



The Department of International Environment and Development Studies, Noragric, is the international gateway for the Norwegian University of Life Sciences (NMBU). Eight departments, associated research institutions and the Norwegian College of Veterinary Medicine in Oslo. Established in 1986, Noragric's contribution to international development lies in the interface between research, education (Bachelor, Master and PhD programmes) and assignments.

The Noragric Master theses are the final theses submitted by students in order to fulfil the requirements under the Noragric Master programme "International Environmental Studies", "International Development Studies" and "International Relations".

The findings in this thesis do not necessarily reflect the views of Noragric. Extracts from this publication may only be reproduced after prior consultation with the author and on condition that the source is indicated. For rights of reproduction or translation contact Noragric.

© Maikki Fonnelløp, December 2015  
Maikkilee@gmail.com

Noragric  
Department of International Environment and Development Studies  
P.O. Box 5003  
N-1432 Ås  
Norway  
Tel.: +47 64 96 52 00  
Fax: +47 64 96 52 01  
Internet: <http://www.nmbu.no/noragric>

## Declaration

I, Maikki Fonnep, declare that this thesis is a result of my research investigations and findings. Sources of information other than my own have been acknowledged and a reference list has been appended. This work has not been previously submitted to any other university for award of any type of academic degree.

Signature.....

Date.....14/12-2015.....

## **Acknowledgement**

First I want to thank my supervisor, Associate Professor Stig Jarle Hansen, for his help with the structural and theoretical framework. With his expertise in international relations he has been a source for inspiration, and I want to thank him for his patience and trust.

I am grateful for the openhearted discussions I had with author Geir Angell Øygarden about the many topics surrounding war reporters. Thanks to him I was able to get an overview of the vast subject which ultimately led me to decide the objectives I wanted to follow.

Professor Rune Ottosen has extensive knowledge about the history and practices of journalism in Norway. He has published several works, and he has kindly provided me with literature that has been most helpful in this process.

This study would not have been possible without the journalists willing to participate and share their experiences. It has also been a process of fearful joy to have had the possibility of entering the arena of which these individuals are experts. I can only express my humility and gratitude for your forbearance with such an amateur interviewer.

Thank you Anders, Fredrik, Jon, Kristin, Maren, Karsten, Per, Rune Thomas, Sidsel, Sigurd, Tom and Tømm. Your contribution to journalism has been remarkable.

Last, but not least, to the one who continues to provide motivation in dark times:

Author Neil Gaiman. This is not the final draft.

## **Abstract**

Motivation is the inner force that makes people act.

War reporters have several intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivation. This thesis explores the interrelation between these factors to try to determine how they impact motivation.

In addition to analyzing the motivation factors, this research also tries to answer what the common characteristics for war reporters are, to try to find a set of common traits, competencies and values. The second additional objective to explore is to find the ideal characteristics for war reporters.

## Table of Contents

<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	<b>3</b>
<b>Abstract</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b> .....	<b>6</b>
1.1 Terminology .....	7
1.2 Research objectives .....	10
1.3 Literature Review .....	10
1.4 Structure of the thesis .....	11
<b>Chapter 2: Method and sources</b> .....	<b>13</b>
2.1 Selection process .....	13
2.2 Sources and data collection .....	16
2.3 Ethical considerations.....	18
<b>Chapter 3: Theory</b> .....	<b>20</b>
3.1 Motivation theories.....	20
3.2 Grounded Theory.....	27
<b>Chapter 4: War reporters</b> .....	<b>29</b>
4.1 Characteristics.....	29
4.2 The ideal self.....	31
<b>Chapter 5: Motivation factors</b> .....	<b>37</b>
5.1 Intrinsic motives .....	37
5.1.1 Passion .....	37
5.1.2 Duty .....	40
5.1.3 Status.....	44
5.2 Extrinsic motives .....	46
5.2.1 Autonomy .....	46
5.2.2 Collegiality.....	48
5.2.3 Adrenaline.....	51
5.2.4 Fame.....	53
5.3 Impact on motivation.....	58
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion</b> .....	<b>63</b>
<b>References</b> .....	<b>64</b>

## Chapter 1: Introduction

Foreign-news correspondents, conflict journalists, war reporters. The journalists who report from war and conflict zones have many titles, but the most widely used is war reporter. There is a sensational touch to the word reporter and the action of reporting which is easily transmissible to the physical experiences of someone covering war. The war reporters find themselves on the top of the journalist hierarchy. Reporters covering war and conflict get recognition and status, but very few emphasize the attention they get. Instead, they enter battlefields armed with their pens and integrity, and they bring the news of the conflicts back home to us.

The image of a war reporter is largely connected to the journalist role. Journalists have for generations shaped and adjusted the ideology to fit the self-perceptions of their identity (Ottosen 2004:55, Ottosen 2004:72). Journalists have been intermediaries and translators of information between the public and the elites. It is based on a notion of having some form of *social contract* to safeguard the public interest. This ideology has established the journalists as a counter-power to the authorities and constructed familiar journalistic concepts such as *critical watchdogs* and *the fourth state power* (Ottosen 2004:70). Research by Melin-Higgins (in Ottosen 2004:81-82) has argued that the journalistic ideals have changed from reflecting reality as accurately as possible to becoming more activist during the last two decades. Whereas journalists earlier had the public duty to inform, they now have the public duty to report. The new journalist role is to be independent and critical of authorities and defend the rights of the weak, poor and unfairly treated. The image of being the voice of the voiceless and defenders of freedom and democracy has helped constructing a normative concept which is largely responsible for shaping the heroic image of journalists (Ottosen 2004:57).

It is a wide understanding that the motivation for entering journalism as a practice originates from personal determination and satisfaction, but do war reporters need additional sources of motivation? This work is challenging, and war reporters may depend on several intrinsic motivation factors and not work related duties alone. What kind of people chooses a career as a war reporter? Do they have any characteristics in common? Are there some congenital abilities they have in order to do this job? What are the motivational factors that trigger them? Although war reporters are not a homogenous group, there are common characteristics to be found. Some elements are cognitively related, some are related to task performance.

Suitability is one of the key elements for determining the level of success, but deciding on this profession is for some journalists seen as a call rather than a career choice.

Many war reporters have during their careers written memoirs and autobiographies in order to reflect and elaborate on their war experiences. My understanding is that very few can offer a rational logical explanation to the choices they have made which led them into this profession and why they decide to continue. Some are drawn to conflicts because of their personalities, some are driven by curiosity or ambition, some are interested in the civilians and some are sheer war tourists. A common thread is that each and every one wants to be present where the action happens and when history is written. Much academic research on war reporting has been done in the context of analyzing media coverage of specific wars, pros and cons of embeddedness in a military invasion, or measuring the level of PTSD for reporters having experienced traumatic events (Feinstein 2006). There is not much research on motivational forces and the influential drives that can explain their choices and behavior. It is my wish to make a contribution to this.

