Media and Communication
2025 • Volume 13 • Article 9147
https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.9147

ARTICLE

Open Access Journal

Listening in Good Faith: Cosmopolitan Intimacy and Audio Journalism

Kate Lacey

Faculty of Media, Arts and Humanities, University of Sussex, UK

Correspondence: Kate Lacey (k.lacey@sussex.ac.uk)

Submitted: 4 August 2024 **Accepted:** 29 November 2024 **Published:** 27 February 2025

Issue: This article is part of the issue "Balancing Intimacy and Trust: Opportunities and Risks in Audio Journalism" edited by Mia Lindgren (University of Tasmania), fully open access at https://doi.org/10.17645/mac.i467

Abstract

This article interrogates the privileging of intimacy in contemporary discussions of media in general and audio journalism in particular (within a broadly Anglo-American frame). It posits that the prominence of the term in relation to podcasting specifically, together with the communicative practices it purports to describe, has become ideological. The article begins by exploring how the intimate address of radio and podcasting has been variously invoked and celebrated in public and academic discourse across a century of spoken word media. This historical overview provides a context for and counterpoint to the ways in which intimacy is invoked in contemporary discourses and introduces the contradictions encapsulated by the notion of an "intimate public sphere" (Berlant, 1998). It highlights how the language of intimacy in the public realm—with all its positive connotations, including in relation to building trust—can be appropriated or transformed under the logics of communicative capitalism (Dean, 2005) to disguise unequal power relations, restrict communication across difference, and feed into a culture of atomised individualism. The article turns instead to a cosmopolitan ethics of "proper distance" (Silverstone, 2004) combined with a feminist ethics of care as a way to negotiate the balance between intimacy and trust for the listening public.

Keywords

care; cosmopolitan intimacy; ethics; feminism; listening; media history; podcasting; proper distance; publics; radio

1. Introduction

The association of podcasting with intimacy has become axiomatic among producers, listeners, and critics alike. This is widely assumed to be a good thing, as the idea of intimacy brings with it connotations of closeness, candidness, and care. These are all qualities that can be translated into positive values in a

democratic public sphere, not least in terms of building relations of trust between different actors in the realm of public and political communication. However, as the theme of this thematic issue acknowledges, with opportunities come risks. Certainly, the techniques of intimate communication can be used for authoritarian just as much as democratic ends, and the closeness and exclusivity of intimate communications can run counter to public values of openness, plurality, and listening across difference. This article will rehearse these paradoxes, not in the expectation of resolving them, but in the hope of contextualising the current celebratory rhetoric around intimacy in relation to podcasting—first, in relation to a longer view of journalism in the auditory realm, and second, in relation to the broader context of neoliberal rhetorics of individualism and personalisation. It will then go on to explore how the cosmopolitan ethics of "proper distance" (Silverstone, 2004, 2006) and "listening out" (Lacey, 2013) might combine with a feminist ethics of care to negotiate the balance between intimacy and trust for listening publics.

The proliferation of podcasting has been accompanied by an explosion of scholarly interest in what has become an increasingly powerful media phenomenon. A Web of Science keyword search conducted in November 2024 finds 660 academic works (books, articles, and chapters) referencing "podcasts" or "podcasting" in their title in the four years from January 2021, representing more than half of all such publications, going back to 2005. Fifty of those publications include the word "intimacy" in their title or abstract, and more than half of those appeared in the last two years, including Alyn Euritt's 2023 monograph, *Podcasting as an Intimate Medium*. If this indicates an intensification of interest in the intimate affordances of the podcast form, it is important to note that it forms part of the "intimacy turn" across media and cultural studies (Hjorth & Lim, 2012, p. 477) that connects with a broader set of concerns to do with the configuration of bodies, emotions, and affect under social and technological change. It also connects to a long-established concern with intimacy in radio studies (Karathanasopoulou, 2014), including radio's intimate voice (Johnson, 1983), its intimate publics (Loviglio, 2005, 2024), and its sonic intimacies (James, 2020).

Despite this intensification of academic literature on the subject, it is still worth acknowledging at the outset the strange paradox, however productive, of thinking about public communications in relation to intimacy—a term more commonly associated with personal, private, and physical relationships (albeit that even the most personal relationships are always already culturally and socially informed and thoroughly context-dependent, including the context of the mediated worlds that we inhabit). Broadly speaking, then, all of these studies in some way or other address the core problematic of all mediated communication: the extent to which people separated by time or distance can find connection with each other via technological means—connection here having technical, symbolic, and affective connotations that can play out at an interpersonal level or between any number of distant strangers. This is also, of course, the context within which audio journalism is produced and circulated.

Audio journalism is a term of relatively recent coinage, a marker designed to acknowledge the expansion of platforms and players dealing in sound-based journalism beyond its conventional home on radio, as much as to claim its distinction from print and image-based forms. It is a neologism that can also invite attention to a pre-broadcasting history of sound technologies being adopted as authoritative technologies of record. One striking instance of this is Stadler's (2010) account of early phonographs used to document, through re-enactment, the shockingly intimate sounds of lynching in late 19th-century America. Such examples can provide a deeper historical context—and sometimes a counterpoint—to some of the claims being made for current developments. Podcasting's continuities and conversations with broadcast radio are the main

concerns in what follows, although this media-technological framing should not obscure the fact that journalistic practices—and the principles on which they rest—change over time in relation to a whole series of drivers including, but not restricted to, technological change (Hewa, 2021).

Of particular interest to the current argument is a parallel "emotional turn" within journalism studies, which is part of the broader history of feminist critiques of and interventions into politics and the public sphere, as well as the changing affordances of digital platforms and social media in opening up more space for emotion in the circuit of journalism practices (Wahl-Jorgensen, 2020). Writing this in the wake of the 2024 US election, branded by some as "the first podcast election" (Fu, 2024; Galloway, 2024), questioning the impacts and implications of podcast journalism—particularly the long-form interview as intimate, relatable chat—has taken on a new urgency. But since the earliest days of audioblogging, podcasting has been carving out an increasingly significant role in the journalistic space in terms of information-sharing, commentary, conversation, and fresh storytelling techniques (Lindgren, 2022; Rae, 2023; Snoussi et al., 2024; Whipple et al., 2023).

