazumdar, 2019). These same leaders — Gandhi, Nehru and Jinnah were all conferred with law degrees — established their own media houses to disseminate news of the freedom struggle (Murthy, 2011, 28).

By now, the Urdu-Hindi split had crystallized, but the Indian National Congress recognized that to confront the British with demands for independence, they would have to speak and write in English — they needed to communicate with publics back in England and other British colonies to garner support for their cause, and the unifying language came from the colonizers (Bayly, 2009; Jaffrelot, 2002; Jayal, 2013; Orsini, 2009). In retaliation, the British threatened to censor the Congress leaders’ English-language materials, but the leaders had other languages, many unintelligible to the British, to combat the silencing. Writers in regional-language presses continued fervently to circulate disruptive information against the British in

order to rally support for the independence movement beyond the English-speaking elite leaders (Bayly, 2009; Jayal, 2013; Orsini, 2009). The information circulated during the independence movement served as the first iteration of an "Indian" journalism. Under colonial rule, the British controlled what information reached the public in any sort of regular way of news. Ideas circulated through literature written in regional languages, often in critical language undetectable to the British until popular uprisings indicated some way that the colonial subjects were gaining insight to colonial oppression. Thus the British toggled between preventing and allowing regional language literature that might foment opposition, recognizing that to censor languages incomprehensible to the British would further instill distrust and anger in the colonial subjects but also that as the colonial power the British could with great force and brutality stifle communication. As a clear independence movement gained traction and the British attacked regional language literature, these publishers, notably in Bengali literary circles, shifted to English to directly confront the British in their vernacular and to fully comprehend the message of freedom (Chaudhuri, 2010). As the media houses of returning Anglo-Indian leaders took shape in South Asia, offering an organized and regularized way of publishing information as news, Indian journalism established an ethos of critical analysis and confrontation against power (Chaudhuri, 2010).

In 1947, India gained independence from Britain, but not without significant compromises. The region split into India and Pakistan, the borders drawn by a British official working off of rudimentary census data collected by the colonial government and instructed to cater to religious groupings, namely Hindu and Muslim. The haphazard division, known as Partition, resulted in a mass migration of people to their respective religious territories, and in

turn, extreme violence. In the aftermath, the new leadership, Nehru and the Indian National Congress, wanted to uphold the premise of secularism that had caused a schism for the leaders in Congress. This division had resulted in the fractionalizing of the party and emergence of the Muslim League under Jinnah's influence. The Muslim League gained a separate Islamic nation, Pakistan, in the Partition, but a nation of two parts, East and West, with vastly different linguistic traditions that would, decades later, erupt into the Bangladesh LiberationWar (Albinia, 2008; Giridharadas, 2011; Jaffrelot, 2002).

India entered the global stage post-World War II as a new democracy and needed to assert itself as a viable player in the world order. The Congress leaders recognized the need for unified communication within the country but also wanted to give up the shackles of colonialism that echoed from the English language. Gandhi adhered to Hindustani in his efforts to reach the subaltern and common man, those both lettered and illiterate (de Swaan, 2001, p. 70). Nehru famously struggled with Hindi, raised on an English education in London (Giridharadas, 2011). Jinnah had taken Urdu with Pakistan, although he, like Nehru, felt more at ease in English (Albinia, 2008). While Gandhi and others fought for Hindustani, some Congress leaders refused to support it, seeing it as too closely tied to Urdu (de Swaan, 2001, p. 71). A contingent proposed Hindi as a national language, but leaders from south Indian states, the Dravidian-language zone, revolted (Orsini, 2009).

Before emerging from colonial rule, the people indigenous to the region had existed in a condition of "vernacular cosmopolitanism", a term coined by Homi Bhabha (1996), a space of accepting cultural difference in everyday life while maintaining communal identity common to migrant communities oppressed alongside other groups by colonial power (Bhabha, 1996; Huat,

2020). British rule had caused socio-cultural shifts, not least of which was a sociolinguistic shift in Hindustani, that endured peacefully under colonialism, making the condition of vernacular cosmopolitanism seem ideal to unite new citizens in an independent state. In reality, the multi-cultural identities that had codified around things like language and religion became untenable in a society of these diverse groups trying to emerge from oppression and assert dominance (Ganesh, 2008; Huat, 2020, p. 53). This vernacular cosmopolitanism to unite around the independent state actually unraveled into separatist, fundamentalist ideas. Tied to this ideological split, Urdu, Hindustani, and Hindi became contentious not because of the vocabularies themselves but because of the identities now entwined with the languages: Urdu-Islam-elitism; Hindi-Hindu-piety; Hindustani-the common-illiteracy.

In the postcolonial debate for an Indian national language, the situation of uniting states under one federal rule linguistically seemed tenuous. How would the leaders communicate to a nation of many languages? How, as leaders representing diverse linguistic areas, would they communicate with each other? How could they establish an Indian national identity unique from its colonial predecessor if they didn't reject the colonial language? The solution was untidy and temporary. The new leaders had to face a reality that their educated, elite position in the country meant their common vernacular was English. Hindi couldn't be dismissed though. Political platforms had well established a Hindi-Hindu connection to influence the Hindu majority population against Pakistan's Islamic Republic, and after the violent exodus of Partition, Hindu identity seemed more salient against the secular call of government. Still, the southern states, somewhat willing to attach to a Hindu identity, drew the line at Hindi. They had no connection to

Hindi and would not allow North Indian culture to dominate and conquer like the British had (Orsini, 2009).

The authors of the Indian Constitution tried to sort out the language dilemma in the document's Eighth Schedule[8]. Here, English and Hindi served as the first league of languages in India (Pelinka, 2010, p. 482), meaning official government work and communication could carry on in either language. Provisionally for 15 years, English would be the transitional language so that in the adolescence of the nation, the vernacular cosmopolitan communities could establish themselves and see how language played out (Mitchell, 2009, p. 26) — the government would find out before the expiry date if language identities would crush vernacular cosmopolitanism. At two points, five years and fifteen years after the ratification of the Constitution, the President of India had to appoint a committee to evaluate the role of Hindi and of English in the country to determine if Hindi had gained support and if English could be phased out. According to the Constitution, English is still the language of the courts.

When the Constitution was ratified in 1949, 12 other languages[9] were included in the Eighth Schedule as official languages of one or more states; thus, state-level governance could be handled in those corresponding languages. This number would increase in the 1950s and 1960s as political parties began to structure themselves around language politics and demands for official language recognition in the Constitution as well as statehood. Nehru had been against defining states in the Indian federation by linguistic lines, fearing secessionist movements that would sever the ties binding the fragile nation (Tillin, 2013, p. 8). In 1956, the Telugu-language

---

[8] https://www.india.gov.in/sites/upload_files/npi/files/coi-eng-schedules_1-12.pdf

[9] Assamese, Bengali, Gujarati, Kannada, Malayalam, Marathi, Oriya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Tamil, Telugu, Urdu

movement successfully petitioned for statehood after an arduous struggle by language activists in Madras in the South, culminating in the death of leader Potti Sriramulu from a fast-unto death. The States Reorganization Act 1956 went into effect days later (Mitchell, 2009, p. 2). Today, 22 languages are listed with many other requests to add languages to the Eighth Schedule. The first move to restructure states within the belt of land in North and Central India where Hindi is spoken, known as the Hindi heartland, occurred in 2000 and signaled significant activity from a region that overall had faired poorly in terms of development indicators since independence (Tillin, 2013, pp. 2-3). Language movements continue to arise in India, seeking statehood and recognition in the Eighth Schedule as a viable political language of the nation.

While the Eighth Schedule of the Indian Constitution legitimized language, the architects of the constitution in Article 19 wanted to preserve free speech in the new democracy to legitimize journalism, especially after the censorship enacted by the British. However, the national leaders also understood the power of media as an oppositional force against power, and as they tried to display a strong front to the new Indian public, Indian journalism, with its newly established ethos of serving criticism to power, posed a threat to the fragile peace the leaders were trying to create post-Partition. The national leaders, Nehru now at the helm as Prime Minister, expected that the media in infant India would help bolster the message of democratic progress and the economic self-reliance of the nation against established world influence (Chaudhuri, 2010). However, amidst the communal violence of Partition, writers had criticized the actions and reactions of the two new national governments, India and Pakistan, and rather than outright support for the Government of India's proposed efforts, the media questioned and pressured national leaders in the ways they intended to define the country. Thus, Article 19 in the

Constitution set out to protect free speech and expression, but with caveats to appease religious and social sentiment (Lal, 2014).

Article 19 explicitly lists freedom of speech, expression, and assembly but does not directly reference press or media; while notable, it isn't clear whether this was an intentional omission by the authors of the Constitution, and legal challenges over the decades have offered judicial rulings to establish press inclusion under Article 19 (Ram, 2011, p. 26). However, an oft repeated phrase throughout the Constitution diminished these freedoms: "reasonable restrictions". These restrictions continued in several subclauses of Article 19 to articulate various occasions in which the State could legally infringe on these freedoms. One such example, referenced throughout the Constitution, was threats to sentiments, which has played out in legal cases put forth by the Government of India against journalists who the government deems has written something offensive to any religion (although more often Hinduism). Words censored by the government vary according to language; for example, the Hindi word *chamar*, signifying an untouchable caste with no direct translation in English. Today, untouchables largely agree on the name Dalit, although technically speaking caste has been outlawed from India. Thus, on two levels, printing the word *chamar* both acknowledges casteist practice while also offending those who still identify with the historical oppression of caste. The one word exemplifies the way that language holds complex meanings that can come into play in a media environment. The way in which the Government of India, more specifically the courts, confers about how communities find offense to certain words and whether such words are offensive and the word use thereof punishable is deeply political. It depends on the identification of a community to begin and

active political mobility to make a grievance. Journalists may recognize this and grapple with using terms untranslated or translating to bypass criminal charges.

Returning to the historical contexts, following the ratification of the Indian constitution, the new government set to work establishing an Indian political, economic, and social culture. Nehru's vision of how to foster self reliance through the Indian economy involved heavy government regulations and licensing, what became known as the License Raj, in order to limit business from growing into out of control monopolies and to protect Indian citizens with labor laws so that they could prosper and rise out of poverty (Giridharadas, 2011; Jaffrelot, 2002; Thussu, 2012). Media houses and news organizations, however, were not included as businesses regulated by the License Raj. News organizations and journalists struggled to find their fit in a new government and economy so focused on industry; journalists had received little protections under Article 19 to carry out their work, and the media organizations, small in number, paid journalists wages insufficient to sustain a living, requiring many journalists, if not from wealthy elite backgrounds, to take on other jobs and pursue reporting more as a side project. This did not foster a ripe media environment that drew new journalists into the profession. Eventually, journalists spoke out and began to make demands of the government to take note of their profession (Koushik, 2018). In 1955, after commission meetings and audits of the working conditions of journalists in India, the government passed the Working Journalists and Other Newspaper Employees (Conditions of Service) and Miscellaneous Provisions Act to lay out fair wages and protections to Indian journalists against exploitative news organizations monopolizing the media industry in the license raj (Koushik, 2018, p. 81). This in essence solidified an industry and community of journalists, although their collective identity was imagined. Alongside the Act,

the government constituted the Registrar of Newspapers for India the next year as an auditor and watchdog over media organizations' actions. While it offered some protection for journalists, they still faced pushback under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, from the business side of their organizations (p. 85). Since 1955, six wage boards have convened under the Ministry of Labour and Employment to reevaluate the journalism industry and its treatment of journalists. By involving the Ministry of Labour and Employment, journalism had to contend with the idea of journalists as laborers controlled by a supervising entity, the news organization. Thus, the work of journalism risked becoming the purview of news business rather than a democratic device for the public.

In the decades to come, journalism in India stagnated, like the Indian economy, because of the license raj. A critical decade of the 1970s with the Bangladesh Liberation War in 1971 and the Emergency Rule under Indira Gandhi from 1975 to 1977 brought significant press censorship, but by the 1980s, the Indian newspaper business began to see growth, especially in small markets (Desai, 2017, p. 115). By the 1990s, the Nehruvian License Raj was in crisis, having limited any substantial industrial growth in the economy and cutting it off from any global market flows. In 1991 the government ended the license raj in order to allow private business and trade (Mukherji, 2008; Thussu, 2012). Opening the economy meant inviting the interest of multi-national corporations (Rao & Wasserman, 2015). Suddenly, corporate conglomerates wanted to snatch up information and technology services, including news organizations, to add to their business portfolios. Multi-national corporations entered the media market through private channels and thus gave Indian audiences hundreds of options to consume content (Kumar, 2004, p. 97; Ninan, 2007; Rao & Wasserman, 2015, p. 653; Thomas, 2010, p.

83; Thussu, 2012). The presence of multi-national corporations connected the Indian market to the global economy, and thus news and information from India could spread to the world. A new demand for English-language writers in multi-national organizations and conglomerated media groups gave journalists new opportunities and higher salaries under international ownership.

With private individuals and industrial houses monopolizing media ownership, the content of Indian news suddenly changed and the role of journalism in Indian society redefined. Commercialized news coverage became a premium commodity to other economic sectors in ways detrimental to the circulation of critical and diverse opinions related to the distribution of power in the nation (Kumar, 2004, pp. 97-8; Thomas, 2010, pp. 89-91). Business and financial news became an obsession, dominating the scroll on news channels (Ray, 2012, pp. 107-9; Thussu, 2007, p. 600). In the process of privatization, media blurred the line between information and advertisement; the news reader was a consumer, not of information but whatever advertisements could run between the folds. Advertisers realized that the Indian market consisted of many different interest groups and that language pinpointed certain social groups that in turn demonstrated different consumer habits; for example Hindi speakers, partly due to their emergence to the middle class in the decades after independence, wanted to buy new home technologies, like washing machines and microwaves (Lagerkvist, 2009; Ninan, 2007). Companies could spend more money in the Hindi-language press than other vernacular presses to draw in dedicated customers (Ninan, 2007), but advertisements took up space, reducing what news could fit in the pages (Rao & Wasserman, 2015). The open economy and media competition affected the quality and content of news, targeting different communities, especially through language. For example, national-level politics largely catered to the interest of English-

language markets because the national government conducted itself in English. Business news catered to Hindi because the burgeoning middle class wanted to learn how to make more money.

While the economy boomed through the 1990s for multi-national corporations in India, the economy for the lower and middle classes hadn't carried fortune and stability. By the 2000s, people sought change in political power. Government rule had for several terms flipped between the Congress Party, which had held a stronghold on government since independence, and the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), a conservative party heavily backed by Hindu-nationalist organizations. In 2014, the BJP won national elections and named Narendra Modi as Prime Minister. Since then, BJP leaders have bolstered the narrative of a Hindu India, and the notion of Hindi as a Hindu language has gained a political platform to exemplify Hindu pride and support and as a way to give India a unique international identifier with its own widely-spoken national language.[10]

The new millennium also carried in a digital wave to India, and the political and technological changes hit the Indian media sphere (Philipose, 2019). Digital technology through smartphones put information into more hands and households. Wifi networks became affordable to the lower classes. News organizations began to focus on digital platforms and delivering content through mobile technology. In 2011, the shift became clear — mass mobilizations brought social movements against the government and corruption. Alternative news outlets sprang up to challenge corporate newspeak and to more directly confront the government on the basis of public demands through protest. Thussu (2013) describes a more critical alternative

---

[10] "Why Amit Shah Thinks Hindi is the Language of National Integration" on 16 September 2019: https://www.indiatoday.in/india-today-insight/story/why-amit-shah-thinks-hindi-is-the-language-of-national-integration-1599506-2019-09-16

press in India that will take shape as the number of educated Indians increases and the media landscape transforms with technology (p. 162). In the last five years, senior journalists and editors have embarked on developing digital news sites explicitly designed to criticize the government and take firm positions on socio-political issues — these sites haven't just been in English. The topic of global dissemination of information online usually assumes it is published in English, but realistically, technology has worked for decades to accommodate multiple languages and facilitate multilingual interactions online and through mobile technology (Anthes, 2010; Dabari, 1999). A growing number of sites founded by English-speaking elite have turned to Hindi-speaking writers and editors to join the newsrooms, not always in separate language editions. Developers have taken note of language markets to improve the interface of diverse scripts and dictionaries. Around the world, the spread of global information as a commodity contributes to establishing a global culture (Lagerkvist, 2009, p. 368; Thussu, 2012, p. 278), which for a place like India already juggling many reading publics adds another layer of internationally engaged, sometimes through the diaspora, English-speaking audiences (Chaudhuri, 2010; Rao & Wasserman, 2015). However, news still circulates through large media corporations and conglomerates in India, and while the alternative media has put pressure on the industry to re-examine the priorities of news, media corporations have found ways to reframe the story to focus on the same message. News still revolves around economic development and lauds progress at any cost, reframing issues of inequality and poverty, still rampant in the region, as opportunities (Chakravartty & Schiller, 2010, p. 684) or overlooking these issues altogether because they do not adhere to a narrative of economic growth (Rao & Wasserman, 2015). Journalists within mainstream organizations contend with translating messages of socio-political

crises into positive steps for the country, and thus as go-betweens for very different segments of society through their reporting, they take agency over information in contentious ways.

Hindi in Perspective: Multilingualism and Journalists

Multilingualism in India creates identifiers of overlap and exclusion that determine the spaces that individuals can inhabit, as well as the information they can access. Hindi is a complicated juncture on a multilingual spectrum which speaks to the animosity over the language as some umbrella official language when in reality Hindustani better represents the assemblage of languages in the region. Census data helps conceptualize the spread. In 2011, 57 languages were filed under Hindi.[11] On the census, surveyors asked respondents to name their mother tongue; this returned 19,569 different languages in India that then underwent "linguistic methods for rational grouping" that classified them into the 22 scheduled languages. These numbers clearly contribute to Hindi as a majority language of India with 528,347,193 speakers, but across all these myriad forms, the language is not totally intelligible or communicable. To compare, 259,678 Indians recorded English as their mother tongue, with 127,033 calling Hindi their chosen first language, referring to the subsidiary language they learned in school. Alternatively, for those with Hindi as a mother tongue, only 32,018,890 named English as their chosen first language. The next census will report in 2021, and the numbers will increase as the country has seen significant growth in the last decade, although the distribution and density of language may not significantly change. These numbers show the linguistic collage of India, a continuum of languages that can overlap and complicate linguistic associations, and in the context of imagined reading publics, it becomes daunting to identify who writes to whom.

---

[11] Census of India, 2011

Because this project centers on New Delhi, it is important to understand the language landscape in the megalopolis as well as to understand its role in language politics throughout the country since it is the seat of the central government. The Central Government of India since independence has grappled with the degree of power to exert over its now 28 states and 8 union territories. In terms of language politics, it has maintained a role as a mediator for linguistic turmoil in the states and has set up fairly strict terms under which language garners statehood — namely, language demands for statehood must relate only to language and culture, not at all to religion, and must gain support for statehood from other linguistic groups in the region (Brass, 2005, pp. 18-9). Even with this mediating role in linguistic politics, ultimately, the decision of statehood rests with national leaders sitting in New Delhi, conducting all functions of the legislature and judiciary in English and Hindi. In 2011, there were 14,255,526 Hindi speakers in New Delhi, that is as a mother tongue, with 4,171,521 marking English as their first subsidiary language. Compared to today's population in the city, it is still less than half of its residents, but the city has exponentially grown in the last decade. Only 6,236 individuals named English as their mother tongue, and more than half, exactly 3,979 people, had Hindi as subsidiary.

Many people, as the census shows, consider English as a second language. Census instructions assert that the surveyor cannot determine if a person really knows a language; they are to trust the respondent. To what degree the English-as-a-subsidiary-language people actually know or use English cannot be determined. Most likely, these respondents reside in small to megacities where international commerce invites English engagement. Hindi, as mentioned earlier, encompasses an array of types, 57 in 2011, which means that this population may be speaking nearly Hindi but not always meaning the same thing. Hindi is recognized throughout

the country as a necessity, even though to some regions an inconvenient one, if one wants to succeed in politics or business at the national level. In many schools in states not dominated by Hindi, students learn English and another subsidiary language. None of this should minimize the power of Hindi in India. As the primary language in the northern geographical swatch, it holds sway (Tillin, 2013, p. 3). The state of Uttar Pradesh has immense influence on Indian politics — it is busting at its seams by population, poverty, industry, communalism, and religiosity. Other states like Chhattisgarh and Rajasthan, also Hindi states, are respectively the poorest[12] and the largest by land area. So much can happen within these zones that affect the law and order of the whole country when the central government in New Delhi responds. Plus, New Delhi lies in the heart of the Hindi heartland, surrounded by Hindi-dominant states, with Punjab the nearest state with an alternative official language to Hindi. Because of the great influence that Hindi holds over politics and information in India (The Media Rumble, 2020), journalists may contend with how they contribute to the domination of Hindi in India, although this may not be so evident in the way journalists of different languages relate.

English has a presence across India, though relegated to government and international relations mainly. Because of its status in the Constitution, it is a required subject in schools — as a subsidiary language if not an English-medium school. For a majority of India, English stays in school (de Swaan, 2001, p. 62). Some Indian children either have no access to elementary school or drop out before completing elementary education because of poverty and demands to work for their families' survival. Even if for children who do finish school, English taught as a subsidiary language, often by teachers incompetent to teach English, does not typically give students

[12] https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Publications/PDFs/14TABLE9AA846828C16454182612FF9B7172C0F.PDF

sufficient proficiency in everyday English speaking contexts. Those who really learn English with some level of fluency either attend English-medium schools, mostly for the privileged upper class and caste children, or enroll in English tuition courses (after-school tutoring or certificate programs) to pursue better opportunities in India's megacities or internationally, armed with stilted, formally learned English (de Swaan, 2001). English holds immense power in India as a ticket out but represents a minuscule population of speakers who truly engage proficiently in the language.

While educational mandates have designed a curriculum to foster a multilingual public, the reality may be much different. Bilingualism and multilingualism largely coincide with urban populations confronted regularly with several languages, or at least Hindi and English. Multilingualism does not necessarily assume literacy. Comprehending English aurally does not mean reading an English newspaper or responding to English questions in English; likewise with Hindi. Of course, even with literary multilingualism, individuals have preferences, maybe for a mother tongue or the language of their schooling. So while a majority of Indians have exposure to multiple languages throughout their lives, the majority of Indian citizens actually interact unilingually (de Swaan, 2001, p. 63). To actually engage multilingually in India requires education and privilege (p. 63).

Keeping in mind all these caveats to multilingualism in regards to media consumption, the range of literacy and proficiency levels might influence what newspapers people choose to read. From the Registrar of Newspaper for India (RNI) annual audit in 2017-18, Hindi circulation overall in India was 195,621,990, and English 53,453,564. As mentioned earlier in the chapter, English-language writing predominated the independence movement and in turn

served as the language of early Indian journalism. By the 1980s, following several decades that heralded linguistic social movements for statehood along language identities, Hindi-language and regional media surpassed English in newspaper circulation (Desai, 2017, p. 114; Ram, 2011, p. 8), although media organizations and news operated mostly as small business ventures until the 1990s (Desai, 2017, p. 115). While circulation numbers do not give us details about the readers, we can hypothesize that many Hindi readers may understand English, considering the census data presented before, but prefer to read in Hindi. Something else to consider outside the numbers is even more impactful to this research: what language do the sources of news speak? It is this question that brings journalists to a crucial crossroad in the reporting process in India.

Journalists serve as modern-day go-betweeners, a sociolinguistic bridge from their interview sources to the reader. When working between Hindi and English, in other words interviewing in Hindi and writing in English, Indian journalists very likely interact with sources unable to access the journalists' texts. The readership for English news, larger than the readership of news of some large countries, still represents a small portion of the overall population in India. However, like foreign correspondents, English-language journalists in India offer global coverage of their country, whether to interested foreigners or members of India's diaspora, the NRI (non-resident Indian) community. Indian journalists who are able to easily work between languages betray their privileged background — not all journalists, especially those writing for regional-language presses, can actually go between and are therefore left out of crucial spaces of reporting. For example, Hindi journalists often do not cover Indian courts, convened in English. Do Indian journalists working in-between realize their part as multilingual translators for the nation?

In India today, language lies bifurcated between a necessary tool to communicate and an identifying characteristic that discriminates. Since Indian independence, journalism has followed a fluctuating pattern, and language has played a part in establishing journalism principles in India. It is important to extend from the historical context into the contemporary ways that a place's unique foundations, struggles, and cultures have helped create distinct journalism practices (Ståhlberg, 2006). Journalists teeter between this, mediating through language, especially English-language journalists sourcing largely from Hindi or regional languages, but likewise Hindi- and regional-language journalists, and through culture, like urban-rural, literate-illiterate, or conservative-liberal; these distanced populations have considerable impact on one another even without direct contact, namely through voting. This section considers how literate individuals choose to take on a role in the go-between of languages to become journalists and how they are prepared in this role to specifically engage different linguistic fields.

On the one hand, consider the previous discussion on multilingual India — India itself is a multilingual mass made of unilingual individuals except for those functioning as go-betweeners. Go-betweeners, referring broadly to translators, may work exactly in that space as translators, but also include journalists, who write in one or two languages and engage sources in as many, or second-language teachers, who work in a Hindi-medium school but teach English language. Many other go-betweeners exist in India — for example, doctors educated in English-language medical schools but working in government or private hospitals with patients predominantly speaking Hindi or a regional language. On the other hand, focusing on journalism as the go-between — a prescribed identifier in order to be included as a member of the professional journalistic community is literacy; arguably an overarching journalism community

encompasses sources and audiences, but the go-betweeners of the community are the journalists. Journalism requires the ability to read and write, unilingually or multilingually. Even journalists who work unilingually, that is report and write in one language, such as a local Tamil-language journalist who interviews sources only in Tamil, still function as go-betweeners by bringing cultural stories to a readership; however, this project focuses on the bilingual or multilingual reporters. To understand how journalism as an industry confronts multilingualism in the profession, a look at journalism education offers insights into how journalists choose what language to work in and how to work in language.

University education in pre-independence South Asia and subsequently in early postcolonial India saw journalism programs situated in language departments, but by and large, journalism education was inconsequential to newspaper owners (Desai, 2017, p. 113). In these early journalism programs, teaching concentrated on language purity in writing rather than reporting skills (Desai, 2017, p. 119). Following a study conducted by UNESCO in 1961 of university education, including journalism programs, India's landscape of journalism training began to shift (p. 120). Initially, Indian journalism education relied on the influence of American and British media theory and education models to teach reporting (Bhaskaram, et al., 2019, p. 161; Desai, 2017, p. 119; Murthy, 2011, p. 26). This meant that journalism education came in English (Desai 2017, p. 123). Indians trained in U.S. institutions returned to establish journalism programs, or American scholars were consulted to help establish journalism curricula; however, these institutions tended to concentrate on Western principles of reporting and to ignore local contexts of journalism (p. 119). The Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) was conceptualized in 1965 following the UNESCO study by an American scholar and began

teaching with a post-graduate diploma course in journalism for developing countries.[13] IIMC is considered one of the earlier institutions that focused solely on journalism, and because it was a government initiative, IIMC adhered to the linguistic requirements of the state to conduct instruction in English. IIMC has several campuses across India and notably four post-graduate diploma programs in journalism, differentiated by language: Hindi, English, Odia, and Urdu.