Studying journalists who cover war is important. These individuals help shape the public discourse by which conflicts they choose to highlight and what type of information gets publicized. Their contribution is significant because the coverage of war is likely to impact policy. Although the actual impact is hard to measure, there is no doubt that politicians and policy makers follow the news with great interest. News headlines create attention among readers, listeners and viewers who may ultimately form a demand for new governmental policies, at least in Western democratic states. Journalists who report from war zones provide their hand experiences, empathy with the victims and knowledge of international conflicts. Their on-spot analysis may be more influential to our understanding of global crises than a scholarly article. Acknowledging the motivation of these opinion makers can help us understand the way we, the public, perceive international news and how war coverage can influence foreign policy.

## **1.1 Terminology**

Journalism is a field of education which can lead to a specific livelihood as a practicing journalist (Ottosen 2004:13-14). There are different types of journalists in regards to their affiliation, assignments, employment status and media formats. The first distinction is



between those who work for national state media (TV and radio) and those who work for newspapers owned by private corporations. The second element to consider is the type of assignments they have. Some are foreign correspondents stationed overseas, and others are journalists working in foreign departments of a newspaper editorial and are being sent out on assignments when conflicts and important international events occur. The third distinction can be made between the types of employment. Some are permanent employees while others are supplying material as freelance journalists, so-called stringers. Finally, the original media formats used to be divided into primary media sources such as television, radio broadcasting and newspaper whereas now, the digitalization of technology has added a whole new set of outlet channels. The very nature of broadcasting itself has changed and every media organization has in addition to its primary source, different web channels such as online newspaper, web page, radio or TV channel and social media like Facebook and Twitter in order to reach specific audiences. This makes the journalist practice, which used to be specialized for one format only, a patchwork of simultaneous appearances. For example, a journalist who works primarily for a TV station is expected to appear on radio, write a commentary on the web page and contribute in social media. And in the other end, a journalist who produces written material for a newspaper can be asked to write a different version for the online newspaper, a smaller version for Facebook and appear on the newspaper's Internet TV channel. This is all part of the digitalized media reality today where a multitude of information outlets broadcast news customized to fit different platforms. The media reality today can be seen as 24 hour coverage with live streaming or regular updates.

The terms journalist and reporter are often used interchangeably although a clear distinction can be made between the practice and the practitioner. Journalism refers to the professional framework and ethical norms surrounding the work-related activities. Journalist is not a protected title, meaning anyone can call themselves a journalist as long as the product meets the requirements of what a journalistic piece is expected to be (Ottosen 2004:13). This depends on the definition but is normally linked to the role a journalist plays in the society. A journalist can cover any kind of topic; food, fashion, music, literature, domestic politics or foreign policy, but a reporter is mainly reporting news. This is self-explanatory. Although a reporter may also be a journalist and the profession is called journalism (and not reporting), reporting is related to the (reflexive) action. Thus, reporting is what you do when you let something be known (to the public), announce events, reveal facts, uncover wrongdoings or disclose misconduct.

The need to find a common term to use has been a concern and opened for an interesting discussion. The journalists who work for foreign-news departments in media organizations specialize in international news coverage. Whether they are correspondents with permanent residence abroad for a fixed period or they function as ambulatory reporters who are sent out on ad hoc-basis to report from international events, their coverage includes, but is not limited to elections, political negotiations, civil unrest, disasters, terrorist attacks and wars - anything their local news organization finds important. In Norwegian, they would be considered *utenriksjournalister*, translated to *foreign journalists*, which serves as an unfortunate term because it may suggest that the individuals have other ethnic backgrounds than ethnic Norwegian. One could refer to them as *foreign-news journalists* but it's very broad and cumbersome to use. The term *conflict journalist* relates to a certain type of coverage, but conflict can be defined as anything from an armed conflict to a local rebellion to a tense geopolitical crisis and is therefore less suitable. *Front line journalist* is even more specific, but it is a wrongful label because the journalists do not spend all their time by the frontlines in a battle, making it not transferable to the actual working conditions. The term *war journalists* will by definition include both journalists and photographers covering war, and *war correspondents* will exclude freelancers and ambulatory reporters. I have chosen to focus on the common set of practices that summarize the actions performed by all my informants (reporting), regardless of the various media organizations they work for, if they are working as freelancers, correspondents or reporters. Although they cover all kinds of international news, my interest in them is their motivation for reporting war. Thus, I will refer to them as *war reporters*. I want to stress that this label is simplified and may be perceived as less adequate for the work these journalists in reality do. Bear in mind that being a war reporter is merely a job description and not a profession itself. I alternate between calling them *journalists*, what they are, and *war reporters*, what they are in the field. Because they hold several social identities it is not strange to use both labels interchangeably. Sometimes I will use the term *conflict journalists*, and when I do I refer to the category of journalists covering war and conflict zones, reporters and photographers included. Other times I will use *foreign-news journalists*, which is meant to cover all the journalists who report international news, where wars and conflicts constitute a natural part.

## **1.2 Research Objectives**

This thesis attempts to answer the following questions:

*What are the intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors for war reporters?*

*How do these factors impact motivation?*

In addition to the research questions there are two objectives developed through the research process. The first objective is to identify the personal qualities war reporters have in common to be able to establish characteristics that unite them. The second objective is to explore their self-perceptions to identify the ideal qualities war reporters would like to have. These objectives are formulated as the following research sub-questions:

*What are the common characteristics of war reporters?*

*What are the ideal characteristics of war reporters?*

## **1.3 Literature Review**

There are many publications devoted to the field of war reporting. To get a full, comprehensive overview of the complete history of war reporters in an international context, one should turn to Phillip Knightley's award-winning "The First Casualty" (2003). The book provides an extensive, entertaining and insightful historical timeline from the first known war correspondent during the Crimean War in 1854 to Iraq in 2003.

John Byrne Cooke's "Reporting the War" (2007) traces the U.S. history of media reporting from the American Revolution to the present War on Terror. Even if the relationship between the U.S. government and the American press is very different from Norwegian standards it gives an interesting perspective to the debate of free press in a democratic society during war times.

Professor Rune Ottosen has written several books on the history of journalism, the journalist identity, and challenges with media digitalization. His publication "I journalistikkens grenseland. Journalistrollen mellom marked og idealer" (2004) provides a thorough description of the various sides of the journalist practice, gender roles and the motivational

forces from a Norwegian perspective. Ottosen has also made a comprehensive contribution to the understanding of journalistic practices in Norway. “Fra fjærpenn til Internett” (1996) covers the complete chronological history of the Norwegian press and is presented in a historical context. This has been particularly vital for understanding the dominant position the Norwegian State Media (NRK) has had, and still has, in Norway and how it has developed a unique tradition for covering international news.

Many former war correspondents and front line journalists have published books about their time in the field. Autobiographies, personal memoirs or collections of published war articles. I want to highlight the contributions from Michael Herr (1977), Anthony Loyd (1999) and Francesca Borri (2014) who through their memoirs from Vietnam, Bosnia and Syria have managed to shed interesting light on how first hand experiences in war helps to shape and deconstruct the identity of a war reporter. Norwegian author Geir Angell Øygarden’s “Bagdad Indigo” (2011) and freelance journalist Pål Refsdal’s “Geriljareporteren” (2011) have been important literature for understanding human emotions and seeking empirical knowledge for motives of war fascination.