It is already becoming evident that the concept of intimacy in this media context is a rather inchoate one, itself intimately aligned with concepts of emotionality and affect, interactivity and immediacy, presence and proximity, familiarity and informality, communication and connection, empathy and care; though it might be adequately summed up, for the purposes of this article at least, as the "feeling of closeness." Finally, while there is much to be said about how intimacy is produced in specific podcasts and how interpersonal intimacies are represented publicly, it is the discursive categorisation and celebration of mediated relations in the public realm as intimate, specifically in relation to podcasting, with which this article is primarily concerned.

2. Sounding Out the Intimacy of Podcasting

Podcasting is certainly widely accepted to be an intimate medium, even exceptionally so (Euritt, 2023; Sharon, 2023; Swiatek, 2018). One common explanation has to do with its being an auditory medium working in sound and voice. Even with podcasts being carried via audiovisual platforms like YouTube, the point broadly stands, because their naming as podcasts denotes production values weighted in favour of sound over visuals. First, the immersive properties of sound work to produce an embodied sense of place, of presence (Euritt, 2023). The soundscapes of audio media are overlain on—or, with noise cancellation, even become—the sonic environment of the individual listener (Bull, 2000; Downs, 2021). This is intensified by the prevalence of earbud listening when it comes to podcasting, which is said to eliminate any sense of exteriority, producing a kind of hyper-intimacy (Sharon, 2023; Spinelli & Dann, 2019). Furthermore, because sound connects the body to its surroundings, theorists have long argued that mediated sound allows for something akin to touch at a distance (McLuhan, 2013; Vassiliou, 2018).

Beyond the sonic qualities, podcast content can be affectively touching too, of course, whether in terms of subject matter or tone. But it is the sound of the human voice that is key to understandings of mediated intimacy, as a channel for emotion, empathy, and identification. The "grain of the voice" (Barthes, 1977; Ffrench, 2015) betrays markers of embodiment, including gender, age, class, ethnicity, or regional heritage. Indeed, it is arguably within the imaginative gap between the particular and the universal that there lies the potential for an idealised intimacy. However, it is also worth noting that the ability to hear any such voices as intimate and trustworthy rests on the historic normalization of listening to disembodied voices, which until the advent of recorded and transmissible sound had belonged firmly in the realm of the uncanny.

Of course, these sonic attributes are not unique to podcasting. Scholars of radio have long since reflected on how the property of visionlessness supports the production of intimacy by allowing for the experience of both inwardness and involvement through imaginative co-production (Crisell, 1994; Karathanasopoulou, 2014). Indeed, from the earliest days of recorded speech—notwithstanding the distortions and limitations of the technology—producers and consumers alike were struck by the ability for listeners to be transported by a voice, and by the ability of sound to give the impression of co-presence across time, distance, and social differences. Gramophone companies soon exploited the desire of people to hear the living voices of the great and the good within the confines of their own home (Gitelman, 1999), a domestication of public speech that only accelerated with radio broadcasting. The private setting for the vast majority of the listening public began to force a modification of the formats, cadences, and modes of public address (Scannell, 1989). It is almost exclusively within this familiar and feminised communicative context (Lloyd, 2019) that audio journalism developed through the major part of the twentieth century and beyond, albeit in constant tension with the powerful cultural lag of journalistic and presentational conventions forged in the age of print (Carey, 1986; Lacey, 2013). This tension persists into the digital age, expressed now particularly in relation to reconfiguring once stable distinctions between producers and consumers.

Podcasting's intimacy is often also attributed to the degree of control that an individual, isolated listener has over the curation of content and the conditions of reception (Sharon, 2023), although this properly connects to a much longer history of intentional and individualised consumer control over, and interaction with, the sonic environment (Bull, 2000; Lacey, 2013; Spinelli & Dann, 2019; Sterne, 2003). Moreover, the impression of increased individual choice, control, and convenience disguises just how much these discourses are the product of—and raw material for—increased commodification, algorithmic targeting, and surveillance of listening trends. Podcasting is just one place among many on privately owned platforms where the creativity, labour, and social capital of digital intimacy is valued as data, mined for profit, and recursively reinscribed into the training of algorithms, although the contours of "emotional capitalism" and its "cold intimacies" were already being shaped before the accelerations of the digital age (Illouz, 2007). As Dobson et al. (2018, pp. 4, 18) explain, platforms in this way "learn to privilege expressions, intimacies and bodies that generate more affective intensity than others" and "to identify and maintain boundaries between different kinds of people and intimate relations." This is a problematic that has consequences for the public sphere of audio journalism, as it speaks to the same set of dynamics which are held responsible for the increasing polarisation and fragmentation of a communicative commons (Boler & Davis, 2020).

But it is in tracing the continuities and changes in relation to radio specifically where many of the arguments are made relating to podcasting's special claim to intimacy. Technologies, techniques, personnel, and audiences are not only shared between radio and podcasting but are, to varying degrees, consciously produced in dialogue with each other (Bottomley, 2020; Markman, 2015; McHugh, 2016). This is a theme taken up by Bonini (2022), who argues that podcasting is a hybrid cultural form between old and new media, and one that remediates radio in terms of its production ecosystem, genres, aesthetics, and listening practices. In the end, attempts to delineate the edges of media are ultimately futile, though the persistent attempts to do so can reveal much about the shifting ways in which media technologies find their social application (Lacey, 2009), not to mention what they might say about the incentives for practitioners and academics alike to declare and delineate a new field of practice. Such attempts can also display a certain amnesia about or disregard for the great variety of generic forms that have come under the umbrella of radio in different times and places, with "mainstream radio" set up as a kind of ahistorical and impersonal monolith to be contrasted with the intimate and individualising

apparatus of podcasting. This is not just a media-historical issue. As Lambert (2019, p. 304) reminds us, there are also "ways of being intimate that have been forgotten, transformed, or have yet to occur."