Journalism programs today have expanded from the language departments into full-fledged departments or schools of their own (Thussu, 2012). In India, some 700-plus universities offer degrees in mass communication, and as of 2017, two state universities and one national university were established solely as journalism schools (Desai, 2017, p. 114). One school has a reputation[14] as a premier journalism school in India, the Asian College of Journalism in Chennai — the school appears to offer courses in English-language only and have no language-specific curriculum. This differs from many other university programs, and for the sake of focus on this project, I present a brief survey of how language enters journalism education courses in major New Delhi institutions.

New Delhi harbors a multitude of educational institutions administering post-secondary degrees, but the big names in public universities are the University of Delhi (DU)[15], Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU)[16], and Jamia Millia Islamia (Jamia)[17]. Within many academic programs

---

[13] iimc.nic.in

[14] Based on anecdotal observations from interviews, lectures, and other events in which people off-handedly made reference to ACJ (Asian College of Journalism) as a journalism program apart from all others.

[15] www.du.ac.in

[16] www.jnu.ac.in

[17] www.jmi.ac.in

not directly linked to journalism, professors try to prepare students who will engage with journalism, whether as public intellectuals or in careers as journalists (Desai, 2017, p. 125). These professors recognize the convergence of interdisciplinary fields and the way that media tend to circumnavigate through them. At DU, the Departments of Hindi and Urdu still offer degrees related to journalism or media more broadly: respectively, Post-Graduate Diploma in Hindi Journalism and Post Master's Diploma in Urdu Translation and Mass Media. Other departments teach courses tied to issues in media alongside their primary focus, like literature. The university lists a Post MA Diploma in Translation and Mass Media, although no details are provided about coursework or departments that host students enrolled in this program. DU has established the Delhi School of Journalism with a five year integrated program in journalism offered in Hindi or English, awarding students a Bachelor's and Master's degree upon completion. An important component of the program requires students to study four foreign (French Spanish, Chinese, Arabic) and two regional (Tamil, Bengali) languages. Shifting to Jamia, the university's A.J.K. Mass Communication Research Centre (MCRC) has a reputation among journalists, especially broadcast, as a top graduate program. MCRC offers only post graduate degree programs broadly in Mass Communication, with some specialized degrees in fields like Convergent Journalism, Development Communication, Animation, and Broadcast Technology. It does not specifically address language; however the Departments of Hindi and Urdu, like at Delhi University, have post graduate diplomas in Journalism (Hindi Medium) and Urdu Mass Media. The Department of Hindi also allows for an Honours B.A. focused on Mass Media Hindi. Finally, JNU has no department specific to journalism or mass communication but does house the Centre for Media Studies for Masters of Philosophy and Ph.D. degrees where, as

their website expresses, one area of research that students might pursue is in linguistic and regional diversities.

The above in no way covers an exhaustive study of journalism education at these institutions, let alone a complete overview of India's journalism institutions; other scholars have taken on some aspect of that project (Desai, 2017; Murthy, 2011). I showcase these New Delhi institutions for two reasons. First, specific to this project, Indian journalists working in New Delhi who have opted to study or gain post-graduate credentials in the field of journalism may likely attend these universities. Second, through just three universities, and IIMC, the extent to which journalism and media seep into different intellectual topics is important, and even more so the fact that these interdisciplinary inclusions often overlap through languages and literature departments. Also, linguistic distinctions in journalism and media seem to coincide with regionalism and a focus on translation within the educational curriculum. In addition to university education, which is highly regulated by the Indian government except that journalism has had relatively lax expectations for curricula (Ray, 2012), media houses have launched their own private institutions to train journalists. The media organizations charge high tuition fees to enrollees, often under the notion that the training program will funnel participants into newsroom roles (Thomas, 2010); this is by-and-large not the case. Journalism associations and press clubs periodically develop trainings or team with business and nonprofits to provide media-related training programs, and these short courses typically aim for vocational training.

Spanning the history of journalism education, scholars have noted the tendency of journalism programs to either prioritize skills or theory, rarely a balance of both, and largely depends on whether instructors have significant experience in the profession or are research-

driven academics (Bhaskaram, et al., 2019; Desai, 2017; Murthy, 2011; Ray, 2012). Programs that revolve around teaching vocationally tend to elevate the idea of writing towards the industry (Bhaskaram, et al., 2019, p. 160; Ray, 2012, p. 112; Thussu, 2012, p. 282); in other words, the basic reporting skills of interview, writing, and editing revolve around what is suitable to the profession to fulfill the needs of the boss. Journalists in this sense are laborers for a business. While undoubtedly journalism students need to learn the tools of reporting, another perspective from which to teach both vocational skills as well as more critical analysis positions journalism in terms of democratic responsibility to the society (Bhaskaram, et al., 2019, p. 160). This latter format of Indian journalism education follows from the historical independence movement in which leaders and intellectuals engaged in writing to the public in order to push forward new ideas of a nation (Desai, 2017, p. 127).

Researchers on Indian journalism education often point out that in the context of India's political climate and socio-economic inequality, journalists need to have particular skills and sensitization to confront complex and uncomfortable issues (e.g., Bhaskaram, et al., 2019; Murthy, 2011; Ray, 2012;). Ray (2012) classifies journalists as "cultural workers" within a globalized reporting milieu (p. 107) but laments that many journalism students in India enter journalism post graduate programs from academic programs disinterested in societal problems and solutions and thus ill-fit for the critical analysis necessary for good journalism (p. 111). In Ray's conception of the journalist, the cultural workers coincide with the idea of the "go-betweeners". To some degree, the news industry has sought journalists prepared to write to the business of media organizations rather than report critically on social woes (Desai, 2017, p. 125). Whereas Ray (2012) criticizes the students of journalism as inept or disinterested in examining

socio-political conflicts, Bhaskaram, Mishra, and Nair (2019), through research based on focus groups comprised of Master's students in a journalism degree program, find that students craved curricula that taught them about journalistic agency and critical reasoning, feeling adequately prepared in the program through technical skills but lacking in critical enquiry (pp. 165-6). Desai (2017), describing Indian journalism and journalism education through the metaphors of a maze and a mosaic, emphasizes that because of the vastly unequal divisions in Indian society, journalism must aim to report on and uncover socio-political injustice (p. 130). The scholar also notes that the diversity of India further complicates how to teach journalism because coverage can differ across vernacular languages, and thus, journalism programs need to focus on linguistic diversity in reporting so that journalists can better report for regional media (p. 126).

Conclusion

Returning to the idea of a linguistic collage, if this chapter has raised more questions about linguistic communities and language politics in India, then it has served its purpose. There is no easy way to explain how language has come to be so influential to India. On the one hand, language has worked to foster national pride and identification, but on the other, those same sentiments have oppressed and divided people based on the language they speak. Indian journalists contend with their own individual anxieties around linguistic identities while also choosing to mediate information to particular language publics. The journalism industry, however, has not made clear the role of journalists and how to report in the languages they know.

The history of journalism and the press in India echoes similar tensions as in language politics. The industry has deep roots in the Indian independence struggle, although to compare India's current media ecology to that of the 1930s and 1940s is preposterous. The circulation of

writing, the mode of writing, the language of dissent — these branded Indians with pride and participation in the new democracy. However, as India grew, in its adolescence a shift happened and the job of the journalist was taken for granted and devalued. Economics had a major effect on Indian media and news, especially after the neoliberal shift in the 1990s. Now, decades later, a resurgence of pride in the work of journalism emanates from elite English-language circles as technology has allowed the stories from India to spread. Yet, the allure of the journalism profession calls, as seen through the proliferation of English-language programs and educational institutions, with other languages a factor to consider but not pursue.

From a societal, macro-level, language in North India and in journalism emphasizes the tug-of-war between Hindi and English, ignorant to the critically strong linguistic and literary traditions of other Indian languages. Political leaders push for a Hindi nation, while economics lead Indian citizens to hope through English for prosperity and global opportunities. The next two chapters go to the meso- and micro-levels specific to journalism, all the while keeping the external factors that resonate from Indian society in mind as to how these influence Indian journalists at work. Chapter 3 shifts to look at the spaces where Indian journalism as an industry takes form and develops values in relation to language. Festivals and summits are specifically designed to present the journalism industry to the public, and meetings and trainings give private space for journalists to debate the profession. Individual identities related to language surface as Indian journalists attempt to define a cohesive, egalitarian, multilingual industry.

3: Journalism on Stage: Public Discourse of an Industry

A shuffling of boxy lounge chairs covered in white slipcovers, the organizers on stage made room for the five guests of the hour. Dragging the podium stage right, stage left, they called to the cameraman, "How about here?" Eventually, they pushed it against the stage's back wall covered with a white sign featuring the event's name, *Penguin Fever*. Shelves of books on stage added decor and charm, but more importantly held books for the event's Open Air Library. The audience, situated in the amphitheater facing the stage, had begun to convene. Some people had passed time here all day, taking advantage of the Open Air Library to grab a book and read, leaning against bright orange and pink bolster pillows. If lucky, the organizers would make a book sale or two. Other attendees arrived after work for the Author Sessions, scheduled each evening for four hours starting at 5:00 PM, but actually slated for the guests at 7:00 PM. That time had passed, and those of us who had arrived early continued to watch the organizers debate stage arrangements, place microphones, gather water bottles, and adjust the lighting.

Penguin Fever, organized by Penguin Book's India-branch, showcased the publisher's books in the open-air library installed at the India Habitat Centre. The Centre was a massive brutalist structure in Central Delhi's posh Lodi Colony near the Diplomatic Enclave, Khan Market, and international organization headquarters. The World Wildlife Foundation and United Nations Development Fund were a ten-minute walk down the street. The Centre's outer high-rise shell housed offices of various NGOs and government institutions, as well as art galleries, banquet halls, and conference rooms. Tucked into the heart of the building were open-air gardens, lawns, and theaters for events like *Penguin Fever*.

This particular literature festival, usually held in the spring, had been rescheduled to the fall in order to mark the October milestone of 30 years of the company's work in India. Perhaps the organizers had not anticipated the toxic haze of October — when smoky clouds oozed through the air over the National Capital Region for weeks, carried from seasonal field burnings in neighboring states, anticipatory fireworks shot off for Diwali, and the omniscient industrial output of factories along the city's border. New Delhi's Air Quality Index (AQI) hit hazardous-to-life levels, and political leaders closed schools and called for Delhi denizens to stay home, forcing its avid reading public to remain indoors. Attendance that evening seemed low at first, but as the start time passed and the organizers waited, the rows slowly filled.

Tonight's session, "The Line of Beauty", included four writers who had worked on translated materials to complete their books: Rana Safvi (Urdu), Bibek Debroy (Sanskrit), Kannan Sundaram (Tamil), and Perumal Murugan (Tamil). They were introduced one-by-one by moderator Namita Gokhale, a renowned Indian author, co-founder-director of the Jaipur Literature Festival, and a regular guest and moderator at many other arts and literature festivals held in India. Safvi, Debroy, Sundaram, and Gokhale spoke English. Murugan did not speak English and expressed this to the moderator in Tamil, a South Indian language that the moderator did not know. Sundaram, a Tamil-language publisher and author, translated Murugan's observation, including that Murugan understood English. Confusion and hesitation took over Gokhales's face, her eyes seeking the organizers for an answer of how to handle the situation.

Sundaram offered to serve as translator. Sundaram knew Murugan well — he was the Tamil author's publisher, and Murugan's translated book, *One Part Woman*, had two years before stirred controversy in South India when a caste-based ideological group demanded its removal

from circulation until the book was censored.[18] Because of the controversy, their professional relationship, and their different responses to the idea of censorship, they had ridden the literature festival circuit together. I had seen them before talking about translation and the controversy, and I recalled that Murugan adamantly and unapologetically spoke Tamil in these public appearances to take a stance on the inclusion of non-English languages. However, it seemed for this event, the two had been invited separately this time for their independent works.[19]

Some awkwardness passed; the session moved forward. Sundaram received a pointed question or two, but the vast majority of his speaking time went to translating for Murugan. When Murugan, whose comprehension of spoken English allowed him to directly reply without Sundaram translating questions, gave responses, his answers often came in a long-form response, just like the other speakers' answers. The audience largely sat in incomprehension during his answers, listening with alert anticipation for the translation. Sundaram would interject at times while Murugan spoke in an effort to give a more accurate thought-by-thought translation for the audience; the long Tamil answers could lose the audience's attention and were hard to translate in full. Sometimes, Sundaram waited for Murugan to finish and distilled his thoughts into a single, inadequate summary. Further, Gokhale inserted some impatient sighs and fidgets, trying to coax Murugan to wrap his responses. She mumbled at one point that to offer long answers in Tamil that had to be translated robbed the other authors of fair time to speak.

---

[18] The controversy is fascinating in terms of how Murugan and Sundaram responded differently to the demands, but that is not relevant to this project. A great interview with the publisher: https://caravanmagazine.in/vantage/meeting-perumal-murugan-publisher-kalachuvadu

[19] I didn't confirm this with the organizers, but in this exchange on stage, Sundaram made a quick remark about his role not just as translator tonight, although it got muffled in the confusion.

Safvi and Debroy assured Gokhale and the audience that they didn't feel cheated; the audience tried to express with applause and affirmative whistles their interest to hear Murugan's point of view, even in Tamil. Nonetheless, awkwardness trickled through the space like the toxic air pollution — the discussion of this session, even though pointedly about working in other languages, served an English-speaking audience and had no room to host real issues about other languages, like the inclusion and accommodation of other Indian languages in public forums. In a country like India, with multiple languages reigning supreme across the various regions, such catering to English seems misplaced in the "democratizing" fora of literary salons.

***

This was just one of many ethnographic observations I noted in similar spaces in India's Hindi belt. From my time spent wandering literature festivals, media summits, association meetings, trainings, and workshops, I recount in this chapter some poignant moments of multilingual programming across both the public and private gatherings. I also follow the spawn of journalism-centered events from the broader literary field and trace the organization of one media summit and the issue of inclusive multilingualism. I think about the interplay of language during these events and how multilingualism informs the debates and determines the debaters. Specifically, I focus on journalists invited to these spaces.

While the aforementioned scene represents a much broader scope of multilingual interaction in a writing industry, this chapter especially considers the facilitation of multiple languages in journalistic writing and how journalists' public discourse on translation shapes perceptions of and within the journalism industry about the value of multilingual reporting. I discuss my role as an organizer of one such event in Delhi and the behind-the-scenes debates that

ruptured our event. I note how journalists and organizers include the topic of translation in journalism, depending on the forum. I also highlight which journalists get invited as speakers and whether and how these spaces welcome linguistic diversity. The observations I draw show how members of the Indian English-language journalism industry discuss a phenomenon in their professional practice. In front of a public audience and within industry networks, journalists vaguely address translation and writing in confused anxious discussions of how to make language matter in the news.

I begin the chapter with a discussion of ethnography in the context of journalism studies and past studies of arts festivals, drawing upon ethnomethodology and a critical cosmopolitan approach. I consider how journalists describe the multilingual writing phenomenon in these different spaces. Ethnomethodology with a critical cosmopolitan approach allows researchers to question individuals' perceptions of self and their responses in relation to global and local others (Delanty, 2011; Gubrium & Holstein, 2000). While critical cosmopolitanism offers an important lens of analysis, I cautiously acknowledge critical cosmopolitanism in the sites of discourse as present but not idyllic to the ideas of interactional influence. The remainder of the chapter travels through four spaces where journalists participate and exercise authority over the writing process in their profession: literature festivals, meeting summits, association meetings, and journalism trainings. Festivals consider the broad commons in which journalists present their work and processes to a general public. Meetings represent the targeted industry conversations that can be open to other actors besides journalists who are invested in the process of journalism. Finally, trainings show journalist-to-journalist interactions and how they intimate the challenges of the industry. Observing these spaces begins to answer my first research question: *to what degree do*

members of India's journalism profession value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting? The discussions and debates fostered in these spaces or left out of the programming help show how journalists and the industry of journalism weigh the importance of language ability in regards to other skills in the profession. This chapter also addresses part of my second set of research questions, namely: *what do Indian journalists describe as individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process?* While I found journalists rarely discussed the actual *writing* process in these public arenas, they frequently acknowledged challenges and barriers to their general reporting process, of which writing is a part.

Method

Researchers undertake ethnography to try to understand local performances of individuals, not taking cultural consumption for granted but instead unpacking the process of interaction that infuses culture (Murphy & Kraidy, 2003, p. 15). Ethnography, a staple of anthropology, infiltrates many other disciplines engaging in cultural studies. Ethnography applied to fields outside of anthropology has invited new conceptions of culture or cultural phenomena as well as a redefinition of place and sites. Ethnographic research contributes important perspectives to communication and journalism studies, and scholarship reveals the necessity of ethnography to truly understand global information flows (Couldry, 2003; Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Murphy & Kraidy, 2003).

Ethnography of communication (EOC) considers the continuous information flows that transmit symbolic practices and social structures in interactions between subjects, charging them with meaning, power relations, and norms in interactions (Frow & Morris 2000, p. 316; Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Murphy & Kraidy, 2003). An important area of research in EOC examines the

imagined communities of media producers, acknowledging the large part that media authors play in the exchange of ideas in global culture (Couldry, 2003; Murphy & Kraidy, 2003). The idea of the imagined community comes into play in this chapter because of the disparate groups of media producers, namely journalists working in Hindi, English, or other languages. In the public spaces I studied, the Indian journalists invited to speak were meant to represent an imagined community of the entirety of "Indian" journalism, yet the organization of subspaces like panels and presentations consistently reinforced the separation of linguistic reporting communities.

The newsroom ethnography offers insight into organizational norms of news production as well as the evolution of information in the lifespan of a story arch (Robinson, 2011; Rao, 2010; Ståhlberg; 2006). For instance, Ståhlberg (2006) uses ethnography in Hindi-language newspapers in Lucknow, India, to study how vernacular press in India develops culture and ideas in everyday society and draws attention to the need to study different parts of media production processes. Rao (2010) also selects the city of Lucknow as her field site for ethnographic research in newsrooms to study the professional interactions of journalists with politicians and citizens and the implications these relationships have on information. These ethnographies offer crucial insight to the workings of Indian newsrooms. Yet the digital influence on Indian media in the last decade (or two) since these studies invites the interrogation of new environments and field sites to understand information flows, organizational structures, and socio-political influences on the profession of journalism. Media with a digital context have complicated the idea of "places" in ethnography (Couldry, 2003, p. 41; English & Underwood, 2016). A challenge is to define a field site while still maintaining a grounded context to study and systematically extract data (Murphy & Kraidy, 2003, p. 7).

This project traverses several circuits of information flow to reimagine the place of production for journalists. I forgo the newsroom ethnography, though I am cognizant of the organizational influences, structures, and pressures that newsrooms place and impose on journalists' actions. My goal instead is to consider other spaces that allow journalists to engage more introspectively with their profession, away from the daily beat and ticking deadlines. In terms of ethnographic inquiry, I focus on venues of professional interaction for Indian journalists: literature festivals, media summits, association meetings, and workshops. I name many of the large annual events by name, but I choose to keep smaller events anonymous. Most of them only last a single cycle. Also, I grew intimately involved in the planning of one such event during my research, and out of respect for all involved I do not want my analysis to indict these people in any way as responsible for choices made in the event.

Within these spaces, journalists are called upon to discuss the procedures of news reporting — to account for the stories they produce, to grapple with the challenges of myriad issues, and to atone for shortcomings in the media. Further, they are consulted on how to write, how to approach assignments, and how to understand audiences. Thus, these sites enable a coagulation of perspectives on the accepted or popular practices in reporting to represent an informal discourse on industry standards among Indian journalists. These perspectives may be stilted, tailored to address the topic of a forum or to uphold the title of a panel discussion, and in that vein, the public appearances of journalists do not define the norms of the industry but rather reveal debates and concerns that journalism as a coherent field may be facing behind the paywall.

Notably, I attended mostly English-language events, but within these events, panels or segments were scheduled in Hindi-language. If Hindi-language programming was absent, there was guaranteed to be criticism, vocalized on stage by invited speakers and murmured among attendees, about the lack of access. Sometimes, uncomfortable encounters in situations of unshared language comprehension happened on stage, more often when an English-speaking Indian writer unversed in Hindi couldn't understand a co-panelist or an audience member question.

Interestingly, there is a long scholarly history of choosing festivals as sites of ethnographic study, often centered around harvests, puberty, or deaths. The modern twist on the festival that aims to commemorate the arts (e.g., music, contemporary art, and literature) offers ties to those ritualistic affairs marked in communities (e.g., harvests, rites of passage) and to the historic literary salons in Europe (Giorgi, 2011, pp. 30-33; Giorgi & Sassatelli, 2011, p. 8). The spaces of the literary public sphere with aspects of personal, social, and political interests intersecting in conversation transformed into a notion of civil society in the 20th century (Giorgi, 2011, p. 33). The early idea of salons created spaces of intellectual debate outside of the intimate family space of the home, and over time these intellectual spaces opened even more publicly as ideas of deliberation and democracy spread. Thus, the literary public sphere took the discussions of art and literature and combined them with questions on social and political issues to foster discussion between people and develop the norms and values of a community.

Literature festivals and other arts events have to some degree taken apart the consolidation of civil society through single-issue discussions in "creating a space for discussions and debates that transcend the purely political, social or personal and rather seek

their dialectic intersection" (Giorgi & Sassatelli, 2011, p. 7). In particular, literature festivals that once revolved around book promotions to excite audiences about the text itself now include insight to the creative process of developing the text and a vision of everyday social context of the writer (p. 38). In a way, these spaces are momentarily utopian, even though the issues and topics may be heavy and at times controversial, enough so to elicit reactive responses from local and national governments. The format of the festival dilutes the debate by trying to altruistically cover issues of social and political significance with a cheerful lens to promoting a writer and giving the writer merit over the topic.

Riding this utopian wave, literature festivals often claim to embody cosmopolitanism, a space for different cultures to interact, especially in "moments of openness, exchange and dialogue" (Delanty, 2011, p. 196). These supposed cosmopolitan arenas may have telling impacts on how ideas are communicated from speakers to an audience (Weber, 2015). By inviting into one space esteemed speakers and common people, the idea is that the people will learn from the speakers, and maybe the speakers will extract new understandings of important issues from the people. In reality, the interactive space allows barely five audience questions, and comments from the audience are usually cut short. Yet by professing the cosmopolitan ideals, reiterated on the event advertising and by an emcee before each session, the audience is meant to feel understood and heard by the elite guests on stage. They are part of the conversation and can have an input, so they are told.

Journalists and media play increasingly heavier roles in these events beyond sponsorship and promotion. Besides journalists who have published some novel-length work, Giorgi (2011) explains, "A widespread format, for instance, is the discussion between a journalist and a writer

about the writer's work, but also, more generally, about the socio-economic and political conditions of the creation and reception of a work of literature" (p. 37). Journalists participate both as experts in the field of writing, able to intelligently discuss the writing process with novelists, and as socio-political researchers well-informed with current affairs, therefore able to contribute an additional perspective to writing through contentious issues. By appearing in front of a live public audience, journalists must confront topics and issues and then take stances and express opinions. At least for that hour, they become the authoritative voice to the audience for an oversimplified journalistic community and any marginalized or otherwise demarcated community important to the issue.

This chapter expands beyond literature festivals, the focus of significant research in cultural studies, to look at media summits, association meetings, and trainings. These spaces are to some degree public, but the authorities on display are typically all journalists, which removes the interface with other "types" of writers. The multiplicity of study sites allows me to explore the overarching question of the process of writing for journalists with particular attention to translation and how journalists describe their role in the process of translation. The discourse of these sites reveal particularly relevant findings towards perceptions of translation in journalism, as stressed in the first research question: *to what degree do members of India's journalism profession value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting?* While the discussions and debates fostered in or absent from these spaces imply some value placed on multilingual ability, the willingness of journalists to engage with certain challenges of the profession in front of an audience hints and begins to explore part of the second set of research questions, namely, *what*

do Indian journalists describe as individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process?

Multi-sited ethnography does not have to be comparative (Marcus, 1998), so each of these spaces offers different situations through which to examine Indian journalists' engagement with questions of writing and translation. Rather than drawing overarching conclusions, I consider how journalists may adjust their responses according to the diverse spaces and audiences they face when contending with questions on norms and expectations in their professional writing. While these aspects of festivals and events influence this project to the degree that they set up the environment of research, this study seeks a very particular, perhaps minute, component posing large insights to the field of journalism. I study moments of translation in the journalistic writing process. Inherent to language, circulation of words and information transfer through networks of speakers and listeners. Starting at translation as the particular, I expand out to consider the pathways in which journalists encounter different pressures, politics, and practices that weigh on their process. Thus, I consider journalists' everyday work life as the notion of culture under study, but I also want to cautiously challenge working towards some idea of a collective identity of journalists. The act of translation may seem minute compared to other processes in the production of news, but it is in the vein of cultural studies to identify what forces come to bear on seemingly incidental behaviors.

A Note on the Researcher

In ethnography, the researcher cannot be ignored, as her placement in the site endows a degree of power (Gatson, 2011). The researcher has the independent ability to determine what in the research setting qualifies as worthwhile phenomena to study and reveal to readers. Through

participant observation, the researcher both studies and experiences the phenomenon. This is a potentially problematic set up in which the researcher dons the role of detached observer but grapples with involvement in an environment not void of emotions and sentiments (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011; Tedlock, 2000). This is relevant to my ethnographic study of festivals because I participated in various capacities within these spaces.

These festivals allowed various tiers of participation — attendee, delegate, speaker/ organizer. The badge of "attendee" was most accessible and public, in the sense that anyone could register because many festivals' general entry was free or a nominal fee. My role as an attendee to various festivals kept me distant from the behind-the-scenes conversations about programming and the purpose for inviting particular guests and organizing around topics. As an attendee, I experienced the festivals from the most accessibly public point of view. A delegate pass cost significantly more and marked a person with more privilege in the festival space. Delegates received merchandise to compensate for the price tag, usually a tote bag to carry around to mark a person as "in" and connected. They also had access to special delegate lounges on location to sip chai or coffee and hobnob with the speakers.