#### **1.4 Structure of thesis**

The thesis is divided into six chapters.

Chapter one starts with a short introduction of the war reporter, how the journalistic role has developed, and the relevance for studying the thesis topic. I explain the terminology used for this thesis, and elaborate on the term war reporter to try to justify the use. Then I state the research questions and the additional objectives related to this thesis. Finally, an overview of the main literature used is provided and the thesis structure described.

Chapter two gives an account for the methodology used in this research. I give a thorough explanation of the selection process when locating the informants. Then I present the sources used in this research and describe the process of data collection.

Chapter three provides the theoretical background and gives a short presentation of the main theories used for analyzing motivation. This research has used The Grounded Theory Methodology, and the advantage of using the GTM is outlined.

Chapter four presents the findings based on the secondary research objectives. First, the commonalities found between the war reporters based on data and observations are presented. This is followed by an exploration of the self-perceived role and the ideal characteristics that war reporters would like to have.

Chapter five is the analysis of the main findings. The first subchapter is devoted to the analysis of intrinsic motivation factors and the second subchapter is devoted to the analysis of extrinsic motivation factors. In the third subchapter, the effects of the intrinsic and extrinsic factors are analyzed in order to determine which impact they have on motivation.

The sixth and final chapter presents the conclusion.

## **Chapter 2: Method and sources**

I will hereby try to justify the methodology by stating the choice of methods I have used for data collection and give an account for the selection process when locating my informants.

The data for this research has been collected by using qualitative, semi-structured interviews and interactional observation. Qualitative research as a method of inquiry is particularly helpful when exploring the why and how of decision making in order to gather in-depth understanding of human behavior. Semi-structured interviews allow for a more dynamic interaction with the informant where only the thematic questions are set, but they are asked in an interchanging order and tailored to each situation. This gives a natural flow to the conversation, giving the informant opportunity to accentuate topics reflecting individual differences (Booth et al. 1995). Also, it identifies new ideas and important areas for the interviewer to further explore, something that made me continuously update and adjust the interview guide after each interview. Observation is a key element, in which it gives the interviewer flexibility when reaching sensitive areas and allowing for emotional processes and behavior to take place. This is a very important aspect in the interview situation (Booth et al. 1995).

Another commonly used method in field studies and qualitative research is the snowball method. This method allows the interviewer to recruit more informants in a specific network, suggested by the informants already selected (Booth et al 1995). Since this research did not intend to include a wide sample variety, the snowball method was beneficial in the sense that more informants fitting the category were made available through recommendations. The weakness of this method is that some of the informants are chosen merely by their relations to others and the fact that they accepted to participate, not by chance or random selection. This research is based on strategic selection, which is common for field studies and explorative interviews. It was more important to recruit individuals who could contribute with their personal experiences than to have a statistical, representative sample.

### **2.1 Selection process**

Norway has two main media organizations broadcasting nationally. NRK is financed by the government and TV2 is a commercial channel with private ownership. In addition there are a

few national channels that specialize in regional news production and cable TV channels with prepaid subscriptions. Most of the high profiled correspondents work in television, which is a direct result of NRK's state monopoly from 1960 which marked the start for regular television in Norway, to 1992 when the commercial competitor TV2 started its broadcasting (Ottosen 1996:449-450). NRK's foreign coverage includes a base of regular correspondents who are engaged for an interval of four years. They report from a main base, usually a major city, covering a specific geographical area or region. In 2015, NRK has foreign correspondents covering nine areas worldwide (Wikipedia 2015). It is important to have in mind the leading position NRK has had in Norwegian media history, causing their correspondents throughout the years to be considered national common property and closely associated with the regions they cover. Hence, it is not surprising that the majority of the high profiled reporters in Norway, and 50% of the informants in this research belong to this organization.

The first selection component was to decide how broad the network of war reporters should be. In many ways it can be claimed that the ones who truly capture the horrific nature of war are indeed the war photographers. They have a different kind of modus operandi than reporters because of the prerequisite for successful photo coverage. Photographers need to get as close to the action as possible and this often puts them in great risk. While reporters have the possibility of being stationed at hotel balconies while conducting their broadcasts, photographers do not have this luxury. By analyzing the different work situations, it became evident that researching war photographers and their occupational hazards would soon demand a thesis of its own. I have thus refrained from including any photographers and focused only on reporters who have experience in front of a camera lens or bylines on newspaper articles. The only exception here is one informant who poses a hybrid in the sense that he is both the journalist and cameraman for his own video reportages.

The second element was to select reporters with extensive experience from war and conflict zones. The importance on field experience and media exposure was important. When making a list of reporters I knew from reputation, one finding was the high proportion of foreign correspondents and reporters who were, or had been, deployed in the Middle East. This can be explained by the large and increasing unrest in this part of the world from the time NRK started to engage foreign correspondents by the end of the 1960s and beginning of 1970s. The reporters who were most familiar to the public eye were also the ones who had been covering

the Middle East, because war and conflict in general gets more coverage than other international news.

The next issue was the gender balance. Historically, war journalism has been an almost exclusive male dominated profession, both in Norwegian and international media. Few females have over the years been included in the foreign departments related to international politics and conflict reporting. Whether NRK had intentionally avoided employing women as foreign correspondents, or women themselves decided not to pursue such a line of work, is not part of the discussion. Still, it is well documented that conservative attitudes and the notion of war being an inappropriate subject for women have roots in social stigma and stereotypical gender roles. My first ambition was to try to increase the number of female respondents, but then the criteria would be based more on gender balance and less on war experience. However, since the number of female foreign correspondents in NRK has been 14 out of a total 68, I believe that I do have a proper balance with 3 women out of 12 informants.

The fourth element to consider was the media formats. Because of digitalization, the media trend has shifted from one-source channels (such as television, radio or newspaper) to include a variety of different platforms. Rune Ottosen (2004) confirms that Internet is now one of the highest-growing sources for news, mainly because of the speed. A journalist today is expected to appear in and contribute to other media platforms to structurally vary the news according to segment, updates and recipients. Although one might consider the primary employer alone, it would be challenging to reach proper balance if all the different formats should be equally represented. Of the informants, 50% is working for TV and 50% is working for print media. I have focused on representatives from the two major TV networks (NRK and TV2) and three newspapers which have national circulation, a foreign-news department with local production and extensive coverage of international news (VG, Morgenbladet and Aftenposten).

The strategic selection shows a clear distinction between age, gender, primary media source and a variety of assignment types, but these variables do not play a significant role for the analysis. The important selection criteria for the informants were their years of field experience and similar field areas. This research will try to give a broader understanding of the motivation of war reporters in Norway, and I believe that the strategic selection of informants for this thesis makes the data both valid and transferable.