Andrew Bottomley has pursued these questions in his account of the "discourses of intimacy" that feature in writing about podcasting, both within the industry and the academy, particularly in ways that attach to the "affective, subjective access" that podcasting affords its listeners (Bottomley, 2024, p. 306). Even where the antecedents of this personal and informal form of address are acknowledged, it is not unusual for podcasting infrastructures to be held up as a heightened example, a site for a kind of "hyper-intimacy" (Berry, 2016, p. 184) or "enhanced intimacy" (McHugh, 2022, p. 220), where producers and listeners alike have become recursively attuned to a set of techniques for the production of intimacy. The political economy of podcasting holds some clues to the pervasiveness of these textual effects and their reproduction (Kammer & Sejersen, 2024; Sullivan, 2019). With its roots as an insurgent alternative defined in contrast to professional radio, and lacking the financial, technical, and human resources of established broadcasting, its sound was predominantly amateurish and improvisatory. With a premium on personality and authenticity over polished professionalism, the podcast voice could, then, bear all the traces of spontaneity and glossolalia that might be trained or edited out in the encoding of the professional broadcast voice (Madsen, 2009). In seeking authority in the public sphere, the public radio voice—and most especially in the realm of audio journalism—had to aspire to the standards of the written word, and so learned to suppress any bodily vocal markers, those hesitations and personal tics that connote an authentic, intimate, embodied voice.

There are two things that follow from this. The first is the recognition that audio journalists have had different routes to establishing their listeners' trust. As journalism gets remediated through new delivery systems or new fields of practice, there may be a cultural lag while the tokens of legitimacy are carried over from the established order. The values of abstracted objectivity and linear reasoning established through dominant forms of print journalism (and the corresponding devaluing of "sensationalism") at first had to be translated into their sonic equivalents. While those traces retain a great deal of their power, a century of broadcasting has seen public discourse open to new tokens of legitimacy, including the encoding of "liveness" and the representation of different forms of witnessing (Peters, 2001). Performative intimacy enacted through personal and personable expression is just one more route to the perception of authenticity and trustworthy connection.

The second thing is the recognition that connotations of intimacy are affected in complicated ways by discourses of professionalism and changing cultures of production as a medium becomes established. This might mean that the association of podcasting with intimacy is contingent on the manner in which it is becoming incorporated into the mainstream media economy—the history of radio hobbyists' early experimentalism is instructive in this regard, for example (Madsen, 2009; Rikitianskaia, 2018). But it might also mean that, in relation to audio journalism at least, it represents part of a more profound shift in how trust is encoded in and through political communications. For much audio journalism in the expanding spaces of podcasting, this shift has been characterized, for example, by a "movement towards personal narratives" (Lindgren, 2016, p. 2; see also Lindgren, 2023.

Bottomley is not alone in identifying intimacy—or, rather, assumptions about intimacy—as one of the values through which producers and listeners understand and reproduce the form. For Euritt (2023, p. 2), intimacy is used "as a self-description to negotiate its own mediation," which Adler Berg (2023, p. 2) similarly

describes as a "self-reinforcing and self-fulfilling prophecy." Certain generic expectations emerge that might include an informal, conversational tone, a certain degree of self-disclosure, immersion into a narrowly defined topic or particular soundworld, and the textual and paratextual constructions of an engaged listening community. However, these authors importantly make the case that discourses of intimacy are products of the wider culture, rather than simply determined by the technology, platform, or format per se. As Euritt (2023, p. 1) puts it in her actor-network-inspired analysis, "podcasts are not intimate because of some innate properties of sound or technology. They are intimate because they draw on how culture constructs intimacy to communicate the feeling of closeness." This makes these mediated forms of sonic intimacy historically contingent iterations of a desire to overcome distance and, perhaps, retreat into interiority.

These are valuable insights, and raise the question of what is it about the current conjuncture that produces such a swell of discourse around intimacy that podcasting feeds off and sustains? What is at stake, politically, economically, and experientially that makes this such a productive and meaningful framing for the ways in which public communication operates under neoliberalism? And in what ways does this connect with or depart from cultural constructions of intimate communication under different conditions? Turning to this latter question first, the discussion looks to the past to provide some context for the present, to get some sense of how mediated intimacy was produced and understood in the constitution of radio broadcasting, and before that, in the constitution of the public sphere in the age of letters.

3. Mediated Intimacy in Historical Context

Griffen-Foley (2007, pp. 123, 125), in an essay on modernity, intimacy, and early Australian commercial radio, cites historian Roland Marchand's assessment that, "radio surpassed all others in its capacity to deny its own status as a mass medium." As we know, broadcasters came to speak to unseen millions, but learned to speak to them not *en masse*, but rather in the personalised tones of a family friend. Early schedules were peopled with radio aunts and uncles, featured chats and advice, mirrored and mobilised communities of different sorts, and addressed the audience as "you," that useful English pronoun that captures at one and the same time a singular personal address and a plural impersonal one. This mode of modern communication served the interests of all its different stakeholders, but also performed a compensatory function in the face of bewildering changes that were happening outside the realm of an individual's control. The ability to reach into people's home and speak directly to potential consumers to gain their attention and their trust was clearly an attractive proposition to commercial and political players alike. On the listening side, people had easy access to new swathes of information and entertainment, and the novelty of having constant company on demand. At the same time, radio was reinscribing the retreat of public culture into dispersed and isolated domestic spaces. Griffen-Foley (2007, p. 130) sets all this in the wider context of a culture navigating the unsettling experience of rapid modernisation:

> The Australian radio industry presented itself as the embodiment of modernity, it sought consciously to offset the complexity and impersonality of modern life, fusing its mass appeal with apparent intimacy….A modern mass medium—with its resonances of the inchoate, the mechanised and the impersonal—self-consciously transformed itself into a unifying, intimate and highly personalised mass medium.

In other words, in industrialising and urbanising societies, radio played a major part in what Williams (1974, p. 11) famously described as "mobile privatisation," a set of communicative responses to these contradictions of modernity that contributed to the development of "a society that is both isolating and connecting, atomizing and cosmopolitan, or inward-dwelling but outward-looking" (Groening, 2010, p. 1335). It is a description that resonates with more recent ideas of "mobile intimacy" (Hjorth & Lim, 2012, p. 477), but there are also resonances that reach back into the literary world of the 18th and 19th centuries (Lloyd, 2019, p. 43) and the emergence of journalism as a pillar of the modern public sphere, as famously delineated by Jürgen Habermas. While his normative version of the public sphere rested on the strict separation from the "sphere of intimacy" (Habermas, 1991, p. 172), the historical development of the bourgeois public from which those norms sprang had its roots in the changing media literacies within the intimate private sphere, specifically the development of readers' "audience-oriented subjectivity" (Habermas, 1991, pp. 28–29). This was a mode of perception and critique learned in the privatised consumption of, and affective engagement with, a novelistic world of fiction and emotion, where readers felt an intimate connection to a text they knew was not unique to them, available as it was to untold distant others. This entrainment of perception through reading was "a ground condition of intelligibility for public language" (Warner, 1992, p. 378). Moreover, not insignificantly, entry into the world of letters for most at that time would have been through listening, as mothers read their children stories, breathing sound into the muted world of print (Kittler, 1999; Lacey, 2016).