I eventually chose to appear as a delegate at several festivals because it provided a level of authority and clout. I could gain access to speakers and organizers to briefly introduce myself and ask questions. The delegate badge offered entry at a level beyond the general public. It also allowed more transparency to identify myself as a researcher, which in some spaces went unquestioned, as academics commonly circulated through the networks, and in other spaces had barred my entry. As a scholar, I was often dismissed by journalists I met because I researched journalism but hadn't worked in journalism; it seemed in their eyes I couldn't relate to their work

or understand the pressures of the field. The delegate badge implied I had reached a certain status as a researcher because I could afford to pay or had an institution backing me.[20] In more intimate, private settings like trainings or workshops, I could spin my identity as researcher as just one aspect of my interest in understanding and learning journalism and truly take on participant observation. Later, my participation as an event organizer tested my privilege as a researcher and to what degree my involvement could overpower the data and analysis. However, in the role of organizer, decisions and issues felt more personal. I had to be cognizant of my own research interest in the space so as not to influence the directions that the organizing team chose to pursue. I began to understand how complex these events can be in terms of how organizers decide to engage in certain issues knowing that their choices in programming ultimately communicate a stance to the public whether intentional or not.

I have tried throughout the analysis to focus on the team conversations and more detached observations, and when I do more actively insert myself, I attempt to give as much detail about my potential influence over a given scenario as possible. Rather than feigning some artificial neutrality and distance as a participant observer, a researcher can implement reflexivity and transparency by discussing how the researcher's own experiences and the subject's experiences interplay in the study (Tedlock, 2000, pp. 465-6). Couldry (2001), paraphrasing Marcus (1999), nicely summarizes the dynamics of fieldwork and participant observation on a researcher:

---

[20] To be transparent, that was partially true. I had "arrived" as a graduate student with a prestigious fieldwork grant. So I had funding to take on these types of expenditures, but I had no real academic clout other than years working towards a degree.

> Only when an outsider begins to relate to a subject also concerned with outsideness in everyday life can these expressions (of anxiety) be given focal importance in a localized fieldwork that, in turn, inevitably pushes the entire research program of the single ethnographic project into the challenges and promises of a multisited space and trajectory —a trajectory that encourages the ethnographer literally to move to other sites that are powerfully registered in the local knowledge of an originating locus of fieldwork. (p. 47)

Couldry writes this to acknowledge the transformation that happens to a researcher in the process of study and how that affects how the project takes shape but also invites exciting possibilities to keep exploring. In a critical cosmopolitan vein, which I explain more in the next section, my participation and presence in the research sites caused me to reflect on my own ideas on multilingualism and translational writing skills. This at times led me to new understandings of skill and process that I may not have considered before.

Undoubtedly, I had complex personal reasons for studying language in Indian journalism. Before the beginning of fieldwork, I had studied Hindi for nearly ten years, in myriad educational institutions and through diverse curricula. Yet, I still felt stilted in my ability to conduct research in Hindi despite my relatively advanced proficiency. I was a researcher focused on South Asia, but still studying a rather Westernized aspect of Indian journalism, the English-language journalist. I found myself nodding at Indian journalists on stage speaking about their English writing, the complexity of knowing Hindi or another local language but feeling just disconnected enough because of English. I felt like a journalist at a literature festival — a writer, sure, but maybe not the "real" kind; a researcher, definitely, but not quite in the "real" field. However, I recognized that while this project focuses on a particularly elite sector of Indian

journalism, which actually plays a significant role in understanding the perception of skill through language, it paves the way for more research within other language presses of India.

Data Analysis

Having established the cultural milieu of this project and my place in it, it is critical to understand how to interpret and analyze observations borne from ethnography. Ethnographic writing in its early iterations, before the notion of a digital network as a place or site, detailed every fact of a community, an event, a place, or a behavior — thick description (Geertz, 2000). This, however, has lent ethnography a reputation to trail off into overusing description at the expense of critical analysis (Wolcott, 2001). In this project, I use ethnomethodology as explained by Gubrium and Holstein (2000). I also take a critical cosmopolitan approach to this ethnography (Delanty, 2011). This section briefly explains these components of analysis.

Because a central underlying factor in a study of journalistic translation is language, discourse seems to be a logical element to analyze (Fairclough, 1993). However, because this project looks at news translation not in terms of the content derived from the translation process but rather at the process itself from journalists' own perceptions of their writing, discourse needs a definition beyond the spoken or written transcript of an interaction which is its common conception (Fairclough, 1993, p. 4). Discourse analysis seeks to understand the texture of a text, the form and organization of discourse (p. 4), the "discourse representation" instead of the "speech reporting" (p. 54). The idea of discourse can go beyond the need for a clear cut textual exchange. Discourse can be understood as a multitude of elements in social practice — for example, for a journalist the everyday reporting process or a public appearance as a speaker. Discourse informs interactions and gives meaning to ideas (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, pp.

494-5). A focus on discourse alleviates the tendency to rely on recorded speech and conversation at the expense of recognizing external forces to the conversation (Bernard, 2011, p. 424; Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 492; Spitulnik, 2009, p. 111). Through this definition of discourse, Gubrium and Holstein (2000) posit an alternative method of analysis to the commonly implemented critical discourse analysis (Fairclough, 1993) called ethnomethodology.

Ethnomethodology relies on the "doing" of everyday social life to understand the construction of individual identities (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 490). Through ethnomethodology, Gubrium and Holstein (2000) explain how to interpret and analyze data from discursive practices, noting that "the interplay of discourse and discursive practice transforms analytic bracketing into critical bracketing, offering a basis not only for documenting interpretive practice, but also for commenting critically on its own constructions, putting the analytic pendulum in motion in relation to itself" (p. 504). If the discursive practice of journalistic translation is studied as the "doing" of social life, ethnomethodology provides a way to articulate the practice while also considering various influences on both the practice and potential output. Ethnomethodology does not dismiss critical discourse analysis; therefore, elements of the three-dimensional framework (Fairclough, 1993) — the analysis of the actual textual language exchange (in this case journalistic translation), the analysis of discourse practices or actions incorporated with journalistic translation, and the analysis of the sociocultural nature of the discursive events (p. 2) — can still apply. Especially throughout the ethnographic component of this research, I rely on the notion of boundary maintenance, in which primary and secondary voices interplay in discourse (Fairclough, 1993, p. 58), to critically contextualize how journalists

articulate a translation writing process in conversation with other journalists, writers, and audiences.

I also find a critical cosmopolitan approach key to analyzing these spaces. Within the arenas of literary festivals and media summits, critical cosmopolitanism considers how these spaces enable the exchange of diverse cultural ideas, with global dissemination in mind (Delanty, 2011, p. 197). In this chapter, the term "global" means that the ideas debated and constructed in literature festivals and media summits are meant to radiate to new and broader levels of interaction. Thus, reaching a global level means that the event reached the largest impact of radiating ideas, not necessarily that it welcomed a global audience. The idea of global stands in for diverse, and in a way allows organizers to skirt the actual issue of how diverse their speakers and audience truly are. They have gathered a global pool of radiating ideas. Individuals constitute converging publics, and so their inputs can help inform their publics, adding layer upon layer to the interactions. These interactions and exchanges have transformational effects back on the individuals as well (Delanty, 2011, p. 197). So in critical cosmopolitanism, there is constantly a push and pull of influence. The ability of an individual to interact and have an influence on another person or publics in turn is an experience that shapes and changes the influencer.

The critical cosmopolitan approach considers five areas (Delanty, 2011, p. 196). First, a *recognition of global openness*, the chance to understand differences and interact beyond an individual's own place or culture. This is in many ways the essence of the festivals, whether successful or not, to be open to ideas from around the world. Second, an individual can or will *interact with cultural Others*; in turn, this interaction will transform the individual. In these

festivals and meetings, interaction is key in the hopes that individuals will learn within these spaces. Third, considering *self-transformation* in the presence of diversity from Others, the individual explores the notion that she too is an Other to be understood by others. These spaces are deliberative and discursive on premise, so each individual in the festival space can contribute to the experience of others around them — most simply, through networking.

Fourth, critical cosmopolitanism recognizes not just openness but also the *ideas of globality*, that global networks exist and flow. Following the first area that global openness exists, the idea of festivals and gathering disparate people is that they will carry the ideas out of this space and into their communities. Fifth, in the space between the local and global exist *critical junctures* to explore — these involve identities and practices that are shared or disputed or misunderstood. The interaction of language exchange in journalism at many levels, from interlocutor to reporter and reporter to audience, infers moments of critical cosmopolitan interactions. Journalists seek out interlocutors in order to build credible stories from within other communities that readers may be unfamiliar with, thus exposing audiences to something beyond the local. Translation serves as a critical juncture between the global and the local for study. The remainder of the chapter combines these analytical approaches to the proceedings within the four spaces of journalists' professional events: festivals, summits, meetings, and trainings.

Literature Festivals

Jaipur, the capital of the desert state of Rajasthan, a two-hour train journey southwest of New Delhi, boasts palaces and forts and royal history that draws international tourists away from the international hubs of New Delhi and Mumbai to wander within the Pink City's ancient walls. Otherwise, Jaipur exists as a second-tier city in India with a well-regarded university, a

remodeled international airport (one flight to Dubai), and meticulous urban planning mostly thanks to its royal past. Still, Jaipur is a desert city. For a significant portion of the year, the heat deters domestic tourists. Quick and accessible, Jaipur could serve as a weekend getaway for Delhiites seeking respite from the craze of the metropolis, but most prefer to ride north to the mountains.

One weekend a year, however, New Delhi seems to descend upon Jaipur, crowding onto the lawns of a heritage[21] site called Diggi Palace for ZEE[22] Jaipur Literature Festival. Among the elite social circles of New Delhi's arts and academic scenes, the five-days of the Jaipur Literature Festival causes an exodus to Jaipur, and by the Saturday events, most of the readers of Delhi have arrived. On Sunday evening when the festival winds down, the train station is packed and every train and bus to Delhi full. Attendees to the Jaipur Literature Festival, JLF for short, fit into several categories, mainly Participants (free admission) or Delegates (for a fee with perks). In the four consecutive years I attended JLF, the festival morphed from six stages and a bookstore-in-a-tent to five stages and handicraft market, food court, and bookstore.

Jaipur Literature Festival is one among many other literature festivals in India. I attended many of the Delhi-based events during this project. To name a few: Times Literature Festival Delhi, Jashn-e-Rekhta, Crime Writers Festival, Urdu Heritage Festival, Penguin Fever. At dinner one evening after a session at the Times Literature Festival Delhi, one speaker, a film lyricist

---

[21] Heritage buildings are preserved for historical significance as previous homes of kings and other royalties. Preservation sometimes means a complete design overhaul to make the space inhabitable for tourists.

[22] The sponsoring media company Zee is a problematic partnership. Its reputation in India is one of ideological alignment with far-right conservative, Hindu fundamentalism. The television channels owned by the media conglomerate reflect a similar ethos as FoxNews in the U.S. Nonetheless, in its sponsorships, the company stays hands off, interested in the exposure and not the content.

from Mumbai, remarked that if she accepted every invitation to speak at a literature festival, then every weekend of the year on her calendar would be full! In a country with a rich linguistic and literary history, briefly traced in Chapter 2, literature festivals emanate a sense of pride in the literary traditions. People from vast social backgrounds attend for the chance to hear poetry recitations or readings from award-winning writers. The chairs in the audience fill, the public listens to speakers with rapt attention, and curious people queue for the chance to ask a question during Q&A. The culture around literature festivals is active, vibrant, and engaged. Starting in 2017, JLF began to record all sessions and maintain a YouTube channel chronicling the various spinoffs around the world, and by 2020, JLF live-streamed the entire festival on YouTube. This has opened a new form of virtual access to the festival. The organizers of the Jaipur Literature Festival describe these changes as such: "Our core values remain unchanged; to serve as a democratic, non-aligned platform offering free and fair access."[23]

I draw my observations in this section from participating in all of these events. JLF is the largest one in India, so much of my analysis lies in what I witnessed in my years there. I first discuss how journalists participate in these spaces. Additionally, I consider what kind of journalists can infiltrate the literary ranks. Finally, I present how the issues of language and translation concern these festivals. What languages are represented in festival programming sends a message about the value and inclusion of multilingualism overall, and journalists' willingness to engage in topics related to language and writing at these public sites helps to construct an idea of industry culture around multilingualism and translation.

---

[23] https://jaipurliteraturefestival.org/about

Journalism in the Festival

Journalists at literature festivals have long served as moderators, since they are considered expert interviewers who are able to question the writers on stage about the writing process. Yet less often, journalists take the stage at literature festivals under someone else's moderation, to talk about their own writing processes in the field. At the festivals I attended, it appeared that most journalists earned spots as speakers only if they wrote a book or published a compilation of essays late in their career. At that point, the journalist was now seen as an author, as if all the work they did in journalism — the research, interviews, and writing — wasn't quite enough. The exceptions were investigative journalists who had earned national awards for some hard-hitting story against the government, or who had received death threats, attacks, or criminal charges for a story they covered. And, of course, foreign correspondents, lauded for sacrificing the comfort of their homeland to cover India.

On the JLF schedule in 2016, only two sessions referenced news directly: "Trial by Media" and "The Frontline Club". I learned the next year that the latter was an annual session, renamed to the "Foreign Correspondent's Club". The organizers usually scheduled the Foreign Correspondent's Club on an early day of the festival, when attendance was significantly lower than the weekend crowds, and the session never drew a packed audience. As in most multi-day events, among organizers and regular attendees, there existed an unspoken hierarchy of the schedule and the stages. At JLF, panels with less "exciting" speakers or about less trendy topics were scheduled for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday morning. This implied that the writers had enough prestige to be a part of the festival, but they wouldn't draw the crowds.

In 2017, the Foreign Correspondent's Club featured 4 international, non-Indian journalists: one retired correspondent to India and 3 journalists stationed in a spate of other Asian countries during their careers. The next year it featured 5 journalists: 4 white men, mid-career, and one female person of color. The conversations revolved around surveillance and safety, and lamented shifts in politics while appraising the renewed importance of journalism. A journalist might mention working with a fixer, but otherwise, they never brought up the language barriers of foreign correspondence. Considering that a major hurdle for many foreign correspondents is language (Hannerz, 2004), it was surprising how little they reflected on the important role of their fixers and the complexities of language exchange. While they recognized the ethical risks that might arise when involving fixers and stringers in reporting, in terms of how the multi-situational translation sites (source-fixer; fixer-journalist; journalist-reader) functioned, they had little to say on the topic. A journalist might comment on a word they had learned in the local language of their posting and how it fit in the context of an issue within that society, but the journalist would not comment on how they crafted that word into their writing.

In other sessions with a news and media focus, topics touched on the newsroom and the information coming out of organizations. The journalists in these various sessions talked about the challenges of reporting and conducting interviews, gaining reliable contacts, but they rarely talked about the writing process in the ways that authors on other panels described the act of constructing characters and developing lavish settings of a story. In fact, at one private session on translation, a panelist scoffingly commented that the work they referred to as literature and literary translation did not include the translation and writing done by journalists. This implied journalism was a simpler process, and the panelist's tone made it explicit that to authors, the

journalistic process was flawed. These speakers suggested that the multilingualism that enabled literary translation was studied and polished, a skill of the trade, while in journalism, the haphazard modes of reporting demonstrated an inferior level of skill. But journalists, if invited to the table, were not speaking up to inform the other writers that journalists had processes influenced by factors like multilingualism, as well as other pressures. Their silence or unwillingness to engage demonstrated a devaluing in the profession of multilingualism as a skill.

Assumed thus far, though until now unremarked, all the Indian journalists participating in these events spoke English, and in most cases, reported in English. The international, non-Indian speakers at the festival, like the foreign correspondents before, often arrived in India for the first time just to attend the festival. So, the moderators of the panels needed a certain kind of English easily understood by an outsider — in other words, very Anglicized and void of a thick Indian accent. English-language Indian journalists typically had English-medium education through the university, and many with elite graduate degrees from abroad. Thus, the configurations of speakers and moderators on the panels exemplified that the people who could represent the Indian public on stage among a group of international speakers were English-language journalists.

The idea of the space of the literary salon had grown exponentially through the image of these literature festivals, but in reality, the salon existed only on stage. The debates and discussions meant to remedy society's social issues happened on stage, and the five or six people in the chairs stood in for diverse publics. The problem was, some of them couldn't fully represent those publics. Indian journalists did not all work under the conditions of the English-language few in the industry, and those English-language Indian journalists could not understand

and fully reflect the lives of all Indians. The programming of the literature festivals oversimplified the spaces of discourse and ignored critical identities and interactions, like language. Journalists of Hindi-language presses, or any other language, even those with multilingual ability in English were rarely invited to the space to be able to give the perspective of work in Hindi-language journalism. The message sent by allowing English-language journalists to speak for the profession indicated that language in journalism didn't have the same subtleties as literature, and journalists seemed to support that.

Language in the Festival

The only way to know if a session at JLF would be held predominately in Hindi was if the panel title was printed in Devanagari script on the program. There were never any Urdu sessions or any other language. Sessions named in English might swerve in and out of Hindi, mainly because something about the topic issue involved Hindi. One year at JLF, five out of 175 sessions on the program hinted at some intersection of languages with English or the promotion of Hindi writing. The session titles were: "The Shri Dwarka Prasad Agarwal Award for Upcoming Hindi Writer", "Adivaani: The Indigenous Literature of India", "The Global Novel", "Bilingualities", and "*Bhasha*: Freeing the Word".

Hindi-speaking writers at the literature festivals, unless the festival explicitly catered to Hindi or Urdu like Jashn-e-Rekhta or the Urdu Heritage Festival, were rarities and often tokenized. They appeared in special one-on-one discussions on stage, maybe because an entire panel of Hindi writers or other language writers would be too difficult to organize, let alone draw a crowd. I sat in on these panels, my Hindi level solid enough to follow some of the commentary, and the halls would fill up to capacity and beyond, a bigger crowd than those panels full of

journalists. A Hindi-reading public existed and wanted to know about the authors. The Hindi writer, like many of the writers appearing on the program, would sit for another session later in the week, an economical decision by the organizers. Interestingly, the second session that a Hindi writer participated in was usually held in English. That meant that the Hindi writer either was bilingual with sufficient English proficiency to participate with other English speakers or would need a translator to facilitate the writer's participation on an English panel. I never saw a Hindi-language journalist on these programs. I also never saw a translator for a Hindi speaker. Speakers of South Indian or Northeast Indian languages at times had a translator, but they were a handful in the pool of hundreds of speakers. Thus, the Hindi-English dichotomy seemed inherent to the space. The organizers did not need to factor multilingual ability in terms of these languages — the translational understanding would happen naturally. In other words, Hindi-English multilingualism wasn't a skill; it just was how things functioned.

In 2017, the reach of translation within the Jaipur Literature Festival changed when a smaller branch of the organizers presented a private event over three days of JLF, called Jaipur Bookmark. Named after a local publishing house that specialized in works of translation, the side event revolved around issues in publishing and publishing in translation, with sessions titles like "South Asia in Translation" and "Politics of Literary Translation". This exclusive event acted almost like a working group or symposium in which only the speakers attended and rotated to the stage to present about their work in translation. The group consisted of authors, agents, publishers, and academics. Journalists were notably absent, and the speakers often remarked on "that other kind of writing", referring to journalism. To the authors, academics, and publishers, journalists had their own set of skills and processes for their profession. Yes, journalists write,

but not like in literature. All of these individuals seemed to ignore the fact that they relied heavily on journalism in their work — whether drawing research and information from news reports or hoping for mentions in pieces for the journalists' research (publicity). In the years I attended, the group appeared to come around to the work of journalists. The focus remained on literary translation, and conversations revolved around listing a great translation to read or new source-to-target language translation in the works or how to foster translation between two dissociated languages. But now journalists, or at least works of journalism, seeped into sessions, with speakers mentioning long-form reporting or publications working with translations. On panels about how technology influenced the possibilities for storytelling, journalistic translation now received praise. The writing process of journalists was starting to look like theirs.

Literature festivals were designed by organizers to construct communities through the speakers that would help the audience relate to writing and literature. Journalists as moderators were put in place to be one of the common people in awe of the writers, not someone well-versed in the skills of writing and translation. These spaces tried to pay attention to language and translation in the programming of panels and speeches, but they succumbed to being a monolingual platform. This sent a message, though not overtly stated, about how organizers and speakers value multilingual ability as a skill that journalists implicitly support through their participation. Even so, as the topic of language seeped into the various sessions and issues, journalists who participated revealed challenges that influence their reporting, including interactions with language. Although the separation of professional communities between journalists and authors remained, their interactions showed more complicity together on how language was of lesser value to the journalistic trade. In the next section, I change venues to

media summits, where journalists own the limelight, to see if the conversations shift among the community of journalists to better articulate the processes of writing and to place greater value on multilingualism in their work.

Media Summits

Literature festivals converged with media through sponsorships and in the way that journalists participated. Media organizations have also tried to independently capitalize on the ethos of the literature festival and distinguish themselves apart through media summits. Media summits have blended the realms of literary debate and journalism to reveal the insides of the writing process while also inviting dialogue about socio-political issues informing news. Talk Journalism, a project of the Vox Media Foundation, shares Jaipur as the destination for its 2-day gala months after JLF, approaching nearly a decade of the annual festival. Besides Talk Journalism, many media summits in India have developed within the last 5 years. The media organization *Newslaundry* launched The Media Rumble born in a partnership with event management company Teamwork Arts, the group behind the Jaipur Literature Festival, and Facebook. I specifically name these festivals because of their reputations and popularity; many others exist. New versions of media summits crop up each year, organized by small organizations and groups, often with the objective to overcome the reliance on corporate sponsorships and management that can influence the content and scope of discussion, they argue. In this section, I take a similar approach as I did with literature festivals. I examine what role journalists are given at media summits and which journalists have the platform to comment on the industry. I look at how writing for news is included in the programming, or not, and how these summits address multilingualism. Through an analysis of media summits, a very targeted site about the journalism

industry, I can begin to uncover how journalists in these spaces value different aspects of their work and prioritize or ignore certain issues of the profession.

Authorship and Translation

At media summits, journalists clearly ruled the guest spots. Even so, when discussions turned to creative processes and story development, sessions relied more on documentary filmmakers than investigative reporters to explain how to portray, or translate, issues into captivating narratives. Investigative journalists spoke to the process of making contacts and combing archives, all important and integral components of reporting, but not the creative skill that draws many print journalists to the industry. The topics and issues presented to journalists speaking at these media summits left little room for them to bring their creative skill and process to light — sessions revolved mostly around the business and funding of news, the technological takeover of news, and specific sting operations. While master classes and workshops offered training opportunities to the audience from some of the experts, few actually engaged the writing process. The skills that the experts could pass on to the audience didn't include writing. This is not a comment on the journalists' own skills in writing, but it shows that journalists may not reflect on what influences their writing, especially in regards to language. Multilingual ability in journalism just exists in these cases and is not a skill to fine tune.

However, one media event attempted to remedy some of these lacunae in the connection of writing skills and processes, with workshops focusing on storytelling and one entire session on creative writing. The sessions organized for these media summits offered a glimpse into a community of Indian journalists. The discussions borne out of these spaces helped paint an image of the values and norms of the journalism industry. The discussions and issues in this

forum, whether truly representative of the challenges and anxieties in Indian journalism or not, give a public impression of what matters in Indian journalism. If multilingualism, translation, and writing, with all of the complexity embedded in these phenomena, are absent or downplayed in the discussions, then the message radiates that they are not valued as highly as other aspects of the industry. Perhaps the inclusion of workshops on storytelling and creative writing signal a shift in Indian journalism that values the writing process and recognizes the intricacies of writing. However, by letting other creatives like filmmakers and not traditional journalists direct the conversations, it suggests that journalists don't have the same command over a creative process.

Media summits treated translation work and multilingualism as a topic that had to be mentioned at least somewhere in the programming or during a session. Language, after all, has major political clout in India, and touching the issue would give the event credibility. Sessions engaged in specifics of language interactions if a speaker floated the topic of language or translation. Otherwise speakers took translation for granted as the norm of working in a multilingual country and political system. Talk Journalism did dedicate what appeared to be two sessions specific to language, "The language of journalism" and "The significance of regional media", although whether these sessions actually covered translation isn't clear. I did not attend this particular festival, but in promotional material and the event website, detailed descriptions of the sessions were not available. So from the titles, which is the only thing some attendees refer to when deciding what to see, these may have covered language and translation in news. At other media summits, similar session titles emerged.

What is particularly interesting about the title “The significance of regional media” is the possibility that language mattered in ideas of regional media. In fact, regional media mattered because of language — that’s how “regional media” as a concept was defined. Regional media didn’t refer to South Indian media; it meant Tamil-language media or Malayalam-language media, for example. Yet, what seemed unrecognized was that, while the journalists in English-language media wrote in English, they still interacted with sources from other languages, just like “regional” journalists did. This was despite the fact that the regional journalists had to discuss ideas about what the people of “their regions” were saying and how could the urban attendees understand. They were translating a culture at the festival, but the organizers and other speakers seemed to miss the point that in reality that was the work of journalism overall. Even the urban journalists translate cultures to their readers. The English-language journalists would have just as much experience in the space of the go-between that the regional journalists were slotted in, but the English-language journalists weren’t asked about “their regions”. It almost seemed as if the regional journalists were foreignized for the event as a comparative difference to the journalism everyone at the event would be familiar with. More often, if the issue of language and translation came up in their sessions, it concerned the reach to audiences or challenges working with translators but rarely in reference to how a journalist takes the information from one language into another during the writing of a story. Reporting subsumes writing. The major outcome of reporting, writing, a crucial step in the process, was significantly left out. The single thing that journalists had to prove that they did their work, their writing and articles, was in some ways waved off as a given, the inevitable after reporting. Perhaps this signals a certain hubris in

their writing ability, but more likely, they didn't conceive of their writing as creative and thus didn't have the authority to comment to the craft.

Organizing a Summit

In 2018, a small start-up organization sought to build an alternative to India's circuit of popular literature festivals and media summits by offering a more intimate space to explore issues on media and journalism with public scholarship. I had stumbled upon the organization through another event, and in introducing myself to the organizers as a researcher, they asked to meet me in connection to their new media summit. I had prior experience in conference planning and a background in media research; the organizer asked me to join the organizing team for the event. I accepted, seeing an opportunity to understand how these events come together and to interface with journalists, gaining some status as an insider in the face of potential research interlocutors.

Throughout the planning process, members of the organizing team expressed the importance of including diverse voices in the program by gender, region, and language. We talked openly about language, but it always seemed to get skimmed off the agenda. There was a critical element to the event that I intentionally extricated myself from — funding. I worked as an organizer on a volunteer basis. I saw the event as research and my involvement as participant observation. Everyone involved in the planning process knew my role as researcher. I stayed away from financial discussions, believing they wouldn't impact the programming that I was centrally involved with.

I later realized how influential funding had been, and how it had been intertwined with questions of language. In the months leading to the event, the director approached organizations

and international groups who mainly operated in English — if he secured funding from these groups, the event director expressed, we would have to carry on in English. These international organizations would also need to be able to access the content of our event, so if it was held in Hindi, they wouldn't have useful material to promote and report. These assumptions should have been challenged. A major U.S. university provided seed funding for the event as well as the venue in New Delhi. Several invited speakers for the journalism event included faculty from that university; a few had never been to India and didn't study journalism. The week of the event, it became clearer to many on the team that the programming needed to appeal and be accessible to these invited faculty in order to prove the value of the event to the university. That meant, more content in English. It also put into question the entire mission of the event; it greatly affected the team.