## 2.2 Sources and data collection

It is a very small community of war correspondents and conflict reporters in Norwegian media. My selection includes three women and nine men. The 12 journalists I have interviewed are Anders Sømme Hammer, Fredrik Græsvik, Jon Magnus, Kristin Solberg, Maren Næss Olsen, Odd Karsten Tveit, Per A. Christiansen, Rune Thomas Ege, Sidsel Wold, Sigurd Falkenberg Mikkelsen, Tom Bakkeli and Tomm Kristiansen. Five are in the age group 30 to 40 years, one is between 40 and 50 years, two are between 50 and 60 years, two are between 60 and 70 years, and one is between 70 and 80 years old. Two are retired journalists and one has resigned as war reporter and is currently working for an editorial magazine. Six are employed in television, one works independently as a documentary film journalist and five works, or worked for national and regional newspapers or as journalist writers.

11 out of 12 knew early that they wanted to pursue a career in journalism. Only one informant had chosen a different career but coincidentally ended up as a journalist. For three of the informants, born between 1942 and 1948 it was a series of random circumstances that led to becoming foreign correspondents which sparked the interest for continuing to work with foreign-news. This can be explained by the period of 1960s being the beginning of the television era and news bulletins increased the interest for the global world. The correspondent network in those days was mainly focused on Cold War realities. NRK's first correspondent in North America assumed position in 1965, the Russia correspondent in 1968 (Wikipedia 2015). Because the first correspondence office in the Middle East opened as late as 1974, it may explain why working with foreign-news was not a common career option for Norwegian journalists in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Although *Aftenposten* had an emissary in Egypt as early as 1967, it was not a common editorial practice to send Norwegian journalists abroad. The nine other journalists had a clear desire to work with foreign-news but explain that it was perceived as a difficult position to get due to few opportunities and fierce competition between journalists. They also lacked professional field experience. Three of them left abroad after their graduate studies to indulge in a personal interest for a specific geographic area and to get more experience in the field.

Ten have higher education from university. Five have combined their journalist education with an additional degree in political science of various disciplines. One has journalism studies combined with another field of study, and one has only journalism studies. One has

combined a political science education with another field, and two have other educations that are not related to either journalism or political science. Two of the informants do not have formal higher education. They all have specialized knowledge of geographical areas from having spent several years in the region as correspondents, reporters and researchers. 11 have their major field experience from the Middle East and one has field experience from Africa. The war zones visited included Israel, the Gaza Strip and the West Bank, Afghanistan from 2001, Iraq in 2003, Lebanon during the civil war, Egypt in 1967/1973 and during the Arab spring, Syria, Libya, Bosnia, Croatia, South Africa, Ukraine, Georgia, South Sudan, Yemen, Pakistan, Columbia and Eritrea. The predominance of field experience among the informants originates from the Middle East and Asia, with Israel/Palestine, Afghanistan and Iraq as the three most covered conflicts, followed by Lebanon, Egypt during the Arab spring, Syria and Libya. Three had field experience from the Balkans, making this region the second most widely covered conflict zone, while Latin-America and Africa are the least covered conflict regions.

When I contacted the informants to ask for interview appointments, the response was overwhelmingly positive. The few who declined participation did so because of their limited availability or because they were not in the country at the time. Time was also a challenge because some correspondents were either preparing to leave the country or not available within the designated time frame. The interviews were completed between March and June 2015. In addition to the empiricism gathered from my informants, I had phone calls with sources who gave invaluable information about the profession, work conditions and their share of experiences as reporters in war and conflict zones.

Most of the interviews took place in the informants' work offices, public areas or local cafés. One interview was completed in the informant's private home and two were conducted by Skype because the informants were stationed overseas or in the process of leaving Norway for correspondent work. One interview was made over the phone. We spoke of many topics, such as why journalists choose war, the attitude towards their profession, the physical dangers they confront, their relationship with their family, colleagues and bosses, the question of whether the profession is becoming more dangerous over time, the difficulty of maintaining neutrality in conflicts and the various physical and emotional effects they might have experienced. Each interview lasted between one and two hours, depending on how much time the informant had available or how much information he or she wanted to share. The interviews were recorded

with the informants' permission, the tapes were transcribed and the notes processed in order to structure the data and verify measurability.

### **2.3 Ethical considerations**

Considering the research topic and the delicate themes that could emerge, a reflection on ethical considerations has been made prior to, during and after the data collection.

The fundamental principle in social scientific research is *do not harm*, which is based on respecting and protecting the research subjects (Berg and Lune 2014:61).

First, it is the use of GMT in research. This methodology implies that the researcher has minimum knowledge of the topic when going to the field. Personal history and previous knowledge can influence the research focus, create expectations and provide a bias, some might argue. Glaser (2001:9) offers a solution to this dilemma: "There is no such thing for GT as bias data or subjective or objective data or misinterpreted data. It is what the researcher is receiving, as a pattern, and as a human being which is inescapable). It just depends on the research".

One ethical concern could be that the researcher has a prior history of working as a journalist, and being employed by the same media organization as the majority of the research subjects could cause a bias. However, the journalistic area of practice was different than the field which is the object for this research, and the researcher had no personal knowledge of the journalists other than from their public reputation. The researcher was also recommended subjects which ensured participation from additional sources.

All research subjects participated voluntarily and consensus was obtained prior to the interviews. A few asked to see the interview guide in advance, mainly to understand the focus and perspective chosen for the research. On a general note, preparing yourself for questions can be an invitation to manipulate answers in order to shape them in line with dominant opinions which could have an effect on the result. However, I do not see that this has influenced the research in limiting ways. On the contrary, since motivation is hard to define and possibly even harder to verbalize, to allow personal thought processes before asking complex questions has only been beneficial to both interviewer and interview subject.

A concern that emerged during the data collection was the political affiliation of the interviewees. The main distress was voiced by those informants who had experienced threats and complaints, arguing that their political affiliation is often brought up for the use of personal attacks. For their protection I have avoided any citation that could lead to the identification of political sympathies of any kind. When focusing on the narratives of experiencing war, sensitive topics might lead to emotional reactions such as rejection or guilt. The interview guide was designed and prepared with this in mind, and the subjects could freely answer the questions they were comfortable with and avoid issues they were not comfortable with. Neither of the informants requested anonymity. To ensure correct citations, any data that could not be recovered from muffled audio or otherwise technical disturbances which influenced the recording sessions was not used. Citations have been sent to the informants at their requests, and all citations are used with permission from the informants.

## **Chapter 3: Theory**

Motivation is difficult to place in fixed categories as it is defined as a process that initiates, directs, maintains and decides the intensity in behavior, and “the biological, psychological and social factors that can explain behavior” (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:93). It is the process of individual development and not only achievements that matters. Moreover, motivations can change over time, given the context and preferences. In other words, motivations are neither static nor generic. One factor that was an important motivator to begin with may end up being less important at a later stage. A useful way of explaining motivation could be to analyze which factors, or which factor combinations, seem to have a bigger impact on decisions and behavior.