This indispensable intertwining of the public and the private notwithstanding, it was the intensification of the "traits of a secondary realm of intimacy" (Habermas, 1991, p. 172) in which Habermas, writing in the mid-20th century, located much of the force of his critique of the structural transformation of the public sphere. In an age where mass media were increasingly making public the problems of private existence, and offering "abundant opportunity for identification," he argued that in place of "an inner life oriented toward a public life" there emerged "reifications related to the inner life" (Habermas, 1991, p. 172). For example, even where the mass media adopted literary terms like "news story" this was simply to "blur the relationship between the private and public realms by portraying in public a fake intimacy" (Keren, 2003, p. 144). However, feminist critics (Landes, 1988; Mansbridge, 2017) have long since established that such a conceptualisation of the public sphere was predicated on, and reproductive of, a series of gendered exclusions which translated into a set of normative constraints on public discourse that privileged reason over emotion and abnegated subjectivity—with exclusionary consequences for the practice and critique of public communications in terms of both form and content.

The rallying call of second-wave feminism—that the personal is political—was a significant part of a set of changes that gradually saw increasing acceptance in public discourse, including journalism, of a more representative range of subject matter and more personalised modes of public speech. In short, the profound transformations in how intimacy is configured in public life have been at least as much a result of political struggle and collective agency as they result from affordances of particular technologies or the satisfaction of consumer demand. There is also an important sense in which the "intimisation" of the public sphere has been a correction, but also a "feminisation," and, by extension, a "democratisation." The question then becomes whether all forms of intimisation are equal and, since intimisation is a process, whether ever greater intimacy is always good for democracy and rational deliberation in the public sphere.

In her review of "histories of intimacy," broadcasting historian Justine Lloyd explains how feminist critiques of conventional distinctions between the public and the private spheres served to produce "the intimate turn," a

concern with intimacy as the "constitutive dynamic of closeness and distance" (Lloyd, 2019, pp. 19–24). Lloyd draws attention to the historically contingent ways in which the public and private worlds are spatially and conceptually organised, not least through the adoption of successive media technologies. It is important to understand that alongside the intimization of the public sphere, the private sphere of intimacy has also been thoroughly mediatised. Lloyd (2019, p. 42) is particularly interested in how radio, rediscovering "the power of the ordinary and of orality," was gendered in ways that served to generate "a new mediated space-time of individualized domestic reception" (Lloyd, 2019, p. 34). More than simply regarding intimacy as a textual effect, however, Lloyd mobilises "intimacy" as a critical category, a third term between the public and the private, that can unsettle and complicate conventional distinctions and hierarchies. She draws on Berlant's (1998) influential work on "the intimate public sphere," identifying intimacy as a mobile set of practices that can "create spaces around it" (Berlant, 1988, as cited in Lloyd, 2019, p. 26), in order to understand radio's role in producing and navigating "intimate geographies." This formulation is a reminder that at the heart of all of these discussions is the negotiation and experience of the space between different actors.

4. Mapping Mediated Closeness

It is to this "dynamic of closeness and distance" in relation to trust-building in the public sphere to which this discussion now turns, via Roger Silverstone's concept of "proper distance." Silverstone (2006, p. 47) defined this relational concept as a constantly negotiated achievement as follows:

> Proper distance refers to the importance of understanding the more or less precise degree of proximity required in our mediated interrelationships if we are to create and sustain a sense of the other sufficient not just for reciprocity but for a duty of care, obligation and responsibility, as well as understanding. Proper distance preserves the other through difference as well as through shared identity.

Silverstone's intervention opened up an analytical space to explore the dialectical interplay of proximity and distance (or connection and separation) in mediated practices within an explicitly moral framework based on ethical responsibility towards the other. It was an intervention motivated, in part at least, in critical response to the prevailing uncritical celebration of "interactivity" identified in emerging forms of internet-based communication. For Silverstone, these new communicative practices involved a "personalization of the other" which necessitated a renewed focus on questions of communicative ethics, not least because "closeness, even intimacy, does not guarantee recognition or responsibility" (Silverstone, 2004, p. 475), just as there can be an ethical dimension to mutual indifference.

To be close to someone can mean either to be in their proximity or to feel some sort of (positive) connection. By the same token, to be distant carries this same doubling, describing either a physical or an affective separation. Of course, this is no linguistic accident but reflects the common distinctions we draw between kin and community on the one hand and distant strangers on the other. This is something we see reflected in conventional journalistic news values, where geographical, cultural, and emotional proximity push stories up the news agenda (Ahva & Pantti, 2014; Caple, 2018). One iteration of this is to be found in the field of humanitarian communication, and specifically the ethical responsibilities of journalists and audiences in relation to the coverage of distant suffering (Chouliaraki, 2015). Here we find some of the most rigorous reflections on the ethical dimension of the dynamic of closeness and distance in mediated communications (Chouliaraki, 2006; Kyriakidou, 2024; Wright, 2012).

The intimisation of the public sphere is particularly critiqued in Chouliaraki's (2010) conceptualisation of "post-humanitarian communication." This describes how a retreat from the problematic "politics of pity" saw humanitarian campaigns move towards inviting fleeting, effortless responses that were already enmeshed in audiences' everyday digital media practices, but that were personally gratifying. Although they can be effective in short-term fundraising and messaging, Chouliaraki (2010, p. 121) argued such developments ran the risk of perpetuating "a political culture of communitarian narcissism—a sensibility that renders the emotions of the self the measure of our understanding of the sufferings of the world at large." In other words, they were "feeding back into a dominant Western culture where the de-emotionalization of the suffering of distant others goes hand in hand with the over-emotionalization of our safe everyday life" (Chouliaraki, 2010, p. 122). This position harked back to the central problem of proper distance in media space that Silverstone (2004, p. 481) had identified, namely the establishment of "the moral duty of disinterested care." Writing around the time podcasting was emerging into the landscape of Web 2.0, he had already identified this disinterestedness as being at odds with a trajectory in new media towards a narcissistic idea of community as "both a projection and an extension of the self" (Silverstone, 2004, p. 486).