Some of the Indian organizations we met with to collaborate on different programming expressly requested presentations in Hindi, for example. But in the end, only two speakers came from Hindi-language media. While journalists came from other regions of India, what the organizers had failed to acknowledge was the language medium of many of these well-known journalists, English. Therefore, a speaker invited from South India who knew Tamil and another invited from the Northeast who spoke Assamese spoke in English at the event. They both largely worked in English, but they had been invited to get to linguistic and regional diversity benchmarks. Accommodations for translators had never been discussed. One journalist on a panel spoke in Hindi alongside his English-speaking co-panelists. The speakers needed some level of English. The intimate space this start-up had aimed to build around journalism and public scholarship seemed less intimate and more exclusive.

To the event's credit, the keynote speaker, famous Hindi broadcast journalist Ravish Kumar, delivered his discussion solely in Hindi. He was joined on stage in conversation with an Urdu-language journalist. The atrium of the venue, where the stage and chairs were placed for his session, filled up. Several independent Hindi-language journalists approached me and asked for permission to cover the session. As organizers, we knew Ravish Kumar would draw a crowd, but I hadn't anticipated how vibrant and engaged the audience would be. Audience members eagerly raised hands during the discussion, wanting to dive into the conversation and signaling to the speakers on stage not to forget to include them. There were moments of applause in agreement of his comments about government attacks on Indian media and the perils of journalism in conservative societies unwilling to engage in open, liberal debate. It was one of the most active sessions of the event.

It appeared that the opportunity to engage a Hindi-language journalist and discuss Hindi-language media sparked something for the audience. Indian media as a concept gave lip service to media in languages other than Hindi, but in a venue like this Hindi finally got some attention. It was a small consolation for the event; in the beginning, lofty intentions were set to give equal space for Hindi and English, and even other languages if needed. However, in the chaos inevitable to event planning, considerations of language took a backseat. Assumptions about the merit of English-language journalism prevailed, and attention shifted to securing renowned journalists with buzzy affiliations. And so, the English-language journalists received the invites and the space to talk industry. Although the organizers acknowledged the existence of other language media in India, they didn't see a need to truly engage with what it meant to have such separate communities in an industry. Language possessed a defining hold on the profession. In

India news is distinguished first by medium and then by language. The journalists present on stage recognized the difference but wouldn't engage in deeper discussions about how the intricacies of language played out between Hindi- or English-language journalism and ultimately how language implied evaluative judgment of one professional community over the other. In the next section, I shift to a space organized around a different classification, women, that insisted on the inclusion of multiple languages. I present a brief public interaction that revealed that the tension between language communities in the profession was still present even with efforts in place to address it.

Association Meetings

In 2019, the Network of Women in Media, India (NWMI) held its annual meeting in New Delhi on the campus of Jamia Millia Islamia. For three days, members of the network met to discuss issues faced by female journalists on the job. In the midst of a global outcry over violence against women in the workplace, the #MeToo movement informed much of the meeting's content and concerns. The annual meetings for NWMI sought to release statements developed and approved over the course of the meet that expressed the network's stance and demands on issues pertinent to female journalists. These statements from the years since NWMI's first meeting in 2002 are archived on the network's website, along with detailed summaries of the meeting proceedings, including members-only sessions.

Unfortunately for me, in 2019, I remained barred from much of the activity of NWMI's meeting. I approached the organizers and leadership, introduced myself as a researcher, and explained my project. While welcoming me to the public meeting held on the second evening of the meet, the organizers told me that a) I had to be a working journalist to gain membership and

b) I needed to be Indian. Access partially denied. I have since noted on NWMI's website a possible expansion to membership: "The Network of Women in Media, India is an inclusive forum which welcomes women working in or on the media (media professionals / practitioners, students and / or researchers) as members, in India and abroad."[24] Although, "abroad" may refer to non-resident Indians or overseas citizens of India and still exclude membership for foreigners. Nonetheless, I attended the public meeting, a panel discussion on the #MeToo movement in Indian journalism, taking note of the interplay of language during the event. I also referenced the meeting report online (NWMI), published in English.

I attended the public meeting skeptical that I would gain any significant data to make note of in relation to my project. Instead, I entered the auditorium to network, to gain more contacts to interview. In the end, the space was much less conducive to interface with journalists in attendance, but what happened during the session proved an informative moment that hinted at the perceptions of language ability in journalistic writing and challenged the English domination of these semi-public discussions about the industry. NWMI sought participation from women journalists throughout India. Speakers on the sessions worked for English and Hindi media organizations but also a range of other vernacular languages in India, many from the northeastern Indian states or south in Kerala and Tamil Nadu. When language appeared topically in the meeting report, the references mostly made note of how different language media offered varied access and opportunity to female journalists. From a study conducted by a team of network members on female presence on television news, English-language news in India clearly surpassed other language media in giving female broadcasters, let alone female-centric issues, air

---

[24] http://www.nwmindia.org/about-us/membership

time. Hindi-language channels showed an abysmal disparity in male broadcasters over female broadcasters, and notably during debates on female-centric issues on panel shows, panels consisted of a majority of male commentators.

During the public meeting, the speakers, mostly women except for one man, came largely from journalism but also law and discussed various legislation related to violence against women and how they had reported the processes of debate and the aftermath. They discussed the newsroom and what women face working in those spaces. On stage, the guests all eloquently spoke English. Then, the questions from the audience began, and after several initial questions, one woman stood and introduced herself, in Hindi. She worked with *Khabar Lahariya*, an all women news organization that trained women in rural north India to report on issues in their villages and published in Hindi. The woman directed her question to a female journalist on stage. As she began the question, the journalist on stage politely interrupted and asked if the woman spoke English or if someone would translate. An outspoken audience member (sitting directly behind me, talking most of the session to colleagues sitting beside her about her involvement in the Indian broadcast news survey and other accomplishments from her year) interrupted, exclaiming, in English, that a Hindi speaker should be welcome to speak only in Hindi within this space and that the speaker on stage should cater to the audience member's language preference.

The journalist stirred in her seat, and her response came in a voice quieter than before as she explained that she did not know any Hindi. She expressed her embarrassment—she did not have an excuse, like being from anywhere south or east from Delhi in regions where Hindi was not a colloquial language but rather a required second language course taught in schools so

students could grow into good civic participants. She wasn't a Tamil speaker, or Marathi or Gujarati or Bengali or Manipuri. She called herself an Anglo-Indian, a reference common to describe either individuals born in the U.K. to Indian parents or individuals born and raised in India in families that only spoke English and sent their children to English-medium schools. She explained that she attended an English-medium school; yes, she had studied Hindi in school but unfortunately hadn't really picked up the language to any level of proficiency. She went on to attend an elite university in English and worked for English-language papers. Most likely, she worked with translators on assignment, not uncommon in general among English-language journalists in Delhi who even if they speak Hindi are seen as elite interlopers and need to gain trust and access with a translator from the community. She apologized to the audience and to the woman and asked if someone on the panel would translate or if the woman would rather ask someone else.

The woman proceeded with her question in Hindi, another journalist on stage quickly translated to the other, and the journalist proceeded to answer in English. Again, a remark from the crowd that the journalist should respond in Hindi. A bit exasperated, she replied that she couldn't, and frankly the audience wouldn't want her to, joking that her Hindi skills were that bad. She looked to the woman and asked if she could understand her in English. The woman responded affirmatively, quickly noting that she can understand English but cannot express herself as well as she can in Hindi. Members of the audience had assumed that this woman, because she opted to speak in Hindi first, could only understand Hindi.

This exchange in a forum of largely journalists gives a glimpse of the linguistic tensions broadly in the industry. It also gives a glimpse of what language ability might proffer an

individual in a multilingual socio-political system and industry. Organizers and network members clearly had an anxiety about elevating English within the space — they wanted to combat the tendency of English to dominate these public meetings in order to let other languages openly circulate. However, at the expense of other languages in India, they defaulted to Hindi and that Hindi proficiency would be a given among the network members, all journalists working in India. Furthermore, the admission by the journalist on stage that she didn't know Hindi and her subsequent explanation insinuated an outing of a sort, that perhaps her inability to engage in Hindi during her work even though she writes in English diminishes her credibility in the profession. On the one hand, the English discussion happening among all of the speakers on stage may have worked to make the discussion accessible to journalists in other languages besides Hindi; this is loaded with assumptions about education. One speaker on stage was unilingual in English, and none of the others were unilingual or more proficient in any other Indian language besides Hindi or English. Therefore, English-language skill mattered. The value was placed on having English skills, not multilingual ability, as evidenced in the unilingual speaker's presence on the panel. Yet in the reaction from the association members in the audience, the unspoken rule in journalism had privileged English, and they planned to challenge that. In that tense moment, the unilingual English writer's credibility to comment on the industry seemed in question. To try to understand these questions more, I now turn to the space of a journalism training institute to probe at how early career journalists might learn about the process of translation in journalistic writing from senior journalists.

Trainings

Back in the India Habitat Centre, I entered a conference room arranged with rows of tables and 40 chairs facing a podium, a speakers' table and a screen. The room filled with women and two men, except for the staff of the Centre serving tea and coffee in an alcove on the side. We had gathered for the first session of a journalism training for women. For nine days, we would come to the room every afternoon for lectures, panels, and discussions about issues in journalism that women might shed new perspective on as well as general procedures of journalism. The two men in the room for the institute were organizers of the event. From the outset, one of the men expressed his discomfort at leading programming aimed for women but said that he had teamed with esteemed senior women journalists and deferred largely to their leads.

We all arrived at the training having completed a series of readings emailed to us by the conveners. All the material was in English, from academic articles to news articles, most of it by Indian intellectuals and journalists. Within the space of introductions, a foreign journalist working freelance in New Delhi and I were called out — it was okay that we didn't speak Hindi, but we might miss out on some of the content if speakers and participants want to engage in Hindi. I reassured her, "Hindi aati hain." *I understand Hindi.* The conveners elaborated on how women had come from around India to attend, but interestingly, didn't mention the possibility of other languages besides English or Hindi to be used in the training. Multilingualism beyond Hindi-English would not be accommodated. Either the participants could translate what they learn into the contexts of their regional languages, or perhaps the training didn't actually recognize the intricacies of translation and writing in different languages.

The array of backgrounds of the women was vast. Some worked in journalism already, both early career and some established journalists. Recent college graduates attended in the hopes of networking and learning skills. Women working in other industries, for example, a director of an NGO working on disability rights and a fashion designer, attended for career shifts. A self-proclaimed Indian housewife explained that she attended not so much to become a journalist but to understand journalism better and the issues she heard about so that she could become a more critical consumer of news.

One participant introduced herself at first in stilted English; she quickly revealed her position as a broadcast journalist for an Urdu TV channel in Lucknow. She switched to Urdu, and for the remaining eight days, she grew as a vocal participant of the training. She asked questions in almost every session, and her inquiries often pointed to characteristics of Urdu media. Touched briefly on in Chapter 2, Urdu and Hindi have deep political entanglements that date to the independence movement of India. Ostensibly, the two languages are at times called the same but with different scripts, Hindi from the Devanagari tradition and Urdu from a Persio-Arabic lineage. Grammatically they are the same, a majority of the vocabulary is the same, but there are words uniquely Urdu and uniquely Hindi that reveal socio-religious characteristics about a speaker.

All of the sessions were conducted in English. The speakers had a varying range of English ability, but I would describe them all as proficient; they could comfortably present and participate in English. Only one session used audiovisual material for the trainees to engage with, a lecture-discussion on visual stereotypes that waxed more theoretical and waned significantly on applicable skills-based material. It was during this session when news clips from Hindi channels

played that the language seemed almost intrusive to the space. We understood the clips, but in discussing the material together, the process of converting even the broad strokes of the Hindi broadcast into English ideas seemed laborious to many of the students as we pinpointed specific phrases in Hindi. The facilitators and speakers gave warnings about ways the media frame marginalized communities. However, they never pinpointed the role that the actual language played or emphasized important ways to write that could remedy the stereotypes and misinformation often deeply rooted in the language. We were tasked to understand the theoretical issues without a tangible process to put in place through our writing.

The institute was slated as a training for early career journalists to develop their skills. While the readings, presentations, and discussions instilled the importance of critical thinking in the profession of journalism, the tangible skills of writing were absent. One participant later remarked to me that she had signed up to improve her writing, but in the entire nine days, we were never given assignments to practice. She said she knew she needed to learn things to help tighten up her writing and build her vocabulary, and while the readings introduced new concepts she could engage with, she didn't come away with much else to make her a better journalist. In the beginning, the organizers offered an option for participants to write an article, opinion piece, or produce a video to be critiqued by a university scholar, but I later learned that the organizers didn't facilitate the feedback loop. Writing was an aside of the work of journalism.

As I mentioned before, the Urdu journalist actively confronted the speakers with questions about vernacular press. If studies had proven disparities in gender representation in Hindi news, Urdu news confirmed the issues at stake for female journalists. While the session topics ranged, many of the speakers prefaced their responses to the woman by noting that they

couldn't speak directly to Hindi or Urdu newsrooms but that their answers pertained more broadly to the industry of journalism as a whole. Most of these speakers spoke Hindi; in fact, most of their work in reporting happened in Hindi, but they wrote their final products in English. Their active separation from Hindi or other language contexts when teaching principles of journalism to a group of writers suggests not just the reality of linguistic difference in the industry but also that writing in different languages may require different skills and approaches.

This foregrounds the complication that if writing in different languages employs different approaches, then also engaging in multilingual information for writing would also greatly influence the writing process. Linguistically, it is clear that the grammars and vocabularies of different languages influence how people can write between them, but what these speakers implied was that there was more than just language barriers in working within other language journalisms. If within a journalist's process, different languages interact and surface, which is likely in multilingual India, then the journalist will have to overcome these barriers even when writing in another language. It seemed that the speakers were reluctant to engage that process and the intricacies embedded in it. Perhaps these processes were seen as personal and individual, not something articulated in a clear coherent practice. They had always had to engage multilingually, so it wasn't a skill they possessed — multilingualism just was a part of them. They assumed, through their silence, that it would be the same for anyone in Indian journalism.

Conclusion

In this chapter, I explored different spaces in which journalists have conversations about how to define their industry. In some of these spaces, the public, which in India is split into many converging publics, had the opportunity to "weigh in" through a ruse of the participatory spirit of

literary salons and the public sphere. Literature festivals and media summits offered spaces for broad discussions on hot-button issues of the times, but the people actually given the platform to speak and engage on stage had the authority to debate the conditions of their representative publics. In a way, it doesn't sound that different from deliberative politics and democracy, but in these spaces, democratic choice was absent on a broad scale, only in the hands of the organizers, but on a much finer level as well. Within each session, the speakers stood in to represent various communities and identities. What they said on stage was understood to be the views, values, and politics of those communities. They had the deliberative power to direct the narrative. In reality, they represented expert, professional, and intellectual communities but could rarely speak to the experiences of the diverse people in their fields or in India.

Literature festivals reflect on the writing community in its broadest sense — or do they? Writing in the literature festivals I attended meant literature, not journalism. Journalists could participate in the festivals, but rarely did they occupy space of authority on an industry of writing. That slowly shifted in time, especially as long-form reporting published online has grown more influential in India; that is, influential in English-language markets. English-language journalists now find frequent opportunities in media summits to discuss the state of their industry, Indian journalism. At times, they make efforts to specify that they can only speak to the English-language press, but in fora where the publics see these journalists as the representatives of a whole industry, these journalists gain influence over the practices of their field. Thus, if issues of translation and language exchange don’t resonate with English-language journalists, then the community of Indian journalists may ignore the critical role of language, linguistic diversity, and translation in their writing processes.

This chapter addressed a meso-level understanding of the question of value in multilingualism within Indian journalism. To recognize an ability as a necessary skill for a job gives that ability value. By ignoring the idea that multilingualism could contribute a skill to reporting and journalistic writing, journalists in these public and semi-private spaces suggested that no, multilingualism wasn't a remarkably valuable skill to the industry. It was inherent for the Indian journalists. But the deeper implication was that some languages just had more value. English-language journalists, not Hindi-language journalists, frequently were given platform to speak on journalism. It is a complex, and in ways contradictory, suggestion — multilingualism can't be seen as a valued skill, but English skill is valued. I do not believe that it is the message that the English-language journalists meant to convey, but in these discursive spaces it was communicated in a way. In the next chapter, I go to the micro-level of analysis to investigate if the personal values of Indian journalists around multilingualism and their writing might tell a more nuanced story about the role of translation in reporting. I ask English-language journalists about skill, process, and creativity in regards to how the multi-situational translation moments that they encounter through their work as journalists confront their position in the industry and in relation to their sources.

4: Interviewing the Writing: Creativity in Multilingual Processes

The sill on the other side of the tinted window where I sat waiting measured only a few inches. Still, pigeons landed their plump bodies there, cooing if undisturbed, flapping and knocking against the concrete walls if startled into flight. Pigeons — almost always present in the background of my interview recordings, no matter where the interview was held. Whether I sat at a table in a news office conference room, on the couch in a journalist's apartment, or over coffee at a tiny boutique cafe, I couldn't set my recorder in a place that avoided interrupting noises — the pigeons outside the window, the person ringing the doorbell, the coffee machine steaming milk. I realized, listening back on the audio, that those sounds echoed the bombarding pressures aimed against these journalists during their reporting processes. Language was an important component of their process, but their multilingualism didn't fully equip the journalists for the go-between nature of their reporting and their writing. As I listened through muffled voices and flapping wings in the background of my interview audio to find the writers' perspectives, these journalists listened through language to contend with many other influences — class, gender, education — on their reporting.

I approached the open gate into a concrete courtyard abutting stone steps up to the wide doorway of a massive but otherwise nondescript, 12-story high-rise building. Several men walked out the door; several headed in. No women were around. I self-consciously passed through the gate undetected by the guards sitting by a plywood cubicle against the wall. In the lobby, no signs or welcome desk. I saw a list displayed behind a glass frame near the elevators. I didn't want to look lost since I stood out already among the businessmen, so I quickly swept my eyes over the list for the news organization's name. I found the floor number and hopped in the

elevator with several men, two carrying buckets of hot milky *chai* (tea). The first stop opened the doors to a corridor that looked under construction and unlit. The next floor, a wall. My stop came third; stepping from the elevator, I landed in a hallway with no signs. I took a right — wrong — found a door with the name of some consulting company. Turning back the other direction, I pressed against the wall to pass a man coming down the skinny corridor from a law office. An unmarked door across from there, I decided to test it out.

Inside, a man sat guard by a water cooler. I introduced myself, and he ushered me into a small conference room nearby, windows on all sides. I was used to these rooms, nondescript with a clean table and flimsy chair. The doorman offered me a glass of water. I looked out at a nearly empty newsroom except for two women sitting with their laptops. The man approached one of the women to announce my arrival. She looked over and nodded, conveyed some instruction to the man, and continued to type on her computer. “She’s coming. Few minutes,” he said, peeking his head in the door.

I watched the two women at work. The two walls adjacent to the window were lined with long desks divided into cubbies, and a long center row divided the room into two sides. They both had spots near the center of the middle row. Perhaps one cubby length separated them, but they faced each other. Sparse papers and books lay on desks within each cubicle space, but no one else was in the room. Nothing on the walls, the floor a drab carpet, the lighting dull florescent. It was uninspiring, but also not distracting, for a writer. The other woman I was not there to meet had on a clunky set of headphones. They intently watched their screens, at one point typing on a draft or an email and another moment clicking through files or open tabs. It was an innocuous view. None of the bustle I had seen in other newsrooms, or even at the very

least, movement. Yet amidst this drab office space, I would soon be transported by both women out of New Delhi into other parts of India. One woman would take me on train journeys to report on Indian elections, hopping off at random small town depots to spend a day or two talking to local shopkeepers and residents. The other woman would sneak me into contested zones, dodging curfews to investigate police encounters. In these quiet moments sitting down at plain desks to write, the women engaged in crucial moments of their work process as journalists. I wanted to know about their interactions as field reporters, but I also sought to understand the complex situations unfolding through their writing, all of the things influencing the decisions they would make in the language of their writing. Now I was the pigeon knocking on the window to interrupt and muffle the moment.

In Chapters 1 and 2, I reviewed research on Indian journalists and their work (Koushik, 2018; Ståhlberg, 2006), and in this chapter I pursue the call from previous studies to focus on certain practices of journalism that examine individual roles in idea production. Other studies have explored publics in India and their transformation throughout political and economic shifts in the country through the decade (Chaudhuri, 2010; Rao & Wasserman, 2015). Journalists enter these publics by engaging with and reporting from sources, a key part of translation work on the job. Through the craft of writing, journalists aim to contribute to public good by communicating and connecting to and through diverse publics. However, journalists must mitigate these shifts between communities, some that overlap in the collage of identities while others stay strictly apart. Journalists have to maintain a presence in these publics, which includes negotiating their relationships to other people and managing the expectations of the job (Chua, 2019). All of these pressures contribute to what journalists endure through the processes of reporting.

In India, studies have found that journalists spend more time in the field than in newsroom spaces with their peers, although field time refers to any time spent on work outside of the newsroom (Rao & Wasserman, 2015; Ståhlberg, 2006). As newsrooms shrink into small spaces in dull corporate office towers and technology enables newsrooms to operate online and remotely, journalists can be even more mobile and travel between different publics. Field time in India's cities, for example, involves less information gathering and more relationship maintenance with officials and politicians. These studies suggest that journalists in India need to keep open, cordial ties with their sources and power players in order to gain access to information and story scoops (Rao & Wasserman, 2015, p. 656; Ståhlberg, 2006). While much of this may remain true for journalists working in India, this chapter shows a different perspective on the interactions that make up the work of journalists. In interviews on the myriad translation situations that journalists encounter during reporting, the journalists with whom I spoke revealed complex translative interactions with people they encountered in the field. The journalists were conscious and aware that translation offered space to amplify unheard voices through their writing.

This chapter dives into individual journalists' own connections with writing and translation. It steps into a more personal and intimate realm for journalists to reflect on working between languages. The individual practices and processes that the Indian journalists trace reveal pressures from the industry of journalism when working in different languages. In the context of Chapter 3's findings on a meso-level, this chapter shows that on the micro-level, the issues of multilingual ability as a skill and defined processes of writing resonate differently when considered from a personal perspective of an Indian journalist. Again, I explore *to what degree*

Indian journalists value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting, and by speaking to individuals, I more narrowly target *how they describe their writing process,* cognizant of *individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process.* Also, the individual perspectives allow me to consider *what creative strategies Indian journalists use in writing in order to fully translate different cultural meanings across languages.* The chapter proceeds with a detailed section about the method of interviewing in this project and explains the analytical approach to interview data that enables me to develop a discussion about individual-level perceptions and practices. Then, I investigate the interviews through the categories of skill, process, and creativity to consider the Indian journalists' perspectives on translation work in journalism. Through skill, I investigate what multilingualism means to the Indian journalists and how it has influenced their work. Process looks at their writing practices and how language comes into play. Creativity examines the choices these journalists face in writing that affect language and voice.

Method

In order to target individual perceptions of multilingual news writing, I looked at news translation in terms of processes of writing articulated by Indian journalists rather than at the content derived from these processes. The interview subjects were chosen through purposive and snowball sampling. My early interviews targeted individuals working for specific publications that openly engage with translation ideas in their news production. I recruited from digital organizations known mostly for their English reportage that also published Hindi pages. I thought that there would be overlap between the reporting in different languages, whether through translated writing or team reporting. I connected with journalists at literary festivals and

media summits during ethnographic fieldwork, both by chance and as an organizer. I received permission in all of my interviews to use their names, and I only use first names. I maintain anonymity for one individual because of his very high position over his publication. I have chosen to leave the publications and organizations anonymous. The observations I make in connection to media organizations are not meant as criticism or indictments of the organizations represented in this chapter. I did not always speak with members of organizations' management teams to understand the newsroom ethos or to clarify rules and guidelines. Therefore, to offer some distance, I do not directly name the media that the journalists work for.

After an interview, I asked individuals for contacts as well, often noting the same names circulating in the networks of journalists. In total, I conducted extensive interviews with 14 news workers, and in some cases conducted follow up interviews. I use the term "news workers" to signal that some interview subjects held positions as editors but still reported as well; all interview subjects ultimately worked in the role of journalists because they actively published reported and investigated stories. In this chapter, I generally refer to the interview subjects as journalists, and I clarify those who now also hold higher-level positions in media organizations. In total, 4 journalists worked for magazines, 2 worked for newspapers, 2 worked for news agencies, 3 worked for digital outlets, and 3 considered themselves independent journalists.

The location of an interview depended on the journalist. I met journalists in newsrooms, in coffeeshops, and in their homes. Coffeeshops were not ideal settings, with other voices and brewing machines carrying into the microphone and muffling the recordings. The home space eased some of the subjects, and more typically these journalists worked freelance assignments. The office environment posed interesting challenges to the research. Invited for an interview at

the workplace meant contending with cut-ins from the workday newsroom but also allowed me to gain some context to understand the interviewees' professional environment. Interviews ranged in time from 45 minutes to 2 hours.

The structure of an interview influences the breadth of information and detail a researcher might be able to gain. The interviews in this project followed a semi-structured format. I approached the interview with an interview script of questions (Appendix 2), but the journalists could steer their answers in any direction. The interviews veered in and out of topics on language and writing education, expectations of journalism, and challenges reporting across languages. Typically an interview began with demographic questions and the journalist's current work profile. I next asked about the individual's career — how the person came to work in journalism; what topics the journalist typically covers; what outlet(s) the journalist writes for if not employed by a media organization.

This led to questions directed at language: Do you write for Hindi/English/other-language publications? Why did you choose that language? How did you learn the languages you know? How comfortable are you to read/write/converse in these languages? After understanding a journalist's background and motivations for entering the industry, I routed the conversation to ask the journalists to walk me through the reporting process. This led to an interesting methodological dilemma that forced me to confront the complexity of journalistic translation situations — a core issue discussed in Chapter 1 related to if and how journalists identify as translators — a crucial aspect of this research overall. My research design yielded a broad field to discuss translation within the journalism industry in India — from editors to early-career

reporters. I sought to understand various perspectives on language use and the way multilingual interactions come to bear on the work of journalists.

To interview means the researcher asks the subject to make meaning of a story or an encounter the researcher deems relevant to a phenomenon (Lindlof & Taylor, 2011, pp. 174, 181). This research engaged in polyphonic interviewing to allow each interview to stand alone and contribute to a larger index of ideas rather than develop a collective interpretation of an overall phenomenon (Fontana & Frey, 2000, 657). From polyphonic interviews, researchers present data representative of individual responses and diverse perspectives without making sweeping collective statements about a phenomenon. Individualistic data of this type can show collective trends and influences that arise but the focus of data collection targets individualism.