### **3.1 Motivation Theories**

Theories on how and why motivations occur are mostly used in psychology and they are often trying to explain the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Understanding how motivation affects people is important to an employer who wants to increase work production or employee satisfaction, or a squad leader who needs to motivate soldiers to go to war. Human behavior is determined by many factors and variables, and studying different theories may provide knowledge into how performance can be improved. There are four initial types of theories that can explain and predict human behavior (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:93).

The best known theory is the Hierarchy of Needs. Abraham Maslow (1954) established two basic premises: One, human beings are in the constant state of ‘wanting’ and thus are motivated to seek the needs which are not satisfied. A need that has been satisfied ceases to be a motivator. Second, the needs are arranged in order of importance where the lower levels are the fundamental needs and the higher levels are the more advanced needs. Different needs can be attended to at the same time, but there has to be a minimum of needs satisfied on one level before one can move up to the next one (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:95). Maslow identified five levels that are organized systematically in a hierarchic structure. On the first level are the physiological needs that are basic for human survival, namely food, water, air, sleep and shelter. The second level consists of the safety needs. Humans have to feel secure and safe from any harm, threats and unexpected danger that can occur in their physical

environments. This can also be related to health, economy and job security. On the third level are the needs to have social relations to others, friendship, affection, love, affiliation and the feeling of belonging. The fourth level consists of the esteem needs, sometimes referred to as ego needs. Praise, recognition and respect from others will strengthen human self-confidence and prestige, and it can also affect self-perception and pride. Finally, on the fifth and last level are the self-actualization needs. On this level, humans can achieve realization of self, reach the goals in life and achieve one's full potential. There are two important elements to Maslow's theory. First, the two lower levels affect human physical health and the three upper levels affect human mental health. Second, the levels are divided into mechanisms of growth and deficit. The three lower levels symbolize motives of deficit, meaning they only motivate behavior if they are not satisfied. The less you have of food, safety and love, the more you want it. Once they have been fulfilled they lose their motivating force. The two higher levels symbolize motives of growth, meaning they continue to motivate behavior even after the needs have been received. The more self-realization and recognition you get from others, the more you continue to want it.

The one unquestionable point Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs makes is that the basic needs are undeniably surpassing all other needs. It is a biological fact that if humans have no food or water, they simply cannot exist and no other activities than satisfying these needs will be of equal importance. Moving up to the next level, a different hierarchy of needs can be found. War reporters travel to unsafe areas and often find themselves without proper shelter, sometimes even with scarce resources of food and water, and usually travelling with few companions. Esteem needs and self-actualization needs might be more superior to security needs, simply because the completion of task and the job as a war reporter surpasses the need for physical comfort and security. I do not suggest that security is not an important need for war reporters, but they voluntarily travel to hazardous environments where they might be susceptible to unexpected danger, physical harm or diseases as a consequence. According to Committee to Protect Journalists (2015), 61 journalists were killed in 2014 (motive confirmed). 34% worked as broadcast reporters and 59% were killed in war zones. While the type of death varied, 38% died in crossfire/combat and 18% in relation to dangerous assignments (CPJ 2015). Although 77% of the journalist killed were local and not foreign, 35 of the 61 died in Middle Eastern countries such as Syria, Iraq, Israel/Palestine and Afghanistan. War reporters follow the news and travel to countries such as these where the risk is substantial. This can support the argument that they see a growth need as more

important than a deficit need, which suggests that Maslow's order of needs is not entirely applicable for the behavior of war reporters.

Clayton P. Alderfer (1972) revised Maslow's theory with his ERG Theory from 1969. He reduced the number of levels from five to three, ordering them from a priority of how clear the needs in each category could be verified. The key element in his theory is that each person has an individual priority of needs and that the verification of the specific objectives on each level depends entirely on the person. His lowest level of existence needs include all the material and physiological desires that constituted Maslow's first two levels. The next level of Relatedness needs encompassed the external social needs of Maslow's third and fourth level, but which are only in relation to others. The third level of Alderfer's model is the Growth needs, which consists of the internal esteem and self-actualization needs from Maslow's fourth and fifth levels. Because this theory allows for flexible movement in each direction of the structure, this theory can offer a better understanding of war reporters' motivation. However, the structure is still hierarchic, and despite flexibility and individual focus, the ERG theory still suggests that all physical needs should have to be fulfilled before moving up to the stages of Growth needs. The simplification of the Existence needs level where a biological need essential for human survival such as water is equated with a physical need for safety such as having shelter is problematic at best and cannot explain the systematical behavior of war reporters.

The Expectation Theory created by Vroom (1964), sometimes referred to as the Cognitive Evaluation Theory, claims that every action is a result of a conscious, rational choice (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:97). Rational choice is seen as the most influential drive of human behavior, and supporters of this theory argue that the triggering factor is the expectation to achieve certain goals. It is the anticipation of a reward that motivates people, and the perspective of rational choice being the essential motivator for human decisions derives from the notion of consequences through logical calculation. This can be related to external benefits such as economic profit, but also internal gains such as recognition and status. Humans are motivated by the expected end result, and therefore consciously make decisions about their behavior. They will do things which they believe will result in favorable outcomes and avoid things which they think will lead to unfavorable outcomes. Work performance is instrumental to achieve this, and a person will thus justify his/her work efforts in order to receive the reward. However, it is not motivation alone but the individual

qualifications and abilities to perform the tasks that matter significantly. This is largely connected to different role expectations. Performance is a function of three interrelated variables: the performance level, the individual skills, and the accurate behavior to get a successful result (XX). The premise is that rational choice motivates someone to perform with great effort, with the skills necessary to do it and in the way the boss wants it to be done. In other words, there should be a correlation between the effort, expected result and the reward.

Although the Expectation Theory may be used successfully to measure motivation of soldiers, it may not be able to fully explain why a war reporter sometimes replaces logic with intuition in order to perform a task. War reporters are rational individuals because they have to assess risks and balance the need for security with the desire to get a sensational story. They depend on systematic calculation, regular procedures and cognitive skills, but logical decisions are in some cases not appropriate. Some of my informants explained that when they maneuver around in war zones they often base their judgments on intuition. This could be referred to as the indeterminate phenomenon of *gut feeling*, an antenna of field sensibility that has been developed through experience. Rather than just doing what is supposed to be correct or safe from a logical perspective, war reporters consult with their psychological instincts. They believe that if certain elements do not seem right despite having everything prepared, cleared and checked, they should trust their instincts more than their rationality. However, the idea of trusting the *inner voice* as a method for decision-making should not be seen as a substitute for using rational strategy. War reporters may use a combination when they see that using reason and intuition is beneficent to the situation.