Returning to primary definitions for a moment, there is clearly a connection between "being close" and the verb "to close," including in the sense of "close off" or "shut out." This seems significant for a discussion of public communication where publicness is definitionally practically co-terminous with openness (*Öffentlichkeit* is the German term used by Habermas that came to be translated as "public sphere"). It may be that there are processes of intimisation that are an expression of openness in the public sphere—being open to new modes of expression or enabling a space of genuine plurality that includes once marginalised or excluded voices, for example. But there can also be discomfort in being too close. Podcasters may at times lean into "claustrophobic intimacy" for aesthetic effect (Berry, 2018, as cited in McGregor, 2022), but there can also be feelings of alienation in being excluded from a conversation among intimates. This connects to manifestations of intimacy that are more about exclusivity, about drawing the distinctions between self and other ever more closely in, or about closing off certain voices. Indeed, intimacy has been described as a process of "enclosure over time" (Lambert, 2019, p. 300). Once again, the implications are ambivalent for forms of public communication like audio journalism. If public space comes to feel like a private domain, it can support positive in-group satisfaction that is associated with increased well-being; but it can also enable the rise of new forms of gatekeeping and a return to what Erich Fromm and other Frankfurt School scholars termed "collective" or "group narcissism" (Golec de Zavala, 2024, p. 2). This is a version of social identity (in media terms also a version of imagined community) that is "more focused on out-group prejudice than in-group loyalty" (Kaufman, 2021), a potent context for prejudice and political othering.

5. Podcasting and the Limits of Intimacy

So much of what is celebrated about the curation of intimacy in podcasting has to do with the space it affords for niche interests, for fostering parasocial relationships and communities of interest, and for the direct address to listeners who have made a conscious effort to listen in, especially if they find themselves and their interests somehow reflected back to them. The following summary, standing in for many, is taken from a recent encyclopedia entry on podcast studies:

> Various characteristics of podcasting as a medium make it particularly well suited to the generation of parasocial relationships. The amateur and grassroots history of the medium (based on the

> open-access ethos of RSS technology), the seriality and thus familiarity of shows, on-demand listening through subscription, and generation of microcommunities through highly niche content work together to make podcasts feel more authentic, approachable, and personal than many other forms of mass media. (McGregor, 2022)

Of course, there are all sorts of advantages, including public interest ones, to being able to carve out these spaces of intimate commonality. They provide spaces where it is possible for different groups of people, whether amateur or professional, to diversify, intensify, and fortify their engagement with each other, to experience and experiment with the audio form (Copeland, 2018; Florini, 2019; Fox et al., 2020; Robinson et al., 2021). But at least two questions persist. The first is about why intimacy should be quite such a compelling framing for the field of podcasting, and the second is on what might be missed or lost along the way.

For all that the discourses of intimacy are couched in positive terms of authenticity, empathy, and approachability, they appear as part of a broader neoliberal discourse of heightened individualism and a media environment in which, increasingly, content is algorithmically tailored to reflect an individual's worldview back to them (Lim, 2020). The phrase "on-demand," and the associations it has with valorised concepts like choice, control, and convenience, are also part and parcel of a cultural normalisation of self-centredness. Textual effects designed to curate a feeling of intimacy, to let the listener feel spoken to directly, produce a version of the world that is cosy and contained, and centred on the self. This is matched by the sense that barriers to participation in the digital public sphere have been lowered to the point where it is easy (if still misleading) to claim that everyone can have a voice. More than that, voices in these public spaces that register as authentic are likely to be those that disclose most about themselves, experientially and emotionally, to their listeners. To this extent—in theory, at least—podcasting is just one practice among many that are at work in reinforcing the ideology of the sovereign individual within a bespoke, personalised media universe.

This can be a blind spot in the discussions that engage with the ways in which podcasting relates to radio. Alongside all the attention on continuities and changes in relation to production techniques, sonic textures, listening practices, and textual effects, we need to attend to what's at stake in the difference revealed in the nomenclature itself—the contrast between radio as broadcasting and podcasting as a form of narrowcasting. The difference is all too often caricatured as a shift from a monologic and monopolistic mode of communication to one that is dialogic and diverse. This shift then seems unproblematically positive in terms of sustaining a pluralistic and democratic public sphere. It seems counter-intuitive in the current climate to argue that there is also something intrinsically democratic or democratising about broadcasting as a model—a model of communication that can, at least in principle, be undirected and non-reciprocal.

Peters (1999, p. 52) has set this position out most persuasively in understanding the distributive model of broadcasting as generous and undiscriminating. Less efficient than more targeted models of communication, broadcasting's profligacy, particularly when it takes the form of mixed scheduling, is built on the latency of the listenership as a listening public rather than on the predictability of particular demographic constituencies. It is founded, in other words, on the possibility of communication across difference in live, shared communicative space. Instead of a public sphere parcelled up for individual consumption on demand, and distanciated through evident pre-recording, it rests on notions of unruly congregation in real-time and

the serendipity of the chance encounter. It is in the very expectation of exposure to voices and views that are unexpected, alien, or alienating—as well as those that are familiar—that listeners are interpellated as inhabitants of a pluralistic civic space. And it is in listening out beyond the confines of the familiar and the echo, and in being able to imaginatively inhabit different subjectivities, that listeners exercise an important civic responsibility (Lacey, 2013). In this sense, the preservation of a public forum that is not predicated on exclusionary intimate relations is a powerful counterpoint to the pseudo-individuality of the public sphere.