The use of polyphonic interviewing in this project allows me to transition from the broader ethnographic technique described in Chapter 3 to consider the concepts of skill, process, and creativity at a micro-level through individuals. By speaking one-on-one with 14 news workers, I learned about unique practices journalists use in reporting, different expectations of writing and linguistic interactions, and different expectations of multilingualism in the industry. The ideas and revelations presented show diverse ways that journalists understand the role of translation in news writing. I do not draw overall conclusions about translation and writing within Indian journalism. In the vein of research that counters the dominant trope of Western scholarship to offer conclusive findings, I emphasize this point of uniqueness. The space for multiple voices and findings through research on non-Western contexts allows other ways of doing to be understood and considered as alternative practices.

Data Analysis

In Chapter 1, I laid a foundation drawing from theories on literary and journalistic translation studies and articulated three areas of focus — skill, process, and creativity. Analyzing translation often cycles between allegiance to literal or to figurative meanings, dependent on the layer of translation, as in the source, translator, or the target. All layers are important components to study but also create dizzying processes to trace through the phenomenon of translation. Skill, process, and creativity help to structure the analysis of interview data. Lindlof and Taylor (2011) encourage systematic analysis of qualitative research data — in other words, organizing data and findings through categories and codes (p. 246). These two realms, categories and codes, help schematize the data analysis through patterns articulated in existing theories or classificatory indexes or developed from deep readings of the data (p. 248). A system of analysis built from patterns provides more rigor to the interview method.

This study on translation processes in Indian news writing draws from several literary translation theories to highlight the categories of skill, process, and creativity in the data analysis. I embarked on interviews to trace and articulate a translation writing process, but early on I found that the interviews offered insight into other ideas on multilingualism in journalism. For example, journalists often discussed their linguistic ability and how that weighed heavy on their relationship to language. This important information expanded the way that I examined the categories of skill, process, and creativity. Whereas process initially had more weight in the construction of the research agenda, I realized the other two categories had equally important influence on multilingual translation in Indian news. Reflecting on early readings of the project's

interview data helped me solidify these categories and code the data for skill, process, and creativity in the discursive practices of translation, reporting, and writing.

Gubrium and Holstein (2000) guide how to interpret and analyze data from discursive practices. In journalism, reporting, interviewing, and writing in multiple languages constitute several inter-related discursive practices. They define discourse as a multitude of elements in social practice that inform interactions and give meaning to ideas, a definition grounded in Foucauldian analysis that considers practices of subjectivity and imbalances of power (Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 494-5). Discourse analysis in this sense alleviates the tendency in conversational analysis to only consider what arises in the recorded speech and conversation to explain social life and behaviors of individuals. Gurbium and Holstein's approach considers external forces on the individuals that arise in the conversation; these are factors that emerge from the data and observations but that the researcher may not have anticipated how important of an impact they would have on the findings (Bernard, 2001, p. 424; Gubrium & Holstein, 2000, p. 492; Spitulnik, 2009, p. 111). Gubrium and Holstein (2000) suggest that "the interplay of discourse and discursive practice transforms analytical bracketing into critical bracketing, offering a basis not only for documenting interpretive practice, but also for commenting critically on its own constructions, putting the analytic pendulum in motion in relation to itself" (p. 504).

Similar to how Ehrensberger-Dow and Perrin (2013) ask research subjects to explain and analyze external forces on their translative practices, this project considers external factors that contribute to a journalist's critical role in translative interactions. The main external factor is the relationship of language in socio-political contexts of India. In this project, I did not anticipate how frequently the journalists would reflect on social and economic class differences indicated

by their language use during reporting. They thought their reporting could contribute to more inclusive media agendas. I explore this in depth later in the chapter, but I introduce it here to exemplify the complexity of interviews. Researchers need to draw connections from these conversations with what happens outside of the interview space. In other words, researchers should observe the settings and fields that subjects exist in and how that may affect what research subjects express about their experiences — this is the discursive process. For this reason, I presented ethnographic observations in Chapter 3 as contextual milieu for the external circuits — through public events or industry meetings — that press upon journalists' individual perceptions of their work.

This chapter uses interviews with Indian journalists working across a variety of publications and platforms to analyze skill, process, and creativity in translation situations of news reporting. The section on skill considers the educational routes that have brought the journalists to their work as English-language writers and whether linguistic writing ability actually functions as a skill in the industry. In the section on process, I pinpoint particular aspects of reporting that the journalists reflected on in relation to translation and source interaction, namely interviewing, transcribing, and quoting. From talking about how to quote between languages, the chapter finally considers how creativity affects the conveyance of translated information and whether creative agency helps or hinders the journalist in staying honest to the intent of a source.

Skill

Multilingual journalists resist tagging themselves as translators by denying their multilingual ability as a skill linked to their work (Biesla & Bassnett, 2009, p. 15), but

researchers point out that translation epitomizes the work of journalism, compiling information out of multi-source situations to synthesizing these threads together in writing (Schäffner, 2012; Tsai, 2010, p. 194). Under the broad category of skill, this section explores how journalists identify and explain multilingualism in their individual lives. From there, the journalists discuss what role their multilingual ability has played on their choice of career and on the way they *do* journalism. This targets the project's first research question: *to what degree do members of India's journalism profession value multilingual ability as a skill in reporting?*

I approached Indian journalists for this research based on their written work, published in print or digital. What became clear to me in interviews was that the journalists took various in-roads into journalism through media other than print where languages vividly collided, especially in broadcast news. Several journalists who began their careers in broadcast or radio described how language played a particularly contentious role for them in relation to their colleagues. The skill of multilingualism in broadcasting meant different degrees of going-between the language departments of a media organization. Some news organizations conferred their reporters with the title of bilingual reporter, giving equal value to the journalists' skills in two or more languages. In other organizations, bilingual proficiency in certain directions, namely Hindi to English, developed a hierarchy across departments, marking some reporters as superior to others. These experiences contributed to the journalists' current relationships with language use in reporting.

During the interviews, the Indian journalists were not directly questioned about the skills they possessed to do the job of bi- or multilingual writing. Instead, questions about their own language abilities and their education interestingly led them to articulate skill. The journalists described multilingual skills that they acquired over the years through their education and their

experiences. Ultimately, the translative practices they developed through formal education or informal daily interactions led the journalists to choose a language for writing. Skill in how journalists navigate Hindi and English played a basic role in whether journalists opted to write in Hindi or English, but the implications of this choice on their reporting were complex and revealed tensions within the journalism industry. In this section, I explore these two veins: the formal and informal educations that developed multilingual skills and the choices that these skills afforded the journalists in their careers.

Formal and Informal Education and Skill

The journalists said that they go between Hindi and English easily. They worked as English-language journalists, but they also had varying degrees of languages bearing on their identities as writers. Most of the journalists received English-medium education, but they often used Hindi at home with family members passing between Hindi and English. The journalists hailed from every corner of India — Delhi, Kolkata, Madhya Pradesh, Kashmir, Punjab, Kerala. Nonetheless, as I explained in Chapter 2, education policy in India set up a language curriculum that ensured students attain some level of multilingual skill. The journalists raised in the Hindi belt, some in Anglophone households, who attended English-medium schools learned Hindi as a second-language. Living in the Hindi belt required that they functionally speak Hindi in the community anyways, which improved their multilingualism. Depending on the region of the Hindi belt where a person grew up, they might learn Urdu, Punjabi, or other official state languages for three years as an elective to fulfill the language requirements of the National Education Policy. Yet, Ipsita, a digital reporter who grew up in eastern India, had a different experience with formal language education. In Kolkata, West Bengal, instead of a steady second-

language education in Hindi, she studied the state's official language, Bengali. Hindi was then slotted as a third language elective. Ipsita pointed out that Hindi tended to be the most popular third language in school because Indian parents pressured their children to take Hindi for their future. The children would need Hindi-language skills to successfully undertake a career in India.

Ankita, an independent journalist, spoke Hindi with her parents and English in her school, but living mostly with her grandparents, she noted the influence of a "colonial hangover" from her grandfather. He taught Ankita to let go of the regional languages her grandparents had known and to focus on educated English and literary Hindi. "We lost out on something," she stated with regret. She reminisced about completing translation exercises that her grandfather assigned her. She said that those exercises made the translation work she did during her years editing for a publishing house quite an easy activity. In that capacity, Ankita had a tangible skill directly applied to the work at her job. When we talked about translation in journalism, she noted that spoken Hindi and written Hindi were so different because of the regionalism of the language. Ankita downplayed the multilingual skills she had acquired in both her formal and informal education when the translation process involved more oral exchange, like in interviews with sources. She didn't express her ability to go between Hindi and English as a skill, but in expressing the loss of proficiency in regional languages in her family, that "something", while seemingly a connection to generational history and localizing culture, may more basically refer to a missed opportunity at a skill. With just Hindi and English, she felt limited in the communities she could fluidly travel between and access for reporting. While she could hire a translator, these markers of language would set her apart from her sources in rural areas. Although she saw Hindi-English in some ways as an inferior kind of multilingualism, her

sources speaking regional languages based in rural areas would regard this bilingual ability as sophisticated, educated, and elite.

The executive editor of an English-language magazine had a multi-layered history with language. He grew up in South India, educated in Malayalam, the state language of Kerala, in a village, "learning English very late"; the editor eventually went on for graduate education in the United States after working for five years in India in "language journalism", as he referred to it. He remarked that when he read Malayalam news, he always thought about the layers of translation a news item must have gone through, from bilingualism or trilingualism, to finally arrive in Malayalam. "I'm a big believer of language journalism more than English at least in the context of India," the editor asserted, an interesting statement coming from leadership in an English-language publication. He continued, "Actually for political change, social change, I think English is not the language." His magazine, after ten years of English-language reporting, had launched a Hindi-language edition. He aimed to archive past cover stories in Hindi and to produce Hindi translations of all stories that the English edition published, eventually producing original reporting in Hindi first as well. The executive editor clearly espoused a value to multilingualism, one that even diminished the role of English-language journalism in India — even though his *English-language* publication had one of the best reputations among Indian journalists for its hard-hitting investigations against government corruption and caste violence. As an editor, he was well aware of the organizational constraints that had kept the publication from undertaking translation work, but he wanted to make the effort to overcome this. The upper management of his publisher had finally agreed, and he saw this new Hindi edition as an opportunity to revalue Hindi-language journalism. He hoped that Hindi-language journalism in

his publication's long-form narrative style would transform the reading culture of the Hindi-language audience as well, another site of multi-situational translation!

Following early education, several of the journalists pursued degrees in English literature and stumbled into journalism after university. They felt well-equipped for critical analysis and writing, but they recognized that in Indian journalism, English education set them apart, not always for the better in the eyes of their colleagues. Vishnu, whose current job title for a magazine is Hindi translator, but who has a career as a journalist and continues to report, explained that officialdom in India comes in English. Primary resources used in higher education and academic research, official documents from the government, international access to information — all come to Indian publics first through English. He noted that without English, Hindi-language journalists have a difficult time breaking major political stories because of the translation filter they must first pass the information through. He suggested that Hindi-language journalists tend to only work in Hindi, written and oral; this follows de Swaan's (2001) point, made in Chapter 2, that a majority of Indians, though exposed often to multiple languages, actually engage unilingually and that multilingual skills comes from education and privilege (p. 63). Thus, the high-level education that English-language journalists often attain in university gives them a skill on the job to surpass their peers in other-language presses and break major stories. Hindi for most served as a back-pocket tool that made it possible to report independently in the parts of India that mattered for their Delhi-centric reporting. Multilingual ability counted as a skill for their reporting, but language in the hands of the journalists was like a hammer compared to an Allen wrench. The most used tool in the box but not refined like other skills.

Even for Ipsita, proficient in Bengali and English with only rudimentary skills in spoken Hindi, she had found a way to wield Hindi as a tool in reporting. She covered stories about the Northwest and Northeast regions of India, two high-conflict zones that made reporting from there dangerous. While she often relied on correspondents for reporting, at times, she traveled for assignments. She noted that in the Northeast, namely in the state of Assam, Bengali had major political markers as a language of oppression, so she defaulted to Hindi which marked her as an outsider anyways. In Kashmir, people heard her Hindi as Urdu and spoke to her as such, although she always teamed with a local contact for translation. Ipsita was intimately aware that language in the field served more to communicate information to the sources. Based on language identities, a source could choose to trust a journalist or not. Using a language among certain social and political groups could endanger the journalist. For her, language was not something to be taken for granted in the reporting process; she valued multilingualism because she had experienced the stakes connected to it.

Although language skill served journalists in their work, they expressed discomfort at the professional advantage they had in easily accessing official statements in English and conducting interviews on the ground in Hindi. Priyanka, a bilingual reporter for a major news agency, echoed Ankita's exact phrase of a "colonial hangover". For Priyanka, the colonial hangover was the privilege so many English-language journalists accessed through family histories tied to colonial power and roles in cooperation with, and later opposition to, British rule. Their education in English and work writing in English sustained the colonial legacy and strengthened the English-Hindi divide in Indian journalism. Yet, she said, as they perpetuated the Anglo influence, English-language journalists lamented the linguistic dominance in the industry — she

called it a self-inferiority complex. I had observed in public spaces that journalists seemed to exude confidence about their English-language writing, but what Priyanka suggested was that it was a façade to maintain dominance when in reality these journalists were less skilled than journalists with multilingual writing ability.

Priyanka had an interesting path into bilingual journalism, winding from English-medium education to university study in Hindi-language journalism school. Her path to journalism school involved breaking her family's expectation that she would pursue engineering or sciences. When she decided to study journalism, the only university near where she lived with her family was a Hindi-language journalism college. The majority of students in the college came from Hindi-medium educations, but because she had been educated in English, she was allowed to submit her materials in Romanized script. For years, she couldn't type in Hindi and relied on typing in Roman script and using an online translator to switch the Hindi to Devanagari script. She founded, with a small group of peers, an English-language newspaper for her college since all the other publications were produced in Hindi. Directly after college, she interned and then worked as the correspondent in her city for the *Hindustan Times*, an English-language daily. However, she struggled with the division between Hindi and English reporting, both within the profession and in the audience reach. To overcome the colonial hangover, Priyanka eventually switched to Hindi — a calculated decision she could make only because she had a skill set in both languages. In the news agency she worked for now, her peers were also multilingual writers, but with her previous organization, her choice to write in Hindi instead of in English continued to separate her from her Hindi-language peers. They couldn't understand why someone who could write English would take the pay cut of a Hindi-language job. Even though she had the

same salary and work opportunities as them, she also had the choice to leave Hindi. That was seen as a privilege. There was more tangible financial value in one language than another that in turn placed cultural value on the languages.

Multilingual Skill and the Choices to Write

All the journalists at some point chose to pursue writing in English in their careers, but in talking about this choice, they often uneasily remarked about the inequality between English and Hindi reporting. Because they had opted to write in English, they developed more unilingual writing skills and lamented their inability to comfortably write in Hindi and other languages. They explained ways that the Hindi they spoke and the Hindi of their sources didn't always transfer to written reporting. In the accounts of three of the journalists who had actively worked in newsrooms operating in more than one language, they could articulate the differences in working in unilingual journalistic writing versus actively writing multilingually. Ultimately, they all admitted, if a journalist has the skill to write in English, then they ought to choose the better opportunities that were available in English-language journalism.

Vishnu, introduced earlier, worked as Hindi translator for a magazine that launched its Hindi edition in September 2018. His role as translator was not in a traditional field reporting sense but rather reminiscent of local bureau reporters for international offices (Hannerz, 2004). Vishnu was the only full-time translator hired, though he worked closely with two freelance translators. Prior to working for the magazine, Vishnu worked for All India Radio covering news about Nepal and speaking mostly Hindi, at times Nepali — his parents are Nepali, but he grew up in Madhya Pradesh and attended an English-language convent school. He had extensive experience writing in Hindi, as a published author and translator from Nepali to Hindi. He

translated a book, the title he referred to as *Jail Break* in English although an English version hasn't been published, about a Nepali woman, a suspected Maoist insurgent, who had escaped from jail. In completing this project, he said he had acquired skills and perspectives to understand the work of translation. "I learned that when literary translation is at work, you have to, you know, understand the person who is writing, her background is definitely very important," he said. "If the writer is Muslim, or the character is Muslim, then you have to have Urdu words, it cannot be Hindi words, so that way it makes the translation real actually. People relate to the translation, and they do not feel that they are reading something which has been translated." He would echo this sentiment later in the interview when we talked about an article about an infamous Kashmiri insurgent who the original author had interviewed from jail.

Vishnu grappled with the balance of dynamic equivalence, especially attuned to the source. In translating the literary story of a Maoist rebel, his relationship to the source author was one of separation. He credited his mentor, a famed translator, for helping him navigate the process of translation and noted that the rebel, now a candidate for Nepal's parliament, had communicated through his mentor, but never directly to Vishnu. She trusted his mentor's process and choices in translation. He was in a similar situation with the magazine, although he had more access to the original authors who had interfaced with the sources. He noted that if the original author of a story had quoted a source in the article, he could try to access audio from their interviews if the magazine had them on file or, if the author still worked for the magazine or was willing, could get the file or notes to reconstruct quotes as close to the original statement as possible. Vishnu understood the multi-situational translation process he was involved in from

Hindi to English to Hindi. If he could at least preserve some aspect of the original Hindi from the interview, he would honestly convey the source.

In his journalistic career, Vishnu decided to switch to freelance writing in English, a choice he made mainly because of the financial stakes. Within the space of journalism, Hindi reporting could barely pay the bills. Now, work for the English-language publication in this new role finally provided the opportunity for him to apply his Hindi-language translation experience in a way that paid up. Because the magazine published monthly, Vishnu had more time to spend on the English-to-Hindi translation. The publication produced some online content as well, so Vishnu still had daily journalistic experience translating online pieces. The experience of now fixating daily on producing Hindi-language content exposed the translator-journalist to new layers of what working between languages meant. He still considered dynamic equivalence during his work, but now, it seemed more complexly intertwined between the source and target. Vishnu explained, "When I am translating, I want my reader to actually sense what he was going through when he was speaking to [the reporter]. So I wanted to give that. I always want to give that to my readers, that it's not some… they can feel actually what the character or the person in the news is trying to say." Vishnu had clear ideas of his role as translator, and because of the skills he had developed working in translation, he now had choices in how he used his multilingualism professionally. He worked among mostly English-language writers at the magazine, but even though English-language reporting seemed to have more socio-economic value in the the profession, Vishnu felt that he had more opportunities to explore how he wrote between the languages. His multilingual skill made him more creative.

Priyanka had chosen to switch between English to Hindi and now to a bilingual role. She said that she always wanted to do journalism that was "pro-people", telling the stories of the underdog. An editor for a major Indian magazine, now defunct, told Priyanka that Hindi news would reach more people. When she expressed that English-language journalism had more prestige, he replied, "A good story is a good story, no matter what language you do. It will have an impact." Recognizing the colonial hangover embedded in English-language reporting, she wanted to join the underdogs of journalism, too. The editor hired her on the Hindi team, where she quickly experienced the realities of Hindi journalism she had been warned about and that her family feared. She barely made Rs. 10,000 per month (not even $150 USD today) and lived in lower class neighborhoods in New Delhi in order to survive on her salary. Priyanka said that she sacrificed a lot to do the writing she wanted in Hindi. In her family, the move to a Hindi-language newsroom was considered a demotion — why provide their daughter an English-medium education just so she can work in Hindi? Hindi was a necessity of everyday professional life in India, but English was an added skill that set a person apart because English-medium education cost money.

"We have not stood for our people who work in other languages," she decried. She believed that in other languages like Bengali, Malayalam, and Marathi, there was more respect for journalists writing in those languages because of the history of print and literature in those regions, touched on in Chapter 2, in which writers in those languages were politically active against colonialism. Today, to patronize the news in those local languages showed pride in their past — not the case for Hindi. The history of Hindi was complicated and intertwined with external factors of religious fundamentalism and casteism. Hindi had been a tool to separate from

the British and gain an independent India but at the cost of inclusion and true secularism. Hindi stood as a marker of how unrepresentative Hindu nationalism might actually be in India. Thus, Hindi-English journalists navigated a privilege in the languages because of their regional strength near New Delhi, but outside of the urban India, Hindi-English privilege was seen as a sellout to colonialism through globalization that forgot the rural roots.

At the time of our interview, Priyanka worked under the title of bilingual reporter for a major international media organization. She explained that as a bilingual reporter, she is required to represent one Indian language, Hindi in her case, and English. Within this European-headquartered organization, besides its domestic market, India represents its second largest bureau. All reporters hired in the New Delhi office work as bilingual reporters. She explained that within the organization, her stories would be published in Hindi and English, and the English version would be used by other bilingual reporters to translate into their primary language for publication. Similarly, she would sometimes draw from colleagues' English versions to translate into Hindi. While the processes all circulated and overlapped, the central requirement to be a bilingual reporter was the skill to write in two languages. This skill meant that she could engage with quotes — she had the space to both quote her sources verbatim in Hindi and likewise construct the translated version based on her direct primary source interaction. She said, "Message is important. You can turn around the words, but the message matters." This space for creativity on the page arose for most of the journalists, a topic I explore more in-depth in the section on creativity.

Supriya, a senior editor for an online English-language news site, recalled her journey into journalism through a local Mumbai broadcast station. The channel supplied news through

several languages to cater to the diverse linguistic populations of the city, including the state language of Marathi, the language of Gujarati (a large population had shifted from the neighboring state), and the national language of Hindi, along with English and several others. She wrote and produced dispatches in English, but on the job she realized that many of her colleagues reporting in Hindi couldn't read and translate her English. She had to write in Hindi, a skill she had previously ignored but that would eventually elevate her in her career. When she changed jobs to a national station, the languages no longer interacted in one newsroom but rather had entirely different reporters, staffs, and news agendas.

Because Supriya was able to speak and read Hindi and English, the editors asked her to go-between the newsrooms. If she were sent out on assignment, the editors would ask her to dispatch for both newsrooms, meaning that a Hindi-language correspondent would not get the story. She recognized that her Hindi-speaking colleagues resented her for taking these stories. English was the priority of the news organization, so she got paid more than the Hindi-language reporters and also was taking their stories. These Hindi-language reporters could often speak English, Supriya noted, but with less ease and more hesitation. They might be literate in English, but not proficient enough to seamlessly read copy from a teleprompter or to quickly write a broadcast lead in the field. In other words, Supriya had a different level of multilingual skill that catered to the demands of the news station, and those skills came from her privileged background in English-medium schools. She had options of how to report. Like Priyanka, multilingualism afforded her linguistic privilege in the newsroom to cover stories, but for this organization it proved the financial advantage of her multilingual ability. It was a quantifiable skill.

Eventually, Supriya left broadcast and audio-visual to pursue writing. Despite all of her experience working between Hindi and English newsrooms, she still didn't consider herself capable of writing in Hindi. "I can't imagine writing a full Hindi article, say for a magazine, with the same kind of ease. I would be able to produce an article in Hindi, but…" She continued, "I think there's a lot that gets lost in writing in India. It's very hard to write about a multilingual, multiethnic society which has so many different cleavages. I don't think even the most sophisticated writer, especially if you're writing English." In her mind, her abilities between Hindi and English perhaps afforded her privilege in the industry of journalism in India, but it hadn't actually equipped her with skills superior to her other-language journalism colleagues. Similar to Priyanka, she recognized that her English-language skills allowed her to write in a prestigious realm of Indian journalism, but that in reality it would never connect with the majority of the reading publics. Writing in English was a barrier, but in her ability to speak Hindi, she found she could connect to sources in more fruitful ways.

The tensions that Vishnu, Priyanka, and Supriya articulated between the power structures of Hindi-language and English-language journalisms in India and the relationships to sources and readers derive from the recognition of their skill sets in multiple languages. On the one hand, English-language skills give financial benefits to journalists and prestige within an elite, educated reading public. On the other, their Hindi skills connect them to sources and communities that the journalists want to engage through their English-language writing, but who also might never read and interact with the news that the journalists write. Ankita described her Hindi-language skill as a means to break down the barrier of the urban-rural. The journalists all wrote for mostly Delhi-based publications — the independent journalists typically pitched to

urban-based or international papers and magazines — so they needed skills for the field in the Hindi belt. Multilingualism was a key tool these journalists acquired in their educational upbringing, although it failed to give many of the journalists skills in Hindi-language writing. For those who did have both English and Hindi writing skills, multilingualism gave them choice in their profession to go between in the industry. In going between, these journalists could creatively imbue their writing with turns of linguistic phrase, that is, if their organizations allowed. However, this also could affect the *skopos* of their writing. Their ability to go between made them weigh their allegiance through their writing between their sources and their target audience differently than someone who could only truly engage through the target. The next section moves from a focus on skill to understand how the varying levels of multilingual ability played out in articulated practices of reporting and writing.

Process

Through process, I look at the functional aspect of writing and translation and consider what influences the ways that journalists articulate their process. I also discuss the challenges of having a process and whether language complicates their writing work. Take, for example, Vishnu's experience of writing at the magazine. Vishnu easily led me through his process, but his work mainly focused on the writing and not information gathering. Most days, the magazine tried to post one new article online in the morning. Vishnu posted the Hindi translation by evening. He estimated that he could translate 3,000 to 4,000 words in a day but was quick to explain that translation alone was not enough. The article still needed rounds of proofing and editing. The long-form cover stories he translated for the archive, could take 15 days — they ran over 20,000 words, and what with incoming web articles to attend to and the other translators'

materials to edit, he had to break up the process. Plus, the small Hindi team was working on their own original Hindi articles to be translated over to English, and they had to match the heavy standards of the English writing that had built the magazine's reputation.

I realized early in my interviews that calling it the process of writing had a very particular limitation — writing was but a step in the work flow, as pointed out by Vishnu, and for some journalists not even the most involved part of their job. Some journalists offered great detail from developing story ideas to balancing reporting budgets; others struggled to understand what I wanted to know in such a question. In some interviews, the term *process* garnered uncomfortable stirs that led to admissions of working ad hoc, letting what flowed on paper just flow. At times I had to define "writing process", which morphed the question into one about the journalists' reporting processes.

I posed the question of writing process as such: Describe your process for writing a news story, from the beginning when you are assigned it or think of an idea to the end when it is published.To define or delineate a writing process for some journalists came quite naturally and for others a scoff-able impossibility. I noticed in the responses that the adoption of a process seemed linked to the affiliations with media organizations or the position of an individual within the industry. Freelance or independent journalists, whether they were writing a commissioned or pitched piece, talked about pitching story ideas, developing research plans, and writing multiple story drafts. Journalists working for daily publications or news agencies offered a more scattered process: they felt the pressure of the deadline, so they sometimes had to cut corners or speed through certain steps, but they could quite vividly lay out a day of work on the clock, how much

time they would spend on interviews, when they would expect to submit drafts, how long the editing exchange would last.