The premise for this theory presupposes that any reward seen from a management perspective would be instrumental to greater efforts. This would be determined by the reward itself. Rational logic might assume that material gains or social status is a strong motivational force and thus expect certain attitudes and subsequent behavior. War reporters see working conditions as an important factor and they are continuously trying to improve their production quality. But if war reporters were only interested in the expected outcome we would see a lot more reporters who were not capable of doing this job. The suitability to work in war and conflict zones is largely dependent on personality, interests, individual experiences and skills. Because the job at times is exhausting and intense, only the really dedicated ones will endure. Certain rewards such as receiving more interesting assignments could naturally have an effect, but since the theory also lacks to explain the different levels of efforts it would be hard



to predict what a war reporter's behavior might be. Some rewards could lead to higher production effort, other rewards might cause lower, and some rewards might not require a change in behavior at all. This all depends on the nature of the assignment. War reporters need another motivation force than a certain reward, and for this type of work it is less logical to expect a direct correlation between effort, result and reward. Finally, the theory states that satisfaction is the result of performance (Vroom 1964). When the individual's knowledge, personality and past experiences are not taken in consideration, the outcome cannot be guaranteed to lead to a certain result. Some war reporters might lack certain skills in order to do the job as expected, and this would have an effect on the outcome. The Expectancy Theory may be a good approach to analyze employees in an organizational structure where rewards such as a promotion or better salary would lead to higher productivity, but the simplistic nature of it provides less explanation for the behavior of war reporters. This theory can however explain why some attempts to motivate others are successful and other attempts fail.

The Equity Theory emphasizes the individual's relationship to its colleagues as a source of motivation or demotivation (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:105). The notion of justice, equity and fair treatment is essential because it is the perception of relative gains in comparison with others that is the strongest motivator. When a person's effort and reward matches the effort and reward of another person with similar background and tasks, the principle of equity is maintained. If an employee learns that a colleague with the same work preferences is getting a higher salary for the same job performance or equal pay for less effort, the experience of unfair treatment appears. This is not as empirically rigid as it sounds because it is highly dependent on individual sensitivity for what can be perceived as equitable. It is the feeling of receiving the deserved output based on the input that is given. If you receive less than what you think you deserve, you feel inequity, but you also feel inequity when you receive more than what you think you deserve. According to this theory, the feeling of inequity works proportional to motivation.

Journalism is a profession that does not necessarily lead to any material gains or a preferred end result. People have various reasons for choosing the profession, but the desire is mostly rooted in individual interest for self-realization. Realization of self cannot be given by anyone who wishes to influence their behavior because it is an intrinsic quality that is felt only by the individual. Journalism is by many seen as something you are by nature, a lifestyle, and not a tool for achieving something in return. This can be exemplified by UNESCO's description of

journalism as “not only a profession but a mission” (Ottosen 2004:57). Previous studies have shown that journalists are not concerned about power, wealth and status. Although the average salary for journalists in Norway has increased since the 1970s to surpass the medium wages for industrial workers, journalism is not amongst the wealthiest professions (Ottosen 2004:58). In a study conducted to measure the motives of journalist students, 60% said they chose this career because they like to write and only 10% said that wages and social recognition was a motive (Ottosen 2004:67-68). When a student chooses a profession without considering the paycheck, it is reasonable to suggest that other factors than salary is more important. It can be assumed that war reporters are less concerned about what other colleagues get paid, and therefore see no need to compare themselves to others. The ideology of journalism as a practice is based on the notion of fulfilling creative needs. Because war reporters have different experience, interests and personal background it is difficult to determine equal work for equal pay. The theory of equity might be able to explain the lack of motivation based on a reporter’s feeling of receiving less than what he/she thinks is deserved, when the salary cannot justify the risks involved, but that is an individual motive which is not based on comparing oneself to others. Perhaps it would be more helpful to consider absolute gains instead of relative gains when analyzing behavior and motivation among war reporters.

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory, sometimes called the Motivator-Hygiene Theory, advocate the advantages and disadvantages of certain factors being present at work. The idea is to map different job qualities to find the optimal motivation for everyone to develop his or her potential. Herzberg, Mauser and Snyderman (1959) identified two main categories of satisfiers: The Maintenance Factors, also called the Hygiene Factors include policies, work conditions, social relations, status, job security, salary and personal life. The theory’s assertion is that these factors will not give dissatisfaction when they are present, but they will lead to great dissatisfaction when being absent. When status, salary and security are favorable, employees do not feel any particular motivation, but they feel greatly dissatisfied when these elements are missing. To impact motivation, an employer would have to focus on these factors to be well maintained. In the other category we find the Motivational Factors which include recognition, responsibility, advancement, achievement, growth and the work itself. They give great satisfaction when they are present, but lead to no satisfaction when being absent. To impact motivation, an employer must ensure that these factors are present. In other words, the presence of Maintenance factors has no impact on motivation, but the presence of Motivational factors do. The absence of Maintenance factors leads to demotivation, but the

absence of Motivational factors has no impact. This theory suggests that the dimensions of work-related satisfaction and dissatisfaction work independent of one another (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:108). But even if an employer facilitates tasks by increasing degrees of variety, flexibility, autonomy and feedback, individual differences will still occur. There can be no generic standards of adjusting work-related factors to safeguard motivation, simply because people are not machines.

Most journalists today are content because the job allows for individual creativity, interesting work, freedom and the perception of being useful in society (Ottosen 2004:83). As I have explained in the previous section, war reporters are not motivated by status or salary. They accept strenuous work conditions and manage fine without supervision. The Maintenance factors are clearly not favorable, but discontent is still not created as the theory suggest. The absence of these factors seems to have no strong impact on motivation. War reporters favor factors high on the Maslow-pyramid such as growth, responsibilities and the meaningfulness of the job, because personal interests and the feeling of achievement are reasons for becoming a war reporter. According to Herzberg it would make no difference to them if the job wasn't rewarding or it had no particular meaning to them. I would instead argue that losing the self-realization aspect will lead to strong dissatisfaction. It is the absence of both factors that in the Two-Factor Theory leads to a predicted behavior that does not match with the behavior of war reporters. It is a useful theory to distinguish between the impact of present or absent factors, and a useful reminder that the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but no satisfaction.

Another approach is to distinguish between the internal and external factors that trigger psychological processes, influence motivation and lead to action. The internal factors are defined as needs, expectations and evaluations, and the external factors include elements of social relations, community and tasks (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:114). The internal factors are not only the basic biological needs but also intellectual and esthetic satisfaction in regards to admiration, recognition and expression of self. In short, Maslow's theory and The Expectation Theory are both expressing internal factors, and they are activated by individual thought processes. The Equity Theory and Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory are supporting the external factors, which are activated by mobilization through social facilitating and the notion of equity and justice (Kaufmann and Kaufmann 2009:115). But is there another possibility to

refine the inner and outer, and differentiate between the motivation factors triggered by the individual and motivation factors triggered by others?