The rhetoric of intimacy, on the other hand, is rooted in a distrust of representation because of the way it refers back to an ideal of face-to-face communication, reproducing an entrenched nostalgic fantasy of unmediated connection (Young, 1995). The association of intimacy with familiarity, trust, and security only add to its appeal in a chaotic and uncertain world. Within a fragmenting journalistic offer, the "personal news feed" or the recommendations from friends, real or algorithmic, and couched in the intimate vocabulary of "sharing," certainly provide stories a patina of credibility for overloaded citizens. And yet, one significant definition of a public is that it is a relation among strangers, constituted by an impersonal and indefinite address, and open to all (Lacey, 2013; Warner, 2002). Trust is an important part of this equation, but not blind trust. There must also be space for distrust. As Robinson et al. (2021, p. 1222) put it in their discussion of how listening literacies are key to rebuilding trust in journalism, "distrust isn't the opposite of trust, but an essential part of its practice." Trust in this case is built not on prior connections, not in the blind trust we might put in those we have come to know intimately, but rather in the cultural construction of the conditions for cosmopolitanism—or, to put it another way, for listening out to strangers in good faith.

For all this, the argument here is less about privileging broadcasting over podcasting than about making the case for a mixed economy of mediated address—and for moving beyond simple binaries in our descriptions and evaluations. A public sphere that had no place for the experience and vernacular of everyday, intimate life would exclude too much. Apart from anything else, it is in the interwoven experience of individual feelings and a shared horizon of representation in which anyone, or indeed any collective, "comes to voice" (hooks, 1989, p. 5), that slow process of finding and owning a distinctive and authentic voice with which to speak in the world (and that should be matched by learning how to listen). Personalised and social media now play an important part in that process. The appeal of media intimacy is strong and persistent, and meets a whole range of needs. Intimate media can provide trusted spaces (or "counter-publics") within which citizens can build solidarities, find recognition, develop skills and confidence, take risks, and exercise agency—all precious aspects of civic communicative practice. But intimate media as the *only* option would surely diminish the scope of public life.

It is also the case that emotion in journalism is ambivalent—it can be manipulated, mobilised, or interpreted to different ends across the political spectrum. The inclusion of the intimate into politics has therefore been theorised alternately as democratically extending access to, and participation in, the public sphere, or as posing an existential threat. Intimacy connotes close acquaintance and detailed knowledge—but get too close and intimacy collapses because there is no space between the one and the other, no distance from which to recognise one's own otherness in the encounter with another (Lacey, 2013). Too distant, or too enclosed, and there might be neither motivation nor means to communicate, and a space opens up for the demonisation and cancellation of strangers and their views. The stakes are huge in such a balancing act, and inevitably intractable when reduced to binary abstractions. "Proper distance," as Silverstone (2004, p. 476) points out, is not a given, but a challenge and an achievement in constant process in every encounter.

6. Conclusion: Cosmopolitan Intimacy

In relation to audio journalism specifically, the question then becomes whether the entrenchment of intimacy as the dominant mode through which podcasts are understood is obscuring other possible modalities and values, including those traditionally associated with journalism, such as objectivity, impartiality, or disinterestedness. These core ethical principles certainly rest on a certain notion of critical distance which is always, to some degree, a fiction. It simply is not possible to bracket out all traces of status and positionality to produce news as if from nowhere. One powerful element of that fiction which has come under increasing scrutiny, as Wahl-Jorgensen (2020) sets out, is the idea that there is no place for emotion in quality journalism, whether in production, content, or consumption. As she demonstrates, emotion of course plays a powerful part throughout the journalistic enterprise in practice, either directly or through its negation.

This is yet another example of how, just as there are public interest values inherent in some of the most intimate, personalised, and niche formats, so the intimate sphere of emotion and affect resonates through their archetypal opposite. There is, in practice, no singular, linear sliding scale between intimacy on the one hand and cosmopolitanism on the other, but rather an ambivalent and complex constellation of possibilities. Indeed, so imbricated and mutually influential have the terms proven, that the two terms need to be thought together. As Alex Lambert has argued in respect of the network society:

> Today, our circumstance is that of a world system in which intimacy always faces cosmopolitanism. One cannot be defined without the other. Each negates the other to become itself. Yet in a Hegelian fashion, one is tantalized with the potential for a sublation in which the dialectic births a new form: cosmopolitan intimacy. (Lambert, 2019)

Cosmopolitan intimacy has value as a description for the experience of listening publics over the long radio century and into the podcasting age, but it has analytical power, too. The concept offers a way through for a communicative ethics by bearing within it a critique of the universalising abstractions of some versions of cosmopolitanism that are predicated on certain privileged Western and masculinist positions. Cosmopolitan intimacy connects to ideas of a caring democracy (Kavada, 2024; Tronto, 2013), where feminist critiques of the public sphere meet a feminist ethics of care. It builds on the insight that "care plays out at different scales and in many different contexts" (Mitchell, 2007, p. 711) and that "day-to-day cosmopolitan practices…are rooted in the particularities of everyday human relations and in the grounded politics of everyday life" (Mitchell, 2007, p. 712). Significantly, the intimate sphere becomes identified as a locus for cosmopolitanism within a moral and ethical framework that stands in critical opposition to its neoliberal framing as a site for commodified individualism.

The theoretical questions around intimacy and trust that podcasting throws up for audio journalism, then, are part of a much longer history of the paradoxes that characterize media communication, but they are also expressions of the age. Intimacy in the production, circulation, and reception of audio journalism is hardly new, but its heightened prominence and valorisation under neoliberalism has far-reaching and deeply ambivalent consequences for the public sphere. The idea of cosmopolitan intimacy offers a critical alternative to the celebratory discourses of individualism and personal gratification. Its achievement under current conditions, however, remains a challenge that poses difficult questions for the infrastructures of journalism, and demands responsibilities of its producers, its audiences, and its critics alike.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their comments.

Conflict of Interests

The author declares no conflict of interests.

References

Adler Berg, F. S. (2023). Analysing podcast intimacy: Four parameters. *Convergence*, *19*(1), 155–173.

Ahva, L., & Pantti, M. (2014). Proximity as a journalistic keyword in the digital era: A study on the "closeness" of amateur news images. *Digital Journalism*, *2*(3), 322–333.

Barthes, R. (1977). The grain of the voice. In *Image-music-text* (pp. 179–189). Hill and Wang.

Berlant, L. (1998). Intimacy: A special issue. *Critical Inquiry*, *24*(2), 281–288.

Berry, R. (2016). Podcasting: Considering the evolution of the medium and its association with the word 'radio.' *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, *14*(1), 7–22.

Boler, M., & Davis, E. (Eds.). (2020). *Affective politics of digital media: Propaganda by other means*. Routledge.