Senior journalists and editors for well-established media houses tended to dismiss the notion of process for themselves and their reporters. A senior editor for one publication waved off the question of process; then I asked him if he ever asked to see reporters notes or transcripts. Again, he cast off the question, as if procedures were not something that concerned him in his position. Supriya, editor with an online publication, responded, "I'm sorry. I don't think I can. It's too chaotic, responding to so many things… It's hard for me to envision a process." She explained that her responsibilities as an editor, bombarded with emails and edits and her own stories to write, meant nothing about her process could be coherent. However, when we later talked about her field reporting for a series on elections in 2014 called "Window Seat", she eloquently mapped how she approached reporting and writing on a daily basis during her train-hopping assignment across North India.

As I explained in Chapter 1, translation process in journalism is described as a multi-source translation situation (Davier, 2014; Gambier, 2016). With the concept of cultural translation in mind, I understood that translation moments for the journalists would not all be purely linguistic, so I wanted to probe all critical situations in reporting that journalists would reference. In later interviews, I found myself inserting the phrase "from ideation to publication" when I first asked in order to make the concept "writing process" less confusing and more inclusive of the idea of the multi-source translation situation. This section explores journalistic writing process broadly-defined to explore if journalists might apply something akin to *skopos*, aim or function, in the way they report. *How do Indian journalists describe their writing*

process? What do Indian journalists describe as individual, organizational, and social constraints that influence their translation process? These influences relate to the concepts of source and target in that journalists throughout the reporting process weigh information from sources and choose what to present to the target. From an idea or an issue, they set a goal for their story and follow that through the process, although the goal can change as they gather information. After attempting to follow different processes, which include details in how some journalists keep linguistic records, I then look at how the journalists shape the interviews into writing.

Recording the Source

An important step in the multi-source translation situation of reporting that I wanted to understand involved the interviews that journalists conducted with sources. I had to very directly ask the journalists about their interviewing processes because as they described the reporting process as a whole, they often quickly mentioned an interview and moved on. The interview for them was just part of the research and information gathering, but when they talked about writing and incorporating quotes, the journalists began to articulate more details about how they approached sources and what their interactions involved. From using recording equipment, taking notes, to transcribing interviews, the journalists had all sorts of approaches to document their sources. To varying degrees, the journalists made records of their interviews, and this depended on several factors: a) if the journalist had been required to submit transcripts in previous jobs; b) if the journalist wrote an investigative piece that might be contested; and c) if they worked for a specific publication.

Some journalists swore by recording their interviews, even if just for back up. Ankita, the independent journalist, worried about what might get lost or miscommunicated. Transcribing whole interviews took her too long, but she always listened back and transcribed quotes she would use. Even though she didn't transcribe her interviews in full, she felt that between a recording and her own experience on the ground of what happened in a conversation, she could understand the gist of most expressions. Her recording allowed her to verify and revisit what someone said when she felt uncertain. Priyanka, with the international news agency, transcribed everything. "My aim is to minimize my transcribing time," she told me about her transcription speed, but that she always did it. "Obviously editors don't like it much because it extends the deadline." In her process, she had stopped taking notes as much, believing that it distracted the source and stilted her interaction, but technology and better phone recorders had played the biggest part in her shift to relying so closely on recordings, of which she almost always used a personal and a business phone to record interviews, just in case. She noted that only one magazine she had previously worked for, in English, had been against transcribing interviews, with a senior editor frequently mocking her for trying.

These two journalists saw their interactions with people as part of the textual record they created in reporting. They were aware that to include the words of another person in their stories meant that they would translate their interaction to readers. The recordings helped Ankita and Priyanka to be more present in their interactions so that they could also experience subtler modes of communication, but that ultimately they would translate the words from the recording in order to adhere to the source's meaning. *Skopos,* the aim, for them seemed to teeter in the direction of the source. They wanted to communicate the source's experience and culture for the readers, but

their fidelity sat more with the sources because the sources didn't have the means to communicate their story to others.

Using a recorder or cooperating with a local fixer in order to catch all of the content of an interview played into the power dynamics of language and location. Neha, an independent journalist, rarely recorded interviews in the field with local people; she always recorded leaders and officials though. Proficient in Hindi and English, Neha only sought help from translators or fixers in regions outside of the Hindi belt. "It's easy to get what they are saying from spending 2 hours with them," she said about overcoming dialectic differences. She explained that in the Hindi belt, as a person shifts 3 kilometers in any direction, Hindi shifts slightly but noticeably. Because most of her reporting involved in-depth investigations, Neha had the luxury of time to adjust to language. However, she noted that at times when she felt uncertain about information one person passes to her in translation through a local contact, she made sure to clearly state that in her writing. "Sometimes it is needed to put out that this is what this person has translated on this other person's behalf," she explained.

Neha mostly covered stories in the Hindi belt, although she had investigated a major child trafficking operation out of Northeast India that earned her national recognition and awards. When asked about hiring translators or working in areas where Hindi was less common, she answered, "I work better if I know the language myself." However, for some of the Delhi-based journalists, their beat affected this ability. Ipsita, the English- and Bengali-speaking journalist based in Delhi, wrote about the Northwest and Northeast regions of India. She also served as the editor for the Kashmir beat and managed the correspondents located in the regions. She did extensive reporting there when the political situation allowed her to travel, but mainly,

she worked from Delhi. She relied on local contacts to translate the information they collected. She didn't record interviews because of the security situation in the regions, but that also meant she couldn't verify quotes or ask other speakers to translate what the sources said. She explained her note-taking though — she took notes in English, recording either the translation or paraphrase from a contact or directly translating what she understood in the language into English. In other words, the quotes were rarely ever fully recorded in their original form. "I do wonder with some people how faithfully it's being translated," she said about the local contacts who sometimes helped.

Neha said that more important than overcoming language in the field was the urban-rural class divide, and she believed that brandishing a recorder gave her power that she didn't want to display over potential sources. Neha distinguished that officials and leaders knew that interactions with the press were part of their roles, but local people not in leadership positions might have more at stake talking to a journalist. She remarked that many people in rural areas would agree to be interviewed even if they were uncomfortable because they would feel it would be disrespectful to refuse someone of higher status than themselves. She didn't want to coerce someone to talk to her, especially when informing journalists of local issues could implicate sources in abuse and attacks from others when she left. However, she said that for some high profile investigative stories she has reported, she made sure to produce recordings and transcriptions in order to cover all bases and tracks in the story in case of retaliation, as advised by editors. The choice to record or to write notes pinpoints another part of the translation process that relates to writing but at a different site. These journalists recognized that their stories may represent some first draft of history for the communities they cover. However, by not recording

or just taking hand-written notes, the journalists took the oral histories from the sources without considering that they could also document the source text. This would allow the journalists to reflect on the *skopos* or aim and to truly engage with both linguistic and dynamic equivalence as they turned their sources' word into a textual targets.

Writing the Target

Vishnu looked at transcriptions and recordings from another perspective in the process. Referring to a source, "[…] if he is non-English, it is my duty actually to talk to the person who has covered so that I can get something. If the recording is in Hindi and he has translated that in English, it is good for me if I get that original recording instead of translating again," he explained. In this case, because he was producing a full translation of the article, he worried about the three-way process from source language to English to Hindi and wanted to minimize the filters through which a quote would pass. Priyanka similarly worried about this process, though from an angle different from Vishnu. Before becoming a bilingual reporter, she said that she translated much of her own work and posted it, explaining, "At the end of the day, it's your byline, your credibility is at stake." She understood that if someone else translated her story and the quotes she included, she had no control over how they might "turn around words to demean". Now, the translation from one language to another was part of her job description. Ankita noted her attempts to translate her writing. "For my own sake, I want to find the time to translate my own pieces in Hindi because, I mean. I'm doing rural reporting, and the people I am writing about would be able to read it if it's in Hindi and many more people would be able to read it if I also write in Hindi." While she tried to pitch these to Hindi-language outlets so she could reach a better readership, she noticed that when she posted her translated stories independently through

her own online channels, she tended to get a better response, in terms of numbers, than with her original English stories. Vishnu echoed this same response to the magazine's Hindi translations — on Facebook the Hindi articles were shared more than the English version.

The process of recording quotes revealed different ways that journalists perceived the importance of verbatim source text. In the multi-situational translation process, the different situations feed into one another, so the way that the journalist recorded their sources' quotes impacted how the quote would be translated into writing. If a journalist didn't record interviews, depending on what language the journalist took notes, a quote might never be verbatim reproduced from the source in the source language. A translated quote was never truly a verbatim quote either. As I mentioned before, recording interviews and the source language would let journalists contemplate the translation of words in a more direct way. Instead, thinking again about Venuti's foreignization, by transferring the information directly into the target without reference and context to provide in the source language, the journalists acculturate the source.

Also, the media organization that published the journalist's story could set rules on how to include translated text. Some allowed journalists to include quotes in the source text and target text, but more often, word limits or space dictated how to include a translated quote. Ankita worried about using direct quotes in the source language because of the word limits placed on her pieces by some outlets. She noted that when she wrote for an international source, some Hindi words would be particularly foreign to the readership but relevant to remain in Hindi in the story and would require her to eat up words explaining what the word meant; her example was *panchayat*, a village governance system in India. "I do wish that some of the direct quotes could come in," she said. "Sometimes I actually, if there is a line or two, I let it be in Hindi, and then I

put the meaning in brackets." Ipsita remarked, "One word local sometimes requires ten words English to make it clear." She wanted the weight of the Urdu-Hindi words to come through the writing but knew that in translation and paraphrase, the emotional power of some words would lose their heft. Covering the northern corners of India, she recalled times in which she did include original language in her reports, feeling that certain words or phrases were powerful and needed to be conveyed from the source. Her example was the term *zulm*, an Urdu-Hindi word for injustice or oppression, but that in the region of Kashmir the meaning goes even deeper and refers to "discontent that bleeds into everything". Ipsita here reveals dynamics reminiscent of those in critical-cultural studies of translation. Venuti's concern was of making the source too foreign to the target, but as postcolonial scholars point out, including the "foreign", or marginalized and subaltern languages and texts, builds the presence and legitimacy of the source (Bassnett & Trivedi, 2002; Spivak, 2005). The source has a right to the space as well. By including *zulm*, Ipsita gave recognition to the unique culture of a community for the target audience to learn about and understand. Rather than diluting difference, the inclusion of multiple languages in text allows readers to critically encounter their own identity in relations to those of others.

Supriya had various experiences dealing with how quotes came into the writing. As an editor, she remarked on how she could tell when one of the journalists on her team had taken liberties in translating a quote, noting, "You can tell a quote very much sounds like the writer; it reflects their own grammar." She talked about the importance of a quote: "it should sound distinct from the rest of the piece". She wanted her writers to respect the source text and to translate more than just the language of a quote. They needed to engage in cultural translation to

better match the source for the target audience to learn about marginalized communities. From her experience as a writer, she clearly grappled with retaining the language of the source. “How often we miss out on what people have said because we don’t bother to use their words in our story,” she bemoaned.

Supriya referred to her reporting project “Window Seat” in 2014 in which she covered the national elections from the window seat of a train, beginning in Assam and disembarking at train stops along the way west towards the Pakistan border. The project, although fast-paced, allowed her to experiment with her writing because it was a special series. She wrote in a dialogue format that allowed her to include long quotes in the original language with the translated quote published beside it. “Conversation was a big part of the story,” she explained. “Let people have their say in their words.” Supriya understood that more than language was conveyed in the conversations, that the way people interacted, from the length of responses to the titles they used to refer to one another, spoke volumes about a place. By including the conversation, she could allow the target to more fully experience what happened at the source.

Over the years things had changed significantly at her publication. Now the executive editor wanted to minimize the use of other languages when they published a story, although no one really knew why the rules had become more rigid. Supriya said that the expectations of translation that the editors had for the writers were to “translate someone in a way that is easy for the reader to understand, but you should also not lose sight of what that person would have liked to say.” She went on to explain that the journalists should retain the rhythm of speech in translation that would reflect the original statement. Supriya understood that translation involved much more than the linguistic transfer. The rhythm of speech could tell about the culture of the

source as well. Rhythmic sentences and vivid descriptors might signal a culture of poetry (written or oral) that a community maintained and valued. This sort of cadence in writing, whether in the same language or not, could offer the target audience a new perspective.

For most of the journalists interviewed, key to maintaining the source language were elements of speech like rhythm because it could show unique features of language and how different languages emitted creative ways of social expression. They worried about what would get lost when they translated a quote. Even though the journalists worked hard to reconvey meaning through translated quotes, the target language didn't always capture the whole experience. The journalists had to interweave their experiences of being at the source and with the source in order for translated quotes to truly express what originally was said. In their reporting process, they thought about what it meant for them to seek quotes from sources to be transformed into a target language that the source would never access. Even though the source might never know how they were translated, the journalists struggled with their role to mediate a source community to a target. In translation and writing, they had to make judgments on what words to translate, what words resonated from the source, and what the target just might not understand. As in the choice to include source language within their stories, journalists during their writing processes noted moments that could influence meaning for their target audience. These moments were creative junctures in their stories, but they struggled with what degree they had creative license over the information to still maintain honesty to their sources. In the next section, their creative strategies and what the journalists really think they are translating.

Creativity

In the spaces explored in Chapter 3 — literature festivals, media summits, journalism association meetings — authors distinguished between literary and journalistic writing when they talked about translation. Writers of literature warned against making haphazard choices in writing, what they considered a folly of writers in journalism. In reality, the writing process of literary authors and of journalists are very different — temporality, defined as time and space, play a huge part. For example, journalists write to a firm deadline; authors might be lucky and get an extension from their editor. But in making a distinction between literary and journalistic writing, the writers insinuated that the pressures of news writing could not address the same concerns deliberative synthesis and creative writing that literary writing did. When I asked journalists, those uncouth writers shackled by news writing, about translation, they referred to the literary merit of the translation process and acknowledged that some styles of journalism couldn't engage with language in a literary vein. "Journalists don't get the luxury to think like a literary writer does," one editor stated. This section explores how journalists do embody the same creative space as literary writers and what they can do with language, addressing the question: *what creative strategies do Indian journalists use in writing in order to fully translate different cultural meanings across languages?*

Despite the opinion that they didn't write in the same way as literary authors, many of the journalists interviewed referred to ways in which they pursued reporting as story tellers, looking for unique angles or even creative ways to write the stories they investigate and uncover. Although some journalists initially waved aside the focus of working in translation, they easily articulated particular responsibilities they had when working between English and Hindi. Several

of the journalists referred to the responsibility to remain "honest". Honesty pertained to two entities — honesty to the publication and honesty to the source — which echoes how translation studies theorists look at equivalence and function to analyze translation and understand the external factors that come to bear on a translator. This section dives into these two "honesties" and what agency the journalists have through writing to uphold honesty through translation.

In the magazine especially, Vishnu noted how important style was to maintaining the credibility of the publication for the readers but that doing so in Hindi took finesse:

> "[The magazine] has a certain set of writing articles which is not common in news magazines because it's, again, not completely news, that is political and cultural. And the style is very different from what I have seen in Indian English media. They follow certain literature style — more complicated. Compound sentences are there, which is not in other English media… In Hindi, it is preferred not to write in compound sentences. You have to be honest to that. That honesty, I try to maintain so that it looks like you are not reading a random other magazine or newspaper. It should be like you are reading actually [the magazine] in Hindi."

In this Vishnu felt an allegiance to the target audience, to give them a reading experience that catered to their tastes. Vishnu understood that as a niche English-language magazine, it had a particular reputation for a very distinct writing style. If he couldn't replicate that feeling in Hindi, was he truly representing the source? Yet, Vishnu approached his articles from a very different standpoint than someone like Ankita, or even Priyanka. For translated articles, he did not carry out the full reporting process, so as much as he tried to understand the source from transcripts or talking to the English writer, he could never have the temporal experience of the source. Vishnu

hadn't been there in the room. If a recording existed, he could listen to the voices to interpret some level of emotion, but he couldn't accurately recreate a true scene for the audience. He relied on talking to the first target (English) author if he could to try in the second target (Hindi) to maintain as much honesty to what actually happened at the source.

By going-between languages, some of the journalists reflected on how writing in translation, and sometimes working with translators in some places, had allowed them to try new styles of writing in their reporting. Ankita, who had a fairly formal background in literary translation, found that even though she could easily go-between while she gathered information, when it came to writing in English from Hindi-spoken interviews, there was a disconnect. She said that she began to insert herself more directly into the reports and to more clearly include translators or local contacts into her writing so that she could try to symbolize for the readers the separation that language had created for them all. This was a very critical cosmopolitan perspective on reporting that urged all parties involved in a multi-situational process — source, translator, and target — to reflect on their position in relation to the story. She hoped that such perspective might influence how people thought about and aligned with issues. Overall, she had found editors accepting of her openness in writing, and she found self-reflexivity in her journalistic writing helped her think through the imbalances of power lurking between her and her sources. She tried to better mitigate her place in the reporting process by investing more detail, clarification, and nuance to translated text. In a similar way to Supriya's note on preserving the rhythm of speech, Ankita felt that if she couldn't reproduce the language verbatim, she could at least try to document other elements of the source that could provide context to the culture in translation.

Creating vivid senses of place helped some journalists stay honest in their writing. Recalling the sights, sounds, and smells of a location could better reflect the actual time and space in which the journalists had met with the source. To include these details as vividly as possible contributed to representing the place and the people justly. Ankita explained that from her poetry writing and her work in street theater, she had learned to be observant and to enter into vulnerable spaces without harming the sources or the stasis of the community — from that creative work, she found that she took notice of smaller details and interacted in new places more easily. Thus, she felt more able to recreate scenes that showed her sources honestly in their environments to the readers, breaking through a barrier between source and reader she deemed critical to truly conveying messages and portraying issues. Another journalist explained the role of journalism, "You're taking the reader into a world."

In those ways, writing creatively about place helped to translate the people of the story to the reader, but returning directly to English, the journalists expressed anxiety about what might happen to the details of India's diversity in this case. One editor stated, "It's a huge handicap that I write in English because English flattens the complexity of Indian society. It's really a huge challenge. Anyone writing in English, whether you're a journalist or a fiction writer or whatever, how do you use English to convey multiethnic, stratified along many different lines, society?" His statement reflected ideas of postcolonialism, that the role of English lay only in the work of the colonizer. Thus, using English continued to violently erase the diverse communities that needed to be heard. It was important that the language of the colonized emerge through journalistic writing.

Priyanka explained the difference in language as conveying feeling and emotion. “I can write excellent reports in English, but if I have to write a love letter, it’s in Hindi. Angry, Hindi; love you, Hindi. Technical stuff, English.” She also noted that another aspect of staying honest to a person who was being interviewed was to allow them to speak the language they felt most at ease in; for her, she assumed Hindi unless she were speaking with politicians, to whom she addressed in English and then switched if the official wanted. Along a similar thought, Vishnu explained, “When I’m translating, I want my reader to actually sense what [the source] was going through when he was, he was speaking to [the journalist]. So I wanted to give that. I always want to give that to my readers, that it’s not some… they can feel actually what, what the character or the person in the news is trying to say.” He referred to returning to original recordings of interviews or speaking with the original writer of the English-language article to get more than just the written words but also what emotions that were expressed through the use of the original language, Urdu, in the case of the story he referenced. Ipsita spoke about developing her language ability and being able to engage in longer conversations with sources, in which she noticed the nuance of expression. “I would love to bring out particularities in language in my writing — the flavor of a language.”

In the professional circuit of public appearance described in Chapter 3, journalists downplayed the role of multilingualism. In those spaces, they professed that language wasn’t a skill, just a circumstance of the job in India. Process? None of them had time to think process — there were deadlines to meet! But when I sat one-on-one with journalists, they began to open up about their writing. While they recognized the need to convey truth and stay honest to the words of their sources, they also found ways to bring creativity into their writing. After all, they had

entered journalism to tell stories and to write. I would like to note that several, but not all, of the journalists I interviewed had also appeared in some capacity in the spaces I analyzed through ethnographic observations in Chapter 3. In the journalists' writing for news, they recognized that norms like brevity and fact needed to be a part of their writing. However, brevity endangered their ability to include the factual statements, verbatim quotes, of their sources. Thus, in their writing, if they couldn't convey to their English-language readers what their sources said, they got creative. They carefully translated, trying to maintain as much linguistic equivalence as possible. They also engaged in dynamic equivalence through other information in their writing. Reconstructing the place where they interacted with the source meant they could try to bring the target readers closer to the culture at play. Maintaining characteristics of the speech, even if translated to another language, signaled what a target reader might encounter if they too could travel and interact in the same space as the source. Cultural translation, to these journalists, was as important as linguistic, and in cultural translation they could get more creative in order to better reshape the reality of a source culture in print.

Conclusion

The journalists interviewed for this chapter worked in many different contexts. They wrote for digital organizations, daily publications, and long-form magazines. Some answered to one editor; others pursued independent reporting and pitched to editors around the world. Even with the range of experiences, from early career journalists to senior editors, they all wrestled with multilingual India and their place in it. The journalists had taken fascinating journeys to come to their current place in journalism. By speaking about their educational history, they

recalled the role that language played in their everyday experiences growing up and how something about language made them want to write.

Although they didn't articulate their multilingualism as a skill, their Hindi- and English-abilities, or lack of, greatly impacted how they navigated the industry of journalism in India. While downplaying their multilingual skill, the journalists debated how they approached language in the field. Could they trace their steps and preserve the source language? What responsibility did they have to do so? For the journalists, while the language of the source and the language given to the target gave them space to creatively go between in their writing, what mattered more to the journalists was that in that space they could connect two disparate communities.

In the context of critical cosmopolitanism, these journalists had interacted with communities that in some ways they identified with through language, but more critically they were "othered" from. They wanted to take their audience back there with them so that readers could also reflect on the differences they would experience. These were crucial interactions to the journalists that helped them rethink their own position in Indian society, and if they could recreate this for the reader, the reader too might have a change in perspective. If they couldn't offer readers the language of the source, they could find creative ways to translate and transport their readers in time and space.

In the next and final chapter, I ride this analytic pendulum to combine the ethnographic and interview findings in a discussion of Indian journalists' translation practices from a critical cosmopolitan perspective of the impacts translation and writing have on identities and perceptions. I take the analysis further to consider broader implications of the findings and how

these can inform journalistic practices beyond India, but also within India. Namely, I suggest that journalism worldwide should embrace multilingualism and make readers uncomfortable to urge them to reconsider their identities and positions in relation to linguistic and cultural others. I also make notes of the limitations of the study but give suggestions of how research in journalistic translation, whether in India or elsewhere, can move forward.

5: Conclusion: The Possibility of Multilingual News

When I wanted to get around Delhi, I preferred to go by the Delhi Metro (the city's pristine subway system) or an auto-rickshaw. In my neighborhood, I knew I could catch a ride from the auto stand, but closer, I knew of corners where the auto-rickshaw drivers parked to take a break until one of the residents in the know came to bother them for a ride. They either joined their friends there to gossip about the early morning rides they had to give, or they spread out in the back bench for passengers and propped their feet on the barrier separating the driver's seat for a nap. But Delhi streets are noisy, even in private neighborhoods, so those drivers who could read would pay a few rupees for the newspaper and sit back to read.

I loved approaching auto-drivers reading the newspapers. They almost always read in Hindi, and I assume they had had some education in Hindi-medium schools. I would interrupt their reading, we would set a price for the distance I needed to go, and I would climb in back. The auto-rickshaws sometimes had a pouch near the steering column where the driver would tuck his newspaper in, but more often, he would fold the paper and slide it between the bars under the pliable fabric of the roof. As we headed along the road, I would lean forward a bit to read a headline. The driver would see me in his rearview mirror with a skeptical look on his face that I knew what I was reading. In Hindi, I would ask him what's going on in the news. A bit surprised at first that *Hindi aati hain*, that I understand Hindi, he would begin to tell me about the headlines, and we would slip into a broken conversation about Indian politics. The news gave us a chance to connect over something more than probing questions about our families or countries of origin. He might ask about America and the political situation there. I would try to explain that the dream isn't all that it seems. He would explain the city's ruling party's efforts to help a guy in

his profession. From the headlines, we, for an auto-rickshaw ride, connected thanks to our mutually rudimentary multilingualism. We both read the news, just in different languages.

***

The year 2020 changed movement in Delhi. For a time, auto-rickshaws stopped. Everything on the street stopped. Journalism, communication, festivals, interactions, and so much more changed in ways unexpected. Amidst a pandemic lockdown that lasted for months, in which journalists with press passes walked in 30+ degree-Celsius heat alongside migrant workers fleeing the metropolises and joblessness, people recognized issues that resonated under all circumstances, like what markets would remain open and how to complete transactions in a largely cash economy. Unfortunately, at times, language hindered the clarity of official messages and information. For example, Prime Minister Narendra Modi announced on a special evening broadcast in May that the government would launch the Aatma Nirbhar Bharat Abhiyan[25], translated in the media as self-reliance scheme, to bring economic relief and stimulus to India. The announcement, delivered in sharp, formal Hindi glittered with Sanskrit, was reported the next day in the news. Journalists referred to the scheme by its Hindi name in their reports, following protocol to use official titles, and translated it as self-reliance. But what did self-reliance mean to the public? It echoed Nehruvian politics in the early days of Indian independence, that the nation would be self reliant on its own manufacturing, which turned into a disaster. The policy suggested bailouts and stimulus money without any real plan. Was Aatma Nirbhar meant to suggest that Indian citizens sink or swim according to their own efforts, no real help from their government?

---

[25] https://pib.gov.in/PressReleasePage.aspx?PRID=1624661

Memes exploded with interpretations of what Aatma Nirbhar, self-reliance, could mean in the context of a pandemic. Making Maggi noodles (Instant Ramen)? That's aatma nirbhar! Does Spiderman need a suit? No! Aatma Nirbhar! The name and policy earned criticism and laughs when India's Finance Minister Nirmala Sitharaman offered four translations of the scheme's name, Aatma Nirbhar, for South Indian language speakers, remarking that many in South India wouldn't know the meaning of the weighty dialect used for the title.[26] Between reporting the policy and addressing Sitharaman's clarifications, journalists didn't seem sure of what they were interpreting for the public. They had given the best translation of Aatma Nirbhar that they knew, but that didn't say much to what might actually happen for the country on lockdown.