Edward L. Deci (1975) is well known for his theories on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The word 'intrinsic' refers both to what is intrinsic to the individual (psychological factor) and what is intrinsic to the task being performed. Rewards can be given in relation to task, which can be understood as both the activities (behavior) and the purposes (goals), and non-task, which is the psychological reward which is not directly associated with the task itself. By using both meanings one can define intrinsic as "motivation [that] involves psychological rewards that individuals derive directly from a task" (Thomas and Jansen 1996:9). In contrast, extrinsic motivation derives from rewards given by others, such as praise, recognition and economic benefits or pay (Thomas and Jansen 1996:10). The Intrinsic Task Rewards Model distinguishes thus between psychological rewards, which is intrinsic, and task-related rewards, which can be intrinsic or extrinsic. Motivation can be seen as a reward given to you by others and yourself. How much importance the rewards have for you will determine which factor has more or less effect on your motivation to complete task. In order to explain what motivates war reporters, one has to look not only at the premises for external factors connected to the profession, the internal motivators and the individual experiences they derive along the way. Put differently, war reporters have motivation factors related to intrinsic non-task, intrinsic task reward and extrinsic task reward. It is the overall process of these variables when working together that will be determining the degree of motivation.

### **3.2 Grounded Theory**

The Grounded Theory Methodology (GTM) is a perspective based methodology developed by Glaser and Strauss (1967). It is an interactive way to make sense of qualitative data because the research is not depending on previous concepts. When a researcher has limited knowledge of a field, it is sometimes hard to analyze the data according to a known theory. Instead of trying to adjust data to fit existing categories, new theoretical categories are created from the meanings, perceptions, intentions and ideas provided by your research objects. The advantage of using GTM is that it can identify underlying patterns among people's multiple perspectives on a given subject, and this research method has been valued for providing "a comprehensive explanation of a process or scheme apparent in relation to particular phenomena" (Driks and Mills, 2011:12). The researcher will collect data and start interpreting

the findings in order to identify coinciding bits. Through comparative analysis, certain patterns are observed and new ideas emerge. The data is checked and refined by gathering further data. What is discovered through the analysis allows for the conceptualization of categories within a specific contextual frame. This gives the opportunity to construct theories grounded on the data themselves. Such methodology involves a reiterative process which implies a constant interchange between data collection and analysis (Charmaz 2008:82).

There are many benefits of using the GTM: Firstly, theory can be derived from qualitative data regardless of data collection strategies, coding and analysis. Secondly, the interplay between data collection and analysis allows the researcher to become involved and strengthens the understanding of an empirical problem. This allows for the development of theories of “great conceptual density and with considerably meaningful variation” (Kelle 2005:19). Finally, the use of the GTM makes it possible to examine individual difference instead of major trends and specific theories, which validates the data without considering them as measurement errors.

It is important to stress that when researching topics that involve motivation, data results are difficult to test because the answers cannot be scientifically measured or proven to be true or false. The purpose of this research was not to test hypotheses but to gather empirical data and try to construct a theory.

## Chapter 4: War Reporters

### 4.1 Characteristics

All individuals who have chosen a job as a war reporter have different personalities. They have various backgrounds, diverse interests and a range of both innate and acquired qualities. Yet, it is possible to discover some common features in their behavior and personalities from the stories they tell. From the data and observations, these similar characteristics have been found:

They are pragmatic. Working in the field in often chaotic and stressful situations, they have a sense of deductive reasoning. This is mostly exemplified by the way they use rational thinking and calculation to reach certain practical goals. The attention is directed to the control of a situation, and it is the emphasis on usefulness that is important. This behavior allows them to work systematically to predict the outcome and achieve positive consequences instead of letting coincidences happen. This is exemplified by Anders Sømme Hammer:

[...] Journalists often work like doctors. If you're working at an emergency clinic you focus on your job. This is often how I work when something dramatic happens too. I am rational, and concerned with assessing the risks, and cannot take everything in at the time because otherwise I cannot do my job.

They are task-oriented. Very seldom do they lose track of what the objective of the assignment is. Even in tense situations, their focus remains on the target which is to complete the task. Any reaction that may not be expedient to the assignment is suppressed until after the work is done. This is a form of disciplined behavior that helps distancing themselves from any distraction that is a hindrance to job performance. This is exemplified by Per A. Christiansen:

[...] It's like a separate world. When I see a pile of bodies I don't think of it as a pile of bodies. I focus on the words I will use to describe to my readers what it is I am seeing.

They are dedicated. Their sense of duty towards their job and profession is strong. In their desire to improve skills and performance, they show a clear ambition towards their careers. Many have solid academic education, and the ones who don't have formal studies have spent most of their lives acquiring literary knowledge. Being thorough, hard-working with large capacity and high stamina, they let very little disrupt the responsibility which has been placed upon them. The loyalty and enthusiasm they express does not only come from the justification of their field presence but is simply based on the passion they have for the job itself. It's not about scratching the surface of the stories, it's to understand, be involved. To work with foreign-news, they have to go into the field. There is no alternative.

They are adaptable. Having the ability to travel to foreign countries and relying solely on their own decisions makes them independent and highly susceptible to change. They are able to deal with culture shock, solitude and poor conditions, but most important they have the ability to meet and connect with different people. The willingness to expose themselves to trials and absorb people's fates makes them flexible, well prepared for challenges and accustomed to all walks of life.

They are confident. Having solid experience and expert knowledge of a certain field is a way to increase authority. Adding the high level of job freedom and trust in their own judgments allow them to take control of their surroundings and make tough decisions. This builds determination and strengthens decisiveness. Without constant follow-up from the home office they need to find an independent cursor for performance quality, and respect and recognition from others help increase the level of self-assurance which in turn affects performance.

They are humble. For the most part they try to avoid being the center of attention. Instead they focus on the people they write or talk about as the ones that matter. They show deep gratitude to their employers for giving them opportunities, flexibility and trust, and express in different ways how fortunate they are to combine personal interest with a professional career. They are not active attention-seekers. This impression is strengthened by their strong attitudes towards the increased personification of war reporters.

They are curious. Being interested in people and telling stories is what drove them into journalism, but many also have an academic interest in witnessing first hand political

processes. They are fascinated by the world outside, and the reason for being drawn to conflict is to be able to tell stories about people affected by war and disasters. They want to see with own eyes what is happening out there, be eyewitnesses and finally, share it with an audience. They all believe that if you don't have an urge for exploration then there's no point in being a journalist, you might as well do something else.

They are empathetic. The main reason for telling stories is to move their audience, but they emphasize the importance of having the ability to be moved by what they see and hear. They consider themselves eyewitnesses to injustice with a mission to report atrocities and bring suffering victims to the surface. Fair coverage is to understand a conflict from both sides, but a journalist is first and foremost a human being. It is the human touch that allows them to get affected by unfiltered impressions and make them capable of telling stories.

These eight characteristics should not be seen as conclusive facts and should not be used as hypothesis for war reporters in general. Many other variables were present and concurring, but these were the dominating ones. It is interesting to measure the observed findings up against the backdrop of how they perceive their ideal characteristics.