Bonini, T. (2022). Podcasting as a hybrid cultural form between old and new media. In M. Lindgren & J. Loviglio (Eds.), *The Routledge companion to radio and podcast studies* (pp. 19–29). Routledge.

Bottomley, A. J. (2020). *Sound streams: A cultural history of radio–internet convergence*. University of Michigan Press.

Bottomley, A. J. (2024). Sensational voices: Discourses of intimacy in podcast production culture. In A. J. Bottomley & M. Hilmes (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of radio and podcasting* (pp. 306–320). Oxford University Press.

Bull, M. (2000). *Sounding out the city: Personal stereos and the management of everyday life*. Berg.

Caple, H. (2018). News values and newsworthiness. In H. Ornebring (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of communication*. Oxford University Press.

Carey, J. W. (1986). Walter Benjamin, Marshall McLuhan, and the emergence of visual society. *Prospects*, *11*(1), 29–38.

Chouliaraki, L. (2006). *The spectatorship of suffering*. Sage.

Chouliaraki, L. (2010). Post-humanitarianism: Humanitarian communication beyond a politics of pity. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, *13*(2), 107–126.

Chouliaraki, L. (2015). Afterword: The dialectics of mediation in 'distant suffering studies.' *International Communication Gazette*, *77*(7), 708–714.

Copeland, S. (2018). A feminist materialisation of amplified voice: Queering identity and affect in *The Heart*. In D. Llinares, N. Fox, & R. Berry (Eds.), *Podcasting: New aural cultures and digital media* (pp. 209–225). Palgrave Macmillan.

Crisell, A. (1994). *Understanding radio*. Routledge.

Dean, J. (2005). Communicative capitalism: Circulation and the foreclosure of politics. *Cultural Politics*, *1*(1), 51–74.

Dobson, A. S., Carah, N., & Robards, B. (2018). Digital intimate publics and social media: Towards theorising public lives on private platforms. In A. S. Dobson, B. Robards, & N. Carah (Eds.), *Digital intimate publics and social media* (pp. 3–27). Palgrave Macmillan.

Downs, J. K. (2021). *Headphone listening: Space, embodiment, materiality* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Sheffield.

Euritt, A. (2023). *Podcasting as an intimate medium*. Routledge.

Ffrench, P. (2015). Barthes and the voice: The acousmatic and beyond. *L'Esprit Créateur*, *55*(4), 56–69.

Florini, S. (2019). *Beyond hashtags: Racial politics and black digital networks*. New York University Press.

Fox, K., Dowling, D. O., & Miller, L. (2020). A curriculum for Blackness: Podcasts as discursive cultural guides, 2010–2020. *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*, *27*(2), 298–318.

Fu, A. (2024, November 7). After the first 'podcast election,' the medium is likely to continue playing a role in future campaign cycles. *Poynter*. https://www.poynter.org/reporting-editing/2024/podcast-role-presidential-election-results-trump-rogan

Galloway, S. (2024, November 8). The podcast election. *Medium*. https://medium.com/@profgalloway/the-podcast-election-dad601aa6456

Gitelman, L. (1999). *Scripts, grooves, and writing machines: Representing technology in the Edison era*. Stanford University Press.

Golec de Zavala, A. (2024). Authoritarians and "revolutionaries in reverse": Why collective narcissism threatens democracy. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *27*(5), 1027–1049.

Griffen-Foley, B. (2007). Modernity, intimacy and early Australian commercial radio. In J. Damousi & D. Deacon (Eds.), *Talking and listening in the age of modernity: Essays on the history of sound* (pp. 123–132). Australian National University Press.

Groening, S. (2010). From 'a box in the theater of the world' to 'the world as your living room': Cellular phones, television and mobile privatization. *New Media and Society*, *12*(8), 1331–1347.

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. MIT Press. (Original work published 1962)

Hewa, N. (2021). For the record: Journalism recording technologies from "fish hooks" to frame rates. *Journalism Studies*, *22*(3), 342–357.

Hjorth, L., & Lim, S. S. (2012). Mobile intimacy in an age of affective mobile media. *Feminist Media Studies*, *12*, 477–484.

hooks, b. (1989). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking Black*. South End.

Illouz, E. (2007). *Cold intimacies: The making of emotional capitalism*. Polity.

James, M. (2020). *Sonic intimacy: Reggae sound systems, jungle pirate radio and grime YouTube music videos*. Bloomsbury.

Johnson, L. (1983). The intimate voice of Australian radio. *Historical Journal of Film, Radio and Television*, *3*(1), 43–50.

Kammer, A., & Sejersen, T. S. (2024). The economics of podcasting. In U. Rohn, M. B. Rimscha, & T. Raats (Eds.), *De Gruyter handbook of media economics* (pp. 389–400). De Gruyter.

Karathanasopoulou, E. (2014). *An examination of the concept of intimacy in radio studies, combining mainstream and non-mainstream theories and practices* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Sunderland.

Kaufman, S. B. (2021, November 6). What collective narcissism does to society. *The Atlantic*. https://www.theatlantic.com/family/archive/2021/11/group-narcissism/620632

Kavada, A. (2024). The caring public sphere: Reframing the concept in an era of care crises. *Javnost—The Public*, *31*(1), 158–175.

Keren, M. (2003). *The citizen's voice: Twentieth-century politics and literature*. University of Calgary Press.

Kittler, F. A. (1999). *Gramophone, film, typewriter*. Stanford University Press.

Kyriakidou, M. (2024). Audiences and ethics in times of crises. In L. Rothenberger, M. Loeffelholz, & D. H. Weaver (Eds.), *The Palgrave handbook of cross-border journalism* (pp. 349–362). Springer.

Lacey, K. (2009). Ten years of radio studies: The very idea. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, *6*(1), 21–32.

Lacey, K. (2013). *Listening publics: The politics and experience of listening in the media age*. Polity.

Lacey, K. (2016). Listening with mother: The cultivation of children's radio. In E. Wesseling (Ed.), *The child savage, 1890–2010: From comics to games* (pp. 165–184). Routledge.

Lambert, A. (2019). Intimacy, cosmopolitanism, and digital media: A research manifesto. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *25*(3), 300–311.

Landes, J. B. (1988). *Women and the public sphere in the age of the French Revolution*. Cornell University Press.