As the previous chapters have clarified, translation as a component-process of news reporting in India causes conflict and uncertainty for journalists working in multilingual settings. This final chapter recaps the theoretical conclusions drawn from ethnographic observations and interviews conducted with Indian journalists working predominantly in Delhi. The chapter outlines implications for translation studies in news besides Hindi and English in India. Beyond India, this research offers prescriptive notions for how global media networks can learn from the complexity of India's multilingual reporting processes to better include writing and language practices outside of English. Scholars have long demanded that research need not just study media systems of the Global South but also learn from these systems in order to improve Western and global practices (Fair, 2013; S. Rao, 2009; Rao & Wasserman, 2015; Tymoczko, 2005; Voltmer & Wasserman, 2014). This project has attempted to contribute a single thread in a global network of languages with a 1,000+ thread count. Calling it such — that is, one small

---

[26] https://www.indiatoday.in/trending-news/story/what-is-aatmanirbhar-nirmala-sitharaman-plays-pm-modi-s-translator-for-lost-south-india-1677679-2020-05-13

thread — is not to minimize how Indian journalists contribute unique insight about multilingual news reporting processes, but inevitably, this study has gaps in its theoretical approach and methodology. In this chapter, I address the lacuna in journalistic translation research even in the context of this project, but I then describe possibilities for future scholarly agendas. The hope is that research on creative flows in journalism that incorporates multilingual writing can invite new ideas about journalistic skill. The journalism industry could make room for multilingual content in reporting and lessen the global dominance of English information.

The chapter proceeds by recapping the findings of the project overall in a synopsis that brings together the conclusions from the ethnographic observations at literary and media industry events and interviews with individual Indian journalists. Next, these conclusions lead to a discussion of how this project impacts broader questions in journalism studies. This discussion emphasizes that research focused on the micro-level of journalism production in the Global South should influence discussions of global multilingual news flows. However, pivoting to the next section, studies that focus on a single region, whether in the Global South or the West, limits the scope of the research findings. Regional focus also risks invisibility — that other scholars will ignore the study and fail to see broader threads that can inform research and practices for other places and fields. I grapple with these and other issues of the project. Finally, I argue that even as limitations are present in all studies, they also offer trajectories for future research. I close by briefly suggesting several areas to extend this study and research in other regions and languages.

Findings Revisited

Through ethnography and in-depth interviewing, this project recognized inherent linguistic hierarchies still very much at play in the media industry and its members in India. This study went to the source of journalists' perceptions and practices by interviewing the Indian journalists directly. Also, in the context of ethnography, I aimed to observe from journalists during public appearances and conversations any spontaneous thoughts and reactions to ideas on journalistic translation. The project showed how individual journalists are affected by multilingualism in their work. They recognized tensions involving language that informed how they understand their role in information circuits. Keeping in mind the significant catalogue of research in journalism studies that examines translation work (e.g., Conway, 2017; van Rooyen, 2013), translated content (e.g., Bazzi, 2014; Lee, 2006; Valdeón, 2014), and multilingual agencies (e.g., Davier, 2014; Hajmohammadi, 2005), I paired humanist theories from literary translation studies on multilingualism and writing with a social scientific method to study individual experiences with creativity in Indian news writing. I reflected on the linguistic exchange of translation through *skill*, considering what value multilingual ability has in news writing contexts. I addressed the approaches journalists take to translation through *process* that considers strategies of recording and questions of honesty to source and target texts. Through *creativity,* I considered the challenges of making meaning of a culture through translation in news. I chose these categories in order to explore writing processes and creative agency in journalism but recognize that translation studies and the ever-evolving topics involved encompass many more issues with different conceptualization of terms like *skill*, *process*, and *creativity*. This section serves to solidify these three categories — skill, process, and creativity —

from the ethnographic and interview research that revealed tension in Indian journalism over the use and reach of languages in Indian news writing. Ultimately this analysis considers hierarchy and agency from a creative, critical cosmopolitan approach to look at journalism and reporting work. The interactions at play in the multi-situational translation sites of journalism can impact the sources, the journalists, and the target reader to reexamine their own identities in the context of others.

This project revealed a complex relationship around the thought that a person's multilingual ability would count as a skill in an Indian newsroom. I want to reiterate that in this project multilingual journalists refer to journalists writing in multiple languages or journalists who work multilingually — these labels are fluid and overlap for each journalist interviewed in this study. Several of the multilingual journalists whose jobs either required them to translate their reporting in more than one language or who chose to translate their published English-language content into other Indian languages (mostly Hindi) to post online could articulate skills behind the translation process. They remarked on the education that they received to equip themselves for different linguistic news systems and on the experiences that prepared them to more easily take on translation. Even though the other journalists who worked multilingually had received similar education, and in some cases worked across multilingual newsrooms, they didn't register the skill of multilingualism in the same way as a multilingual journalist. The multilingual journalist confronted formal translation, a written source text to a written target text, everyday. Journalists working multilingually did as well, but the source text wasn't written but rather engaged with orally. This difference impacted how they stressed the work of staying honest to their sources.

Most Indian journalists considered their bilingual or multilingual identities as almost synonymous with their Indian upbringing, although this assumed that many Indians in India actually are unilingual in everyday life. For those working in English-language newsrooms, their skill came in English writing, not in speaking Hindi. They took the fact that they often spoke in Hindi to sources, especially grassroots sources (i.e., not politicians, organization directors, businesspeople), for granted. The movement from Hindi to English was not seen as any particularly complex action for the journalists; in fact, some barely registered Hindi in their reporting process, translating their Hindi-speaking sources directly into English and making notes in English and without recordings. Multilingualism in regards to interactions with sources didn't need to be managed through a lens of process for them. These interactions just happened, the journalists took note, and then they wrote. Yet, when pressed to talk about their writing skills and how they employed them on the job, the journalists described important marks in their process that would affect how they wrote information, which in turn made them reflect on what they really gathered from a source if not verbatim quotes.

Moving on to process, as mentioned above, a key point of translation in the reporting or writing process involved the moment of recording sources. Overall, Indian journalists employed ad hoc ways to deal with language, and most often, the transformational moment of translation was inherent to everyday interactions in India. Many of the journalists interviewed did not feel a need to necessarily keep track of Hindi versus English in their process when the ultimate product would be in English. On the other hand, those journalists who had more experience writing in multiple languages could recall important moments in their writing in which source language mattered and complicated an English translation. One journalist had organizational rules and

policies on the requirements of translated material, while several journalists from an online publication had recently received instruction from the executive editor to minimize the inclusion of source language accompanied by an English translation. Zooming out further, while concern about language in Indian news existed at an industry level, there seemed to be little effort to articulate concrete steps to understand the translation process in news making. In training settings, senior journalists praised the work of "vernacular" presses and criticized the opacity of English-language news to include other Indian languages, but they couldn't offer guidelines for how to incorporate multiple languages into writing. In fact, the act of writing itself seemed to be a given in these forums, just the final step in the reporting process rather than a creative output.

The ability and act of translation affords creative license in writing and meaning-making. In terms of creativity, translation can push boundaries and reimagine, but in journalistic space, imagination and boundary-pushing have their place but not in terms of concrete words, quotations, and facts. Yet, found in this research, multilingual journalists struggle at times with translating people from their Hindi speech to English reporting. They recognize the loss of meaning, although as one journalist commented, some words are culturally imbued with meaning; a journalist can get away with covert political message by choosing to incorporate untranslated words.

By investigating a single phenomenon in the reporting process, this research showed how creativity informs journalistic writing in translation to make meaning across non-parallel languages. Recognizing central historical theories on meaning-making and power through postcolonial literary theories, I wanted to specifically address the aspect of faithfulness to a source text. In this project, faithfulness was expressed by Indian journalists as "honesty" to the

source. Whereas in the literary sense, faithfulness can refer to language and tone of artistry from one text to the next, in journalism this honesty to the source more acutely refers to both verbatim quotation of a source as well as maintaining a tone of meaning to the quote. The verbatim-ness of a quote can signal honesty — telling the actual true words expressed by the source. However, to convert, or not, these words into another meaning can also delicately skirt truth, not even for malicious or falsifying intent, as can often be assumed by oppositional news. Nonetheless, to translate quotes does alter what was said and engraves a certain unintended truth. The source's words are not truly from the source. What this project introduces on a larger theoretical scale is the question of truth and honesty in journalism and how to define it in such a way that invites the multiplicity of linguistic voices and protects the truth of the sources.

So What?

In Chapter 1, I placed theories of literary translation and postcolonial writing processes into conversation with the literature on journalistic reporting work. Evident from existing literature, the postcolonial moment is still very much in progress, and in subtle ways, the focus on the postcolonial is central to articulating the broader significance of this research in India's news translation to the academic and vocational canon of journalism studies. I previously pointed out that literary translation and journalism have unique principles and practices across places around the world. Just as the field of literary translation studies has revealed the cultural differences and local nuances of translation theory, scholars in journalism and mass communication have also unveiled the regionalism of journalism and news production and have highlighted the need to understand and respect the diversity of news principles circulating in information flows. This micro-level aspect of journalistic translation in a milieu of translated

news flows within a single country can offer new perspectives on how to incorporate multilingualism in journalism.

There is a hierarchy in multilingual news systems in India. Among individual journalists, there is anxiety over language ability in a creative profession like journalism. The original intent behind this project was to take a closer look at a thriving multilingual news system in India's northern Hindi belt to uncover unique practices and concerns for the industry; the purpose was not meant as a critique of how Indian journalism has handled multilingualism. Thus, while much has been critically unpacked in considering the omnipresent hierarchies and tensions around language, this section serves to elucidate how individual journalists who seek to engage with language and meaning making can inform and lead transformative practices in how news is produced and consumed. The contributions that can come from research on multilingualism out of the Global South carry forth into myriad disciplines and topics.

This study offers a greater focus on the individual agency of journalists in the reporting process from a critical cosmopolitan perspective. Scholars have found that journalists in new democracies have significant influence on setting journalism norms. By developing their own unique practices and adopting some of the standards from global media networks, local media in these democracies support the democratic, deliberative development of the audience (Fair, 2013; Rao, 2009; Voltmer & Wasserman, 2014). India is still considered young for a democracy, under a century old, and despite touting itself as the world's largest democracy (by population), it has major institutional pitfalls, namely corruption, that continue to challenge democratic values of the country. Thus, the Indian journalist, in traversing multiple spheres of contact in reporting, has a unique position to communicate across complexly diverse populations.

The multilingual transfer in reporting particular to the interview demonstrates how this position constitutes a critical cosmopolitan moment. The exchange of language between a source and a journalist in an interview resonates with power, the moment of honesty. A journalist has the agency to provide space for others' voices in news writing or to transform language from sources to fit political agendas. Ultimately, the source has little say, which highlights the importance of the individual in information production. Recognizing the asset that multilingualism can offer to a plurality of voices in news processes, this study in a way echoes Ruigrok's (2010) call for a journalism of accountability by focusing on what individual journalists do in translational moments and how the industry equips (or ill-equips) journalists to amplify multilingual perspectives.

By focusing on an element of the Global South, this project responds to scholars intent to raise awareness of practices and perspectives from these countries into discussions of journalism ethics. As expressed by S. Rao (2010), in global ethics there must be attendance to the local practices that were largely ignored and overlooked in an imperial Western context. Previous research determined that an ethical journalist in India cautiously navigates issues of caste, class, religion, gender, and so on in order to avoid the outbreak of violence (Wasserman & Rao 2008, p. 177). Although this project did not delve into conflict and violence, it certainly probed to what degree language may fit in the "so on" category of issues for journalists to understand. Further, in studies on professional norms of journalism in India, journalists prioritized accuracy, with no mention of truth, and used restraint in reporting (p. 177). Yet, in this project, in terms of language, journalists blurred the idea of accuracy by overlooking or downplaying the importance of the translated moment in reporting. I point this out not as a criticism of Indian journalists and

their current practices in multilingual reporting but to call attention to ethical dilemmas that may uniquely influence multilingual writers. Diving deeper into the ethics of language use in Indian news can invite a reimagining of how multiple languages are incorporated into news. Perhaps a more multilingual global audience will grow out of the inclusion and confluence of languages in all language presses. Perhaps it is not the responsibility of only these multilingual journalists to learn how to mitigate these dilemmas. Maybe it is actually time for the field of journalism to more openly include multiple languages and to make readers struggle with the uncertainty of communication and interaction. This in turn may develop a new way of consuming and interacting with news that involves a critical cosmopolitan lens. Sources, journalists, and readers all will have a chance and responsibility to reflect on their positions related to others in a level field that at times is misunderstood in mistranslation but at others is enriched with new cultural exposure.

Limitations

For all the contributions that this research on multilingual journalism can offer, this study still has some limitations. The trials and triumphs I experienced in my ethnographic research deserve their own paper in relationship to nearly two years in the field, besides years of accumulated observation during preparatory education and exploratory endeavors. Thus, this section begins with this note: The role of the researcher, not unlike the journalist, should always include reflexivity in the process — whether in writing, in practice, or both — to comprehend her own biases, power, and doubts (Couldry 2003; Tedlock, 2000). Ethnography includes uprooting and upheaval, putting the researcher in unfamiliar territory and research subjects into confrontation with their comforting, familiar habits and ideas. To top that, when the field site

happens to be the most polluted metropolis in the world at the time of research[27], everyone involved must adjust to what the city's AQI allows in terms of mobility and health. Ethnography is not without roadblocks endemic to the human condition. So, it is important to acknowledge the methodological challenges on an ethnographer that undoubtedly limit aspects of the research.

First, I want to acknowledge other broader implications of areas of inquiry this project missed or overemphasized because of conscious choices in the research agenda. I consider how the methods, the location, and the language can prevent a certain reach of the research to larger discussions in translation studies, journalism, and writing. To begin, I mentioned methods, and I have already suggested that ethnography requires grit, confidence, and stamina that don't always arrive naturally or easily for a researcher, even after a decade traversing parts of the field. The method of interviewing also limited the scope of this project. While many interesting insights surfaced in the interviews, in reality, defining a subject pool to interview proved difficult from a field so vast as Indian journalism. The interviews themselves invited fascinating reflection from the interlocutors, but I also recognized that the perspective I sought perhaps didn't truly enter the journalists' psyche all that often during reporting. While many of the Indian journalists expressed sincere concerns about their writing and linguistic reach, in reality most of them experienced reporting on a fiscal deadline. In hindsight they could reflect on the role of language, but maybe less so in the moment. Therefore, this has been a story of perceptions but not practice. In the next section on future research, I explain how this study contributes to more extensive study of journalists' actual practices. This point serves to explain that interviews provided great

[27] Undisputed by scientific research on the air quality of Delhi in 2018.

information from journalists but couldn't show how languages actually interact on the page or what journalists actually enact between languages.

The second limitation involves the hierarchy of an India-based study focused on linguistic diversity. The choice of Hindi and English to anchor the project is problematic. Hindi language has a superiority complex in India compared to other languages. In a sense, despite the Western notion of universal English, this study shows an inferiority complex among Indian journalists writing in English, not in terms of ability and talent to write but in representation and access to the news they write. Thus, a project focused on Hindi-English allows two domineering languages among over 20 other official languages and hundreds of other languages to dominate the discussion. In Chapter 2, I pointed out that Hindi, among native languages across the world, lies in the top five, and this gives significant value to studying a system interacting directly with Hindi. However, this also falls on the researcher, a student of Hindi and Urdu. The contributions that studies on Bengali-language or Malayalam-language presses, just as examples, can and have offered should be acknowledged. Scholars equipped in multiple languages need to pursue these systems further. Additionally, related to such scholars, research on and in the Global South, as well as research on and about Western media systems, need to incorporate the other systems of scholarship, i.e., research by scholars of the region. I have tried in this project to seek out studies outside of the American and European canons of journalism studies that have derived from academics located in other regions, mostly Asia, but I also recognize that much more must exist that can't always be picked up by Google Scholar or library databases.

The final limitation of this study again points to the focus on Hindi and English in Indian news. This study has shown that language matters, but in India, so do other identifiers: gender,

religion, caste. In the early stages of research, I considered focusing on translated news writing among women journalists in India, but as is evident, research leads where it will and that component of the project will be left for future papers. Choosing to study language politics in news doesn't ignore that other components of the reporting process pose even greater challenges to journalists. Several of the Indian journalists interviewed for this project, as well as in the ethnographic salons, talked about the difficulty of accessing women as sources for stories based in patriarchal spaces often found in rural North India. Indian researchers unveiled studies that quantified the minuscule numbers of low caste journalists in newsrooms.[28] Furthermore, as any study teetering near critical-cultural perspectives of academia must acknowledge, intersectionality plays heavily in all aspects of identity, and in this project, I have chosen to supersede language over other markers at play in Indian journalism. In reality, rather than call it a limitation, it is an academic choice. I include this point in order to make room for critique of a study in this vein and hopefully to encourage future research in those directions.

Future Research

Having laid out general limitations of this project, I now turn to how future studies can consider and overcome them. I envision research in journalistic translation along the trajectories of either a more humanistic or a more social scientific course, all the while offering space for interesting interdisciplinary conversions. Within the humanities, scholars can more readily incorporate journalistic writing as works of literature and approach the analysis of the journalistic written word as a source of artistic expression. On the other hand, in the social sciences, journalistic translation can probe measures of artistic expression and creativity with

---

[28] https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/caste-not-dead-survey-reveals-isolation-bahujan-journalists

journalists and other media producers. I recognize that this project has echoed questions by earlier scholars of multilingual media studying other regions and systems and has employed different methods to make inroads into India as a site of journalistic translation research. Thus, to recognize the contributions this line of inquiry continues to offer, I propose research into a similar phenomenon through alternative methods, namely progression and content analyses. I want to briefly articulate how applying interdisciplinary theories and diverse methods to these areas of future research matter to the field of journalistic and literary translation studies.

Theoretically, the bridge between humanistic and social scientific research related to journalistic translation needs to be fortified. The pioneering work of Bassnett, along with contributions and collaborations with Conway (2006) and Trivedi (2002) as well as others, demonstrate the nuanced ways translation influences media in postcolonial settings. Future studies may take up questions of technical skills in journalistic translation, such as how do journalists who write multilingually learn to write news in different languages? Other projects could consider reporting procedures in multilingual settings. Do journalists seek consent from their sources to render quotes into other languages? How do news organizations in multilingual settings prepare their journalists for pressures that emerge in the critical cosmopolitan moment of reporting in translation? And finally, along another strand of thought, the professional ethics involved in translation: are the notions of neutrality and objectivity outdated or shortsighted to the realities of social encounters between journalists and sources involving multiple languages? What are the consequences of critical cosmopolitanism, the cultural exchanges and interactions that cause individuals to interrogate their own identities in relation to others, in news production,

for journalists, sources, and audiences? These questions will require numerous studies to try to offer insight on theories of journalistic translation.

The methods through which scholars study translation have shifted substantially, from textual analyses of ancient texts to experimental methods that record translation in progress. Evident from the BBC bilingual reporter interviewed in this study and from previous research on the BBC (Al-Hejin, 2012; Baumann, et al., 2011; Hijjo & Kadhim, 2017; Podkalicka, 2011) the organization has bureaus creating expansive and interconnected translated reporting. Just within BBC lies an archive to draw future content for analysis in translation studies from the social sciences and humanities. Other news organizations, like India's *The Caravan* and the *People's Archive of Rural India (PARI)*, inadvertently are building databases of bilingual news stories. By having side-by-side stories in multiple languages, whether translated by the source story's author or a staff translator, a researcher can study news content from a literary standpoint or media sociology perspective. Both reflections on content can excavate moments of creativity, politicization, or untranslatability in news writing and can hint at challenges in news translation that make it unique from other writing processes.

Further, the digital space to link multilingual editions of articles, as well as multilingual sources, has myriad research opportunities to trace multilingual news flows online. Another method takes one stop further from content-based research and includes analysis of journalists' thoughts and cognitive processes during writing. Progression analysis, employed in the field of applied linguistics by Perrin (2003) along with Ehrensberger-Dow (2008), Zampa (2016), and Haapanen (2019) in Swiss newsrooms, uses software similar to track changes in Microsoft Word and Apple Pages or collaborative features in Google Documents to create a printable transcript of

a writer's drafting process. The transcripts show type changes, time stamps, timed pauses, and other trackable moments during word processing. In such a study, the researcher presents the transcript to the writer to then read through and explain notable moments in the text. This experimental method applied to the work processes of Indian journalists working in New Delhi could reveal interesting ideas about translation in Indian news and advance a fascinating method in journalism research. These methods can spawn endless studies on various language exchanges and cultural contexts for journalistic translation. However, I emphasize the need not to just study how news content changes in translation but also what roles individuals and organizations have in those transformations. Beyond the industry and journalists, what do those transformations mean for sources and audiences of news too?

In this project, I answer the call by many scholars to undertake media and communication research in the Global South. In an idealistic perspective, India as the world's largest democracy operating in multiple languages makes it the quintessential state to study. However, for all the reasons an Indian case can offer novel ways to incorporate languages in news to develop a more networked, coherent, multilingual news flow, the role of Indian media just barely registers in journalism and mass communication research. A plethora of projects on India exist, but to what seriousness are findings from such studies truly implemented in efforts to put research in action. International communication seems to inform initiatives proposed to improve newsroom diversity, media literacy, or journalism ethics, as examples. In reality the international perspective refers to, at least for the US, anglo-phone countries namely through Europe and toes the line of Eurasia into the Middle East (think *Al Jazeera*), or the "foreign", as in not European, bureaus of the Western wire services. Furthermore, as scholars working in the Global South try

to project how X, Y, or Z Global South country has a unique way of producing or consuming news or how media and politics interact there, the Western scholarly field still refuses to acknowledge the contribution these Other countries can make to understanding, and yes, at times improving, media networks and systems. Future studies in the field of mass communication need to treat India, South Asia, and the Global South not as blips in the academic library but as stalwart regions to conduct research on global information flows.

Conclusion

In Summer 2020, events like those studied in this project began to succumb to the COVID-19 pandemic. They had to rethink their public gatherings, so to take advantage of the COVID-19 lockdown in India, festivals decided to expand on a massive scale. The Media Rumble went online! The summit — spearheaded by bilingual news website *Newslaundry* and Jaipur Literature Festival's event management organization TeamWork Arts — announced a new name, TMR Online, and a new bi-weekly series, TMR Dispatches. The dispatches were meant to drum up interest in the new format and to give participants a feel for the ease of the online platform. Organized around the acronym NEWS—North, East, West, South—the first dispatch launched on June 26, 2020, focused on North India, titled "Myth or Reality? Hindi and proximity to Delhi give North India an advantage in the news space", featured five senior journalists and editors. The topic focused on the role of Hindi in North India's news.

The audience tuning in to the livestream saw editors Arfa Khanum Sherwani (*The Wire*), Dr. Himanshu Dwivedi (*Hari Bhoomi*), Shahid Siddiqui (*Nai Duniya*), and writer-columnist Sukirat in conversation with *Newslaundry* Executive Editor Manisha Pande. Although not explicitly stated by moderator Pande, as the speakers made their remarks, it seemed that each

represented a different linguistic press: Sherwani for English, Dwivedi for Hindi, Siddiqui for Urdu, and Sukirat for Punjabi. What had been explicitly stated in the beginning was that the session could be conducted bilingually, and the speakers weaved in and out of English and Hindi. For an hour, the speakers debated the status of various languages in India, and Sukirat commented how Hindi's dominance over the news space extended to the country, as almost every Prime Minister of India originated from the Hindi belt. Dwivedi discussed the various registers of Hindi across the northern region, while Siddiqui sharply criticized the divisiveness in Urdu and Hindi and Hindustani. Sherwani brought up that, tied to language, gender and caste and religion all weigh on the inequities of news production, news representation, and news itself. As the hour quickly passed, Pande tried to steer the speakers to concretely talk about Hindi language in the news space as each person bemoaned tangential politics of Indian language or Indian society or Indian media more generally. They struggled with the topic of language that constructed and filled the news and their own experiences with language in their professions.

As this project revealed, that struggle is real. Journalists contend with multilingualism and the hierarchies of language. While this panel discussed the dominance of Hindi-language press over other language news in India, this study looked at the tensions between English and Hindi and the dominance of a colonial linguistic legacy that still places English ahead of Hindi. From that perspective, other language presses in India barely have a chance. However, as seen through the critical eyes of Indian journalists, language in news writing can be dynamic. For them, infusing creative elements to their stories that bypassed the limitations of translation allowed them to feel more honest to their sources and their target audiences. They recognized the inherency of their multilingual ability, but they also understood that varying degrees of

multilingual literacy could be learned and developed to enrich their journalistic skills. A process of reporting and writing wasn't necessarily organized, clean, or coherent, but processes related to multi-situational translations helped journalists navigate the contours of translation. Although in their news organizations, the journalists were limited in the way they could interact languages on the page, they relished opportunities to give true glimpses of the language and culture of the sites they reported. Taking their cue, journalism as a field might consider letting languages overlap so that readers grow accustomed to the interplay of the language and to the discomfort of misunderstanding. In this they might transform their thinking about their own identities and place in relation to others.

References

Albinia, A. (2008). *Empires of the Indus: The story of a river*. W.W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Al-Hejin, B. (2012). Linking critical discourse analysis with translation studies: An example from BBC News. *Journal of Language and Politics*, *11*(3), 311-335. doi: 10.1075/jlp.11.3.01alh

Allen, E. (2013). The Will to Translate: Four Episodes in a Local History of Global Cultural Exchange. In E. Allen & S. Bernofsky (Eds.), *In translation: Translators on Their Work and What It Means* (pp. 82-104). Columbia University Press.

Anthes, G. (2010). Automated translation of Indian languages. *Communications of the ACM, 53*(1), 24-26. doi: 10.1145/1629175.1692184

Appadurai, A. (2000). Grassroots globalization and the research imagination. *Public culture, 12*(1), 1-19.

Apter, E. (2006). *The Translation Zone: A New Comparative Literature*. Princeton University Press.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2014). *Translation Studies (New Accents)* (4th ed.). Routledge.

Bassnett, S., & Trivedi, H. (Eds.). (2002). *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practices*. Routledge.

Baumann, G., Gillespie, M., & Sreberny, A. (2011). Transcultural journalism and the politics of translations: Interrogating the BBC world service. *Journalism, 12*(2), 135-142. doi: 10.1177/1464884910388580

Bayly, C.A. (2009). "The Indian Ecumene: An Indigenous Public Sphere." In A. Rajagopal (Ed.), *The Indian Public Sphere: Readings in Media History* (pp.49-64). Oxford University Press.

Bazzi, S. (2014). Foreign metaphors and Arabic translation: An empirical study in journalistic translation practice. *Journal of language and politics, 13*(1), 120-151. doi: 10.1075/jlp.13.1.06baz

Bernard, H. R. (2001). *Research methods in anthropology: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Altamira Press.

Bhabha, H. (1996). Unsatisfied notes on vernacular cosmopolitanism. In Pfeifer, PC., Garcia-Moreno, L., (Eds.), *Text and Narration*, (191–207). Columbia.

Bhaskaran, H., H. Mishra, & P. Nair. (2019). Journalism education in post-truth era: Pedagogical approaches based on Indian journalism students' perception of fake news. *Journalism & mass communication educator 74*(2), 158-70. doi: 10.1177/1077695819830034.