Lim, M. (2020). Algorithmic enclaves: Affective politics and algorithms in the neoliberal social media landscape. In M. Boler & E. Davis (Eds.), *Affective politics of digital media: Propaganda by other means* (pp. 186–203). Routledge.

Lindgren, M. (2016). Personal narrative journalism and podcasting. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast and Audio Media*, *14*(1), 23–41.

Lindgren, M. (2022). Podcast journalism and performative transparency. In S. Allen (Ed.), *The Routledge companion to news and journalism* (pp. 207–216). Routledge.

Lindgren, M. (2023). Intimacy and emotions in podcast journalism: A study of award-winning Australian and British podcasts. *Journalism Practice*, *17*(4), 704–719.

Lloyd, J. (2019). *Gender and media in the broadcast age: Women's radio programming at the BBC, CBC, and ABC*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Loviglio, J. (2005). *Radio's intimate public: Network broadcasting and mass-mediated democracy*. University of Minnesota Press.

Loviglio, J. (2024). From radio to podcasting: Intimacy and massification. *The Velvet Light Trap*, *93*(1), 52–54.

Madsen, V. M. (2009). Voices-cast: A report on the new audiosphere of podcasting with specific insights for public broadcasting. In T. Flew (Ed.), *Communication, Creativity and Global Citizenship: Refereed Proceedings of the Australian and New Zealand Communications Association Conference 2009* (pp. 1191–1210). ANZCA.

Mansbridge, J. (2017). The long life of Nancy Fraser's "rethinking the public sphere." In B. Bargu & C. Bottici (Eds.), *Feminism, capitalism, and critique: Essays in honor of Nancy Fraser* (pp. 101–118). Palgrave Macmillan.

Markman, K. (2015). Considerations—Reflections and future research. Everything old is new again: Podcasting as radio's revival. *Journal of Radio & Audio Media*, *22*(2), 240–243.

McGregor, H. (2022). Podcast studies. In D. S. Lynch (Ed.), *Oxford research encyclopedia of literature*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190201098.013.1338

McHugh, S. (2016). How podcasting is changing the audio storytelling genre. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, *14*(1), 65–82.

McHugh, S. (2022). *The power of podcasting: Telling stories through sound*. Columbia University Press.

McLuhan, M. (2013). Acoustic space. In M. Moos (Ed.), *Media research: Technology, art, communication* (pp. 39–44). Routledge. (Original work published 1955)

Mitchell, K. (2007). Geographies of identity: The intimate cosmopolitan. *Progress in Human Geography*, *31*(5), 706–720.

Peters, J. D. (1999). *Speaking into the air: A history of the idea of communication*. University of Chicago Press.

Peters, J. D. (2001). Witnessing. *Media, Culture & Society*, *23*(6), 707–723.

Rae, M. (2023). Podcasts and political listening: Sound, voice and intimacy in the Joe Rogan Experience. *Continuum*, *37*(2), 182–193.

Rikitianskaia, M. (2018). A transnational approach to radio amateurism in the 1910s. In G. Foellmer & A. Badenoch (Eds.), *Transnationalizing radio research: New approaches to an old medium* (pp. 133–142). transcript-Verlag.

Robinson, S., Jensen, K., & Dávalos, C. (2021). "Listening literacies" as keys to rebuilding trust in journalism: A typology for a changing news audience. *Journalism Studies*, *22*(9), 1219–1237.

Scannell, P. (1989). Public service broadcasting and modern public life. *Media, Culture and Society*, *11*(2), 134–166.

Sharon, T. (2023). Peeling the pod: Towards a research agenda for podcast studies. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, *47*(3), 324–337.

Silverstone, R. (2004). Proper distance: Towards an ethics for cyberspace. In G. Liestøl, A. Morrison, & T. Rasmussen (Eds.), *Digital media revisited: Theoretical and conceptual innovation in digital domains* (pp. 469–490). MIT Press.

Silverstone, R. (2006). *Media and morality: On the rise of the mediapolis*. Polity.

Snoussi, T., Heywood, E., & Lugo-Ocando, J. (2024). Radio journalism and podcast news in the Global South. *Journalism*, *25*(9), 1837–1844.

Spinelli, M., & Dann, L. (2019). *Podcasting: The audio media revolution*. Bloomsbury Academic.

Stadler, G. (2010). Never heard such a thing: Lynching and phonographic modernity. *Social Text*, *28*(1), 87–105.

Sterne, J. (2003). *The audible past: Cultural origins of sound reproduction*. Duke University Press.

Sullivan, J. L. (2019). The platforms of podcasting: Past and present. *Social Media + Society*, *5*(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305119880002

Swiatek, L. (2018). The podcast as an intimate bridging medium. In D. Llinares, N. Fox, & R. Berry (Eds.), *Podcasting: New aural cultures and digital media* (pp. 173–188). Palgrave Macmillan.

Tronto, J. C. (2013). *Caring democracy: Markets, equality, and justice*. New York University Press.

Vassiliou, K. (2018). A synaptic common sense? McLuhan's tactility and electronic media rhythms. *The Senses and Society*, *13*(2), 179–189.

Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2020). An emotional turn in journalism studies? *Digital journalism*, *8*(2), 175–194.

Warner, M. (1992). The mass public and the mass subject. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the public sphere* (pp. 377–401). MIT Press.

Warner, M. (2002). Publics and counterpublics. *Public Culture*, *14*(1), 49–90.

Whipple, K., Ashe, I., & Cueva Chacón, L. M. (2023). Examining podcast listeners' perceptions of the journalistic functions of podcasts. *Electronic News*, *17*(1), 40–66.

Williams, R. (1974). *Television: Technology and cultural form*. Routledge.

Wright, K. (2012). Listening to suffering: What might 'proper distance' have to do with radio news? *Journalism*, *13*(3), 284–302.

Young, I. M. (1995). The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In P. A. Weiss (Ed.), *Feminism and community* (pp. 233–258). Temple University Press. (Original work published 1986)

About the Author

Kate Lacey is a professor of media history and theory at the University of Sussex, UK. She publishes widely on broadcasting history and the role of mediated listening in modern public life. She was a founding member of the Radio Studies Network, and sits on the editorial boards of the *Radio Journal*, the *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, and the *International Journal of Listening*.