Biesla, E., & Bassnett, S. (2009). *Translation in Global News*. Routledge.

Brass, P. (2005). *Language, Religion and Politics in North India*. iUniverse, Inc.

Budach, G., Roy, S., & Heller, M. (2003). Community and commodity in French Ontario. *Language in society, 32*(5), 603-627. doi: 10.1017/S0047404503325011

Chakravartty, P. & D. Schiller. (2010). Neoliberal newspeak and digital capitalism in crisis. *International journal of communication, 4*, 670-92.

Chaudhuri, M. (2010). Indian media and its transformed public. *Contribution to Indian sociology, 44*(1), 57-78. doi: 10.1177/006996671004400204.

Clifford, J. (1983). On ethnographic authority. *Representations, 1*(2). 118-146. doi: 10.2307/2928386

Conway, K., & Bassnett, S. (Eds.). (2006). *Translation in global news: Proceedings of the conference held at the University of Warwick*. The Centre for Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Warwick.

Conway, K. (2015). What is the role of culture in news translation? A materialist approach. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology, 23*(4), 521-535. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1026833

Conway, K. (2017). Encoding/Decoding as translation. *International journal of communication, 11*, 710-727.

Couldry, N. (2003). Passing ethnographic: rethinking the sites of agency and reflexivity in a mediated world. In P. D. Murphy & M. M. Kraidy (Eds.), *Global media studies: Ethnographic perspectives*. (pp. 40-56). Routledge.

Darbari, H. (1999). Computer assisted translation system- An Indian perspective. *MT Summit, VII*, 80-85.

Davier, L. (2014). The paradoxical invisibility of translation in the highly multilingual context of news agencies. *Global media and communication, 10*(1), 53-72. doi: 10.1177/1742766513513196

Davies, E (2006) Shifting readerships in journalistic translation. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology, 14*, 83–98. doi: 10.1080/09076760608669022.

Delabastita, D., & Grutman, R. (2005). Fictional representations of multilingualism and translation. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series–Themes in Translation Studies*, (4).

Delanty, G. (2011). Conclusion: On the cultural significance of arts festivals. In L. Giorgi, M. Sassatelli, & G. Delanty (Eds.), *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere* (pp. 190-198). Routledge.

Desai, M. K. (2017). Journalism education in India: Maze or mosaic? In R.S. Goodman & E. Steyn (Eds.), *Global journalism education in the 21st century: Challenges and innovations* (pp. 113-136). Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas.

de Swaan, A. (2001). India: the rivalry between Hindi and English. In *Words of the world: The global language system*. Blackwell Publishers Inc.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Massey, G. (2013). Indicators of translation competence: Translator's self-concepts and the translation of titles. *Journal of writing research,* 103-131.

Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Perrin, D. (2013). Applying a newswriting research approach to translation. *Target, 25*(1), 77-92. doi: 10.1075/target.25.1.07ehr

English, J. F., & Underwood, T. (2016). Shifting scales: Between literature and social science. *Modern language quarterly, 77*(3), 277-295. doi: 10.1215/00267929-3570612

Fair, J. (2013). Democratization by boilerplate: National media, international norms, and sovereign nation building in postwar Liberia. In S. Ward (Ed.), *Global media ethics: Problems and perspectives* (pp. 146-168). Wiley-Blackwell.

Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Sage.

Freedom House. (2015). India: Freedom of the Press 2015. Accessed at https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-press/2015/india.

Frow, J., & Morris, M. (2000). Cultural studies. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd ed., pp. 315-346). Sage.

Gambier, Y. (2016). Rapid and radical changes in translation and translation studies. *International journal of communication, 10*, 887-906.

Ganesh, S. (2008). 'It's time to fly!': An assessment of optimism in contemporary India. *Organization, 15*(2), 293-98. doi: 10.1177/1350508407086584.

Gatson, S. N. (2011). The methods, politics, and ethics of representation in online ethnography. In N. Denzil & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Qualitative research* (pp. 513-527). Sage.

Geertz, C. (2000). *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology* (3rd ed.). Basic Books.

Giorgi, L., & Sassatelli, M. (2011). Introduction. In L. Giorgi, M. Sassatelli, & G. Delanty (Eds.), *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere* (pp. 1-11). Routledge.

Giorgi, L. (2011). Between tradition, vision and imagination: The public sphere of literature festivals. In L. Giorgi, M. Sassatelli, & G. Delanty (Eds.), *Festivals and the Cultural Public Sphere* (pp. 29-44). Routledge.

Giridharadas, A. (2011). *India Calling: An intimate portrait of a nation's remaking*. Times Books.

Grunebaum, J. (2013). Choosing an English for Hindi. In E. Allen & S. Bernofsky (Eds.), *In translation: Translators on Their Work and What It Means* (pp. 156-168). Columbia University Press.

Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (2000). Analyzing interpretive practice. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 487-508). Sage.

Guha, R. (2005). Arguments with Sen: Arguments about India. *Economic and political weekly, 40*(41), 4420-4425.

Haapanen, L., & Perrin, D. (2019). Translingual quoting in journalism: Behind the scenes of Swiss television newsrooms. In L. Davier & K. Conway (Eds.), *Journalism and translation in the era of convergence* (pp. 15-42). John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Hajmohammadi, A. (2005). Translation evaluation in a news agency. *Perspectives: Studies in translation theory and practice, 13*(3), 215-224. doi: 10.1080/09076760508668993

Hannerz, U. (2004). *Foreign News: Exploring the World of Foreign Correspondents.* The University of Chicago Press.

Harvey, K. (1998). Translating camp talk: Gay identities and cultural transfer. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 446-467). Routledge.

Hijjo, N., & Kadhim, K.A. (2017). The analysis of grammatical shift in English-Arabic translation of BBC media news text. *Language in India, 17*(10), 79-104.

Huat, C.B. (2020). Sacrificing vernacular cosmopolitanism for the postcolonial nation. *Situations, 13*(1), 51-74.

Jaffrelot, C. (2002). Indian democracy: The rule of law on trial. *Indian review, 1*(1), 77-121. doi: 10.1080/14736480208404621

Jayal, N.G. (2013). *Citizenship and Its Discontents*. Harvard University Press.

Jensen, K.B. (Ed.). (2013). *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. Taylor & Francis.

Khanjan, A., Amouzadeh, M., Rasekh, A.E., & Tavangar, M. (2013). Ideological aspects of translating news headlines from English to Persian. *Meta, 58*(1), 87-102. doi: 10.7202/1023811ar

Kothari, R. (2016). Translation, language, anthropology: Notes from the field. *interventions, 18*(1), 43-59. doi: 10.1080/1369901X.2015.1040434

Koushik, K. (2018). *Political economy of media labor: An analysis of working conditions of Indian journalists in Karnataka, India*. (Publication No. 10974853) [Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University]. Proquest Dissertations & Theses Global.

Kumar, K.J. (2004). *Mass communication in India*. Jaico Books.

Lagerkvist, J. (2009). Global media for global citizenship in India and China. *Peace review: A journal of social justice, 21*, 367-75. doi: 10.1080/10402650903099450.

Lal, V. (2014). State, civil society, and the right to dissent: Some thoughts on censorship in contemporary India. *India review, 13*(3), 277-82. doi: 10.1080/14736489.2014.938995.

Lee, C. (2006). Differences in news translation between broadcasting and newspapers: A case study of Korean-English translation. *Meta*, *51* (2), 317–327. doi: 10.7202/013259ar

Lindlof, T., & Taylor, B.C. (2011). *Qualitative communication research methods* (3rd ed). Sage.

Longxi, Z. (2014). Translation, communication, and East-West understanding. In C. Lee (Ed.), *Internationalizing "International Communication"* (pp. 244-257). University of Michigan Press.

Mason, I. (2012). Text parameters in translation: Transitivity and institutional cultures. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 399-410). Routledge.

Mazumdar, S. (2019). Free market media, democracy, and partisanship: A case study of Kolkata's newspapers coverage of anti-industrialization protests. *International journal of communication, 13*, 1077-98.

McLaughlin, M. L. (2015). News translation past and present: Silent witness and invisible intruder. *Perspectives: Studies in translatology, 23*(4), 552-569. doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2015.1015578

Merrill, C. (2004). The Death of the Authors a.k.a. Twilight of the Translators. *Bucknell Review, Special Issue: "Translation and Culture"*, *47*(1), 139-50.

Merrill, C. (2012). Postcolonial translation: the politics of language as ethical praxis. In C. Millan-Varela & F. Bartrina (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. (pp. 159-172). Routledge.

Mitchell, L. (2009). *Language, Emotion, and Politics in South India: The Making of a Mother Tongue*. Indiana University Press.

Mitchell, Lisa. (2014). The visual turn in political anthropology and the mediation of political practice in contemporary India. *South Asia: Journal of South Asian studies*, *37*, 515-540. doi: 10.1080/00856401.2014.937372

Mosco, V. (2008). Current trends in the political economy of communication. *Global media journal—Canadian edition, 1*(1), 45-63.

Mufti, A. (2016). *Forgetting English! Orientalism and World Literatures* Harvard University Press.

Mukherji, R. (2008). The political economy of India's economic reforms. *Asian economic policy review, 3*, 315-331. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-3131.2008.00118.x

Murphy, P. D., & Kraidy, M. M. (2003). Towards an ethnographic approach to global media studies. In P. D. Murphy & M. M. Kraidy (Eds.), *Global media studies: Ethnographic perspectives*. (pp. 3-20). Routledge.

Murty, C.S.H.N. (2011). Dilemma of course content and curriculum in Indian journalism education: Theory, practice and research. *Asia Pacific media educator, 21*, 24-42.

Myskja, K. (2013). Foreignisation and resistance: Lawrence Venuti and his critics. *Nordic journal of English studies, 12*(2), 1-23.

Nagy, N., & Brook, M. (2020). Constraints on speech rate: A heritage-language perspective. *International journal of bilingualism*. doi: 10.1177/1367006920920935

Narayan, K. (1993). How native is the "native" anthropologist? *American anthropologist,* 95(3), 671-86. doi: 10.1525/aa.1993.95.3.02a00070

Nayar, P. K. (2011). The vernacularization of online protests: A case study from India. In R. Kothari & R. Snell (Eds.), *Chutnefying English: The Phenomenon of Hinglish* (pp. 71-81). Penguin Books.

Nida, E. (1964/2004). Principles of Correspondence. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 141-155). Routledge.

Ninan, S. (2007). *Headlines from the Heartland: Reinventing the Hindi Public Sphere*. Sage.

Orsini, Francesca. 2009. "The Hindi Political Sphere". In A. Rajagopal (Ed.), *The Indian Public Sphere: Readings in Media History* (pp. 121-134). Oxford University Press.

Ortega, L. (2020). The study of heritage language development from a bilingualism and social justice perspective. *Language learning: A journal of research in language studies, 70*(S1), 15-53. doi: 10.1111/lang.12347

Ostertag, S. F. (2016). Expressions of right and wrong: The emergence of a cultural structure of journalism. In J. C. Alexander, E. B. Breese, & M. Luengo (Eds.), *The crisis of journalism reconsidered: Democratic culture, professional codes, digital future* (pp. 264-281). Cambridge University Press.

Pelinka, A. (2010). Review: Sarangi, Asha (2009). "Language and Politics in India". *Journal of language and politics, 9*(3), 481-483. doi: 10.1075/jlp.9.3.09pel

Perrin, D., & Ehrensberger, M. (2008). Progression analysis: Tracing journalistic language awareness. *L'analyse linguistique des discours des médias: théories, méthodes en enjeux. Entre sciences du langage et sciences de la communication et des médias*. Nota Bene, Québec, 155-182.

Perrin, D. (2003). Progression analysis (PA): investigating writing strategies at the workplace. *Journal of pragmatics*, *35*(6), 907-921. doi: 10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00125-X

Perrin, D. (2012). Stancing: Strategies of entextualizing stance in newswriting. *Discourse, context & media, 1*, 135-147. doi: 10.1016/j.dcm.2012.10.005

Philipose, P. (2019). *Media's Shifting Terrain: Five Years that Transformed the Way India Communicates*. Orient Blackswan.

Podkalicka, A. (2011). Factory, dialogue, or network? Competing translation practices in BBC transcultural journalism. *Journalism, 12*(2), 143-152. doi: 10.1177/1464884910388583

Ram, N. (2011). The changing role of the news media in contemporary India. *Indian History Congress*, 72. Patiala, 10-13 Dec 2011.

Rao, S. (2009). Glocalization of Indian journalism. *Journalism studies, 10*(4), 474-88.

Rao, S. (2010). Postcolonial theory and global media ethics: A theoretical intervention. In S. Ward & H. Wasserman (Eds.), *Media ethics beyond borders: A global perspective* (pp. 90-104). Routledge.

Rao, S. & Wasserman, H. (2015). A media not for all: A comparative analysis of journalism, democracy and exclusion in Indian and South African media. *Journalism studies, 16*(5), 651-62. doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2015.1054173.

Rao, U. (2007). Re-writing politics: Consumerist messages and the emergence of a new style of political reporting in India. *EASA media anthropology network e-seminars series.* 1-28.

Rao, U. (2010). *News as culture: Journalistic practices and the remaking of Indian leadership traditions*. Berghahn Books.

Ray, T. (2012). Globalization, democracy and journalism education: Some thoughts for India. *Asia Pacific media educator, 22*(1), 107-114. doi: 10.1177/1326365X1202200112

RNI. (2018). Press in India 2017-18: 62nd annual report. *Registrar of Newspapers for India.*

Robinson, S. (2011). Convergence crises: News work and news space in the digitally transforming print newsroom. *Journal of communication,* 61(6), 1122-41. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01603.x

Ruigrok, N. (2010). From a journalism of activism towards journalism of accountability. *The international communication gazette, 72*(1), 85-90. doi: 10.1177/1748048509350340

Sadana, R. (2012). *English Heart, Hindi Heartland*. University of California Press.

Schäffner, C. (2012). Rethinking transediting. *Meta, 57*(4), 866-883. doi: 10.7202/1021222ar

Sen, A. (2005). *The Argumentative Indian*. Picador.

Shoemaker, P. J., & Reese, S. D. (2013). *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*. Taylor & Francis.

Silva-Corvalán, C, & J. Treffers-Daller. (2016). *Language Dominance in Bilinguals: Issues of Measurement and Operationalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Solís-Barroso, C., & Stefanich, S. (2019). Measuring language dominance in early Spanish/ English bilinguals. *Languages*, *4*(3), 62. doi:10.3390/languages4030062

Spitulnik, D. (2009). The social circulation of media discourse and the mediation of communities. In A. Duranti (Ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader*. (pp. 93-113).Wiley-Blackwell.

Spivak, G. (2005). Translating into English. In S. Bermann & M. Wood (Eds.), *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation* (pp. 93-110). Princeton University Press.

Srivastava, S. (1995). Review Article: Christopher R. King. "One Language, Two Scripts: The Hindi Movement in Nineteenth Century North India." Bombay: Oxford University Press, 1994. *Social scientist*, *23*(4), 108-116.

Ståhlberg, P. (2006). On the journalist beat in India: Encounters with the near familiar. *Ethnography, 7*(1), 47–67. doi: 10.1177/1466138106064827

Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. In N. K. Denizen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd ed., pp. 455-486). Sage.

The Media Rumble. (2020, June 26). Myth or Reality? Hindi and proximity to Delhi give North India an advantage in the news space [Live Stream]. YouTube.

Thomas, P.N. (2010). *Political economy of communications in India: The good, the bad and the ugly*. SAGE Publications.

Thussu, D.K. (2012). India and a new cartography of global communication. In I. Volkmer (Ed.), *The handbook of global media research* (pp. 276-288). Blackwell Publishing.

Thussu, D.K. (2013). India in the international media sphere. *Media, culture & society, 35*(1), 156-162. doi: 10.1177/0163443712464570

Tillin, L. (2013). *Remapping India: New States and Their Political Origins*. Hurst & Company

Toury, G. (1995/2004). The nature and role of norms in translation. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 168-182). Routledge.

Tsai, C. (2010). News translator as reporter. In C. Schäffner & S. Bassnett (Eds.), *Political Discourse, Media and Translation* (pp. 178-97). Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Tymoczko, M. (2002). Post-colonial writing and literary translation. In S. Bassnett & H. Trivedi (Eds.) *Postcolonial Translation: Theory and Practices* (pp. 19-40). Routledge.

Tymoczko, M. (2005). Trajectories of research in translation studies. *Meta, 50*(4), 1082-1097. doi: 10.7202/012062ar

Udupa, S., & P. Chakravartty. (2012). Changing with *The Times of India* (Bangalore): remaking a post-political media field. *South Asian history and culture, 3*(4), 491-510. doi: 10.1080/19472498.2012.720062.

Valdeón, R. A. (2014). From adaptation to appropriation: Framing the world through news translation. *Linguaculture, 1*, 51-62. doi: 10.1515/lincu -2015-0019

van Leeuwen, T. (2006). Translation, adaptation, globalization: The *Vietnam News*. *Journalism, 7*(2), 217-237. doi: 10.1177/1464884906062606

van Rooyen, M. (2013). Structure and agency in news translation: An application of Anthony Giddens' structuration theory. *Southern African linguistics and applied language studies, 31*(4), 495-506. doi: 10.2989/16073614.2013.864445

Venuti, L. (2004). *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed). New York: Routledge.

Vermeer, H.J. (1989). Skopos and commission in translational action. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The Translation Studies Reader* (3rd ed., pp. 221-232). Routledge.

Voltmer, K., & Wasserman, H. (2014). Journalistic norms between universality and domestication: Journalists' interpretations of press freedom in six new democracies. *Global media and communication, 10*(2), 177-92. doi: 10.1177/1742766514540073

Walkowitz, R. L. (2017). *Born Translated: The Contemporary Novel in an Age of World Literature*. Columbia University Press.

Wasko, J., Murdock, G., Sousa, H. (2011). Introduction: The political economy of communications: Core concerns and issues. In *The handbook of political economy of communication* (pp. 1-10). Blackwell Publishing.

Wasserman, H., & Rao, S. (2008). The glocalization of journalism ethics. *Journalism 9*(2), 163-81. doi: 10.1177/1464884907086873

Weber, M. (2015). Conceptualizing audience experience at the literary festival. *Continuum: Journal of media and cultural studies, 29*(1),13 84-96. doi: 10.1080/10304312.2014.986058

Weinberger, E. (2013). Anonymous Sources (On Translators and Translation). In E. Allen & S. Bernofsky (Eds.), *In translation: Translators on Their Work and What It Means* (pp. 17-30). Columbia University Press.

Wolcott, H. F. (2001). *Writing up qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Appendix 1

FIGURE 1

Clippings from Indian Express *of column "The Urdu Press"*

THE *Urdu* PRESS

JAY SHAH

THE DAILY *SIASAT*, in its editorial on October 12, writes: "A website, The Wire, has unmasked the alleged financial deals involving suspicious use of the thousands of crores of rupees by the son of the BJP President Amit Shah, Jay. The BJP leadership had captured power on the slogan of putting an end to corruption, bribery and black money. But within three years of its rule, a ring of corruption is rising around BJP leaders... PM Modi had made use of social media for popularising BJP during the elections. But the same social media has alerted the people by revealing the alleged irregularities of BJP leaders."

Inquilab, in its editorial (same day) writes: "The criticism by Yashwant Sinha of central ministers, as well as the Additional Solicitor General, for coming to the defence of Jay Shah either on their own or on the government's instructions will be unsavoury to them. But one does want to understand why a defence is being made on behalf of the government as neither Jay Shah nor his father are in the government."

Roznama Khabrein, in its editorial (October 11) writes: "The website is determined to stick by its story. Those associated with it are noted journalists with a good image. The matter concerns the son of one of the most important persons connected with the government and it has become a high-profile case. It seems this battle, between the government and the Opposition, would go far. To what extent the Opposition can use it to its benefit remains to be seen."

AH, TAJ

COMMENTING ON THE current controversy about the Taj Mahal, *Rashtriya Sahara*, in its editorial on October 18, writes: "During the tenure of Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the Indo-Pak talks were held in the shadow of the Taj Mahal, so that a good message would go to the world from the conference held in the shadow of this great symbol of love. But the seventh wonder of the world and a rare example of the art of architecture is again being targeted. The statement of a UP BJP MLA that the Taj Mahal is a blot on Indian culture, has twisted the neck of history in a way that has baffled many bona fide historians. Not accepting the Taj as part of Indian heritage and calling Mughal emperors, "ghaddars" may be the agenda of today's politics of hate. But would the people of this country accept this agenda? However, many important leaders of the BJP have distanced themselves from that statement."

Akhbar-e-Mashriq (October 9, editorial) writes: "Only symbols of Hindu civilisation have been presented as tourism spots. Surprisingly, the list also includes Ayodhya... If Taj Mahal is removed from the map of UP, nothing will remain there except a victim of pollution — the Ganga — and some other ghats. The Yogi Adityanath government has also removed from the tourism list the memorial to Lucknow's Asif-ud-Daula, even though the land for the *mutt* in Gorukhpur headed by Adityanath was given by the Nawab."

FIRECRACKER BAN

COMMENTING ON THE ban by the Supreme Court on the sale of firecrackers in the capital, *Hamara Samaj*, (October 12, editorial) writes: "The judgement is indeed a laudable step towards protecting citizens from polluted air and resultant ailments. It would be a big challenge for the Delhi administration to ensure its implementation... we will have to think very seriously about lives of the three children, who had appealed to the Court and of how to provide a clean environment to the new generation and what steps must be taken towards it."

Aakar Patel, in his column in *Inquilab* (October 15), writes: "The environment in Delhi is like in other cities of the country. If it is polluted, the environment in other cities too is more or less similarly polluted... why is this judgement confined to the capital?. The other issue is that the (poisonous) Hindu nationalism too is a part of the present environment of the country. A BJP governor raised a question about the possible ban on cremation of Hindu bodies. Chetan Bhagat asked if the SC would ban *qurbani* of goats. I want to ask whether Muslims asked for a firecracker ban. Why are they being dragged into this matter? The Court itself said that its order is being given a communal colour but we have to understand the realities of the environment that was kept in mind while passing this order. But the Judges want to bring about a change, with just one step (*ek jhatke mein*).

Compiled by Seema Chishti

THE *Urdu* PRESS

BUILD-UP IN GUJARAT

JAMAAT E ISLAMI'S BI-WEEKLY, *Daawat*, in its lead commentary on the front page (October 28) writes: "Due to the Election Commission announcing dates for assembly elections only to Himachal Pradesh, the BJP has become the target of the opposition parties. The intensifying criticism and attacks have created worries for the BJP and the prime minister has had to step forward.... But despite his total concentration in Gujarat, reports from the state give the impression that this time, the electoral situation there is not to his party's liking. Following the failure of UP CM Adityanath's campaign in Gujarat, the BJP's politics of 'break and make' has led to allegations of horse-trading. The unity of the Patidars and their movement towards Hardik Patel is attracting the attention of all the political parties."

Siasat in its editorial on October 22 writes: "A sentiment of change among the common persons of Gujarat is visible. Anger against the government is palpable among the youth. In other sections of the society too there are mixed sentiments... the PM had made frequent visits to Bihar too forgetting all other states. But the result there was a zero. The support of young OBC leader Alpesh Thakore and Patidar leader Hardik Patel would yield results for the Congress."

Roznama Khabrein in its editorial of October 28 writes: "These days an extraordinary change is visible in the Congress yuvraj, Rahul Gandhi and his direct contact with the people is also being noticed. The new Rahul style has amazed the BJP and brought people close to him... the Congress is writing a new *gatha* in Gujarat. The election there will be interesting this time.

FOCUS ON KASHMIR

DESCRIBING THE APPOINTMENT of the former chief of the Intelligence Bureau, Dineshwar Sharma as the interlocutor for talks in Jammu & Kashmir as the "first important and positive step in three years for improving the situation in that state", *Roznama Khabrein*, in its editorial of October 25, says "the Hurriyat should present its view before the interlocutor."

Inquilab in its editorial on the same day writes: "A cool introspection indicates that the issue of Kashmir cannot be resolved by force. For a resolution, a planned strategy and the farsightedness to take the people of Kashmir into confidence are needed. The opening of a dialogue is the first step towards confidence-building and from this point of view, the step could be lauded. But this has been done earlier and therefore, its workability seems doubtful. One must remember that this is the fourth attempt in the last 20 years to resolve this situation... Was it not appropriate to study the reports and recommendations of all such committees and make an effort to resolve the situation keeping in mind the delicateness of the time and situation?"

The editorial in *Sahafat* asks whether political leaders will tell anything to the new interlocutor. "Whatever had been talked about earlier will be repeated again. Apparently, there is space in the Valley but bitter memories cannot be forgotten. Obviously, Sharma cannot accept anything that goes against the chosen path of the Central government... if there is any forward-movement towards reconciliation and peace, it would undoubtedly be welcomed."

GAG IN JAIPUR

THE CONTROVERSIAL ORDNANCE of the Rajasthan government — the draft Bill has now been referred to the select committee — has generated great discussion. *Rashtriya Sahara*, in its editorial on October 23, writes: "The restlessness among the opposition parties dues to this measure is inevitable. The question arises if the motivation behind presenting such a Bill and giving it legal status is to silence all voices raised against it?"

The *Hindustan Express* editorial on October 25 writes: "This ordinance is the worst instance in recent years of a shameless attempt by the government to protect corruption. In a democracy, one cannot think of any law that prohibits reporting a corrupt act. Not long ago there was a campaign against corruption in the country. The BJP, then in the opposition, was pleading for transparency. But today a BJP government at the Centre is avoiding the appointment of a Lok Pal.

Akhbaar-e-Mashriq , in an editorial on October 24, writes: "The hands of a judicial magistrate are already tied under Section 197 of the CrPC and Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1980. He cannot take action against a corrupt employee without the permission of the government. Under this ordinance, the probe underway can also be affected because an investigating agency cannot contact any other government agency without collecting the required evidence."

(Compiled by Seema Chishti)

Appendix 2

Interview Guide

Demographic information:

Name:

Age:

Do you currently work for a single news outlet? Multiple outlets?

How long have you worked for [news outlet/s]?

What outlets have you written for or submitted articles to?

Which outlets do you prefer to write for? Why?

Describe your process for writing a news story, from the beginning when you are assigned it or think of an idea to the end when it is published.

What types of guidelines do outlets provide to you about translating information from Hindi to English or English to Hindi?

What online tools and resources do you use to help translate?

What offline tools and resources do you use to help translate?

How many languages can you write in?

What language do you prefer to write in?

What do you find challenging about writing in multiple languages?

How did you learn English?

How did you learn to translate between Hindi and English?

Do you speak other languages? Do you write in those languages?

In what language do you conduct most of your interviews?

Do you ever hire a translator for your interviews? How do you find a translator to work with? How do you ensure accuracy? Do you transcribe translated interviews?

Do you give the people you are interviewing an option of what language to interview in?

Does anyone check your translation?