## **4.2 The Ideal Self**

A perception of self is an image of how one believes that others see and define them. It is a reflection of your own person. Nancy H. Leonard, Laura L. Beauvais and Richard W. Scholl (1999:975) describe self-perception like this: "The perceived self describes the set of perceptions that individuals hold about their actual traits, competencies, and values". Traits are patterns of behavior that have been repeated and internalized so they form a person's habitus (Bourdieu 1977). They are expressed as the characteristics a person ascribe to one self, for example being conservative, lazy or generous. Competencies are skills, abilities, talents and knowledge. They can range from general competencies, such as being a good management leader, to specific skills, such as having the ability to twirl for an hour without experiencing dizziness. Values are the concepts and beliefs about desirable norms and behaviors, and a person will demonstrate his/her normative attitudes through words and actions. More research of the perceived self has suggested that individuals define self with multiple identities in terms of additional perceptions like attributes, experiences, thoughts,



actions, physical appearances, demographic attributes and dispositions (Leonard, Beauvais and Scholl 1999:974).

Self is composed of three interrelated sets of self-perceptions: The perceived self, the ideal self and social identities (Leonard, Beauvais and Scholl 1999:975). While the perceived self is the description of how a person believes to be, the ideal self is the set of traits, competencies and values a person would like to possess. The social identities are the categories of social environments that an individual can identify with and belong to. A war reporter could be classified as a journalist and a writer, but also as a woman, a man, a Christian and a tennis player. The informants were asked to name qualities that they believe a war reporter should have in order to be successful. The responses included different characteristics, abilities, skills, values and knowledge that war reporters not only should have for their own sake, but should be required to have in order to perform the job. In other words, abilities in relation to job performance, and traits in relation to human characteristics were mentioned.

The new journalist role is to defend the rights of the victims of atrocities. While the idea of human rights and human universality has always been a strong essence in journalism, the war reporter role is adjusted to fit the idealistic image of being whistleblowers for global inequality and social injustice. The same way as the journalists at home are watchers of local authorities, foreign-news journalists are the keepers of international justice. The war reporter continues to have a critical lookout for skewed power relations, but in recent times there has been an increased tendency to focus on the victims of war. Some informants emphasized the importance of humanizing the conflicts as part of their professional ethics. To make people understand that the death tolls being reported in fact constitute individual human fates and that people should not be classified in collective terms such as for example Palestinians or Egyptians. Kristin Solberg explains her focus as a journalist like this:

[...] It is important that you're able to break free from your own prejudices or cultural background, to detach yourself from this narrative to avoid getting into the dichotomy of *us* and *them*. I want to bridge the gap, not separate the world into us in Europe and them in the Middle East. That we focus on humanity and the collective instead of the individual. Humanize the conflicts and not

just report the numbers of casualties. It was not fifty people who died in a bomb attack in Kabul, but it was eight year old Fatima who liked natural science. Make people relate directly to the ones you write about.

While humanizing conflict is a noble ambition, this could also be a dilemma. The challenge is to be able to show empathy with the victims and simultaneously have the ability to see and report the big picture. Another point that one informant stressed was the risk of wearing out the public. News bulletins are full of depressing stories and people might experience a compassion fatigue. War reporters want to set the agenda and encourage people to get involved. At the same time they might influence resignation because people might get weary from the constant bombardment of world crises.

The war reporter is an important mediator between the public and international conflicts, and this requires an understanding of complicated issues to be able to filter and pass them on to the public. A war reporter without the knowledge of international relations and geopolitics may not be able to give correct, in-depth analyses of conflicts, but it has less to do with academic background. When asked if a war reporter needs to have a formal education or background in international politics, nine informants said yes and three said no. The nine who answered that education is not a necessity, argued that although it is not required it is clearly an advantage. Of the three informants arguing for education being a necessity, two had a combination of formal journalism studies and a second degree in political science, and the third had a combination of political science and another science major. The arguments for having education were the importance of having in-depth knowledge of a landscape with complex and overlapping conflicts. Lacking the ability to analyze conflicts in historical and political context could deteriorate the journalistic quality. Two out of three, however, emphasized that various background and other competencies could strengthen the journalistic work with more enriching and diverse narratives. All the informants said that personal commitment is important, not to a specific conflict, but to have an interest to find stories and have the desire to tell them in the best possible way. This perspective was also largely confirmed by the data, because the most frequent responses were ‘interested in telling stories, being curious, and having empathy’. Empathy was mentioned most frequent, with curious as the second most frequent. Odd Karsten Tveit elaborates:

[...] A correspondent has to be interested in finding the truths. There is never just one truth. You have to cut through the lies. Because everyone lies. You have to be critical. My rule of thumb, borrowed from an American journalist, is 'If your mother says she loves you, check the story!' Be curious, critical and knowledgeable. You have to know the history, and then dig deeper. And of course, be interested in travelling. News don't come knocking on your door, you have to go out and find them.

The responses to the description of the ideal self were divided between the abilities to have suitability for the field and the personal qualities needed in order to perform the particular journalistic work. The characteristics for personal qualities are, not in prioritized order; to have the urge to travel, to be adventurous, to be thorough, to be hungry for news stories, to fundamentally care for people and to have respect for the people one writes about. The characteristics for increasing suitability for the working conditions are, not in prioritized order; to be willing to explore unfamiliar territory, to have large work capacity, to have lots of energy, to be able to endure discomfort, to be optimistic, to be humble and to have experience with all sorts of people. Other qualities mentioned can be fitting for both personality and job performance, such as 'to be fearless'. Negatively charged characteristics were also mentioned, such as 'not be nervous or jumpy'. Even the trait 'being unlucky' was by one informant perceived as an unfortunate quality to have. Although this could be hard to determine in relative terms, the indication is that it would still make a negative cursor for field suitability. Sidsel Wold summarizes the most important traits a war reporter needs to have, in her opinion:

[...] You have to be willing to leave everything, take risks and be fearless. You have to be passionate, strong-willed, energetic and enduring. You cannot complain about bad food, you cannot be lazy and you have to be able to work long, hard days. [...]

Another interesting observation was how most of the reporters were inclined to mention adjectives that are value-free in the sense that they don't measure any performance quality.

For example, instead of using the word *brave* which gives a premise of admiration, they used *fearless*. The responses they gave described qualities which were mostly neutral and without any bias. Whether this was a conscious behavior or an acquired ability is not known. This was a widely observed phenomenon among the informants, but it did not include all. It is hard to say what is causing some to give such neutral descriptions. Work associated with reporting from war and conflict can be mentally and physically demanding. It might be a conscious choice to avoid highlighting factors that could add to the sympathy that war reporters often get from bystanders. This is how Maren Næss Olsen describes her job:

[...] There are probably many people who couldn't do this. Sometimes when I talk with my friends they don't understand at all that I do this job, it sounds so extreme to them. Because you have to improvise, throw yourself out there, and you have no guarantees for anything. Most happens on-site. You have few appointments, and you expose yourself to pretty intense meetings. This job is probably not for everyone. But I think there are two kinds of people who cover conflicts. I define myself with one group, being very sensitive and taking everything in. Then I hear others, mostly women, talk about feeling the same thing, so this gives perhaps one type of journalism? And then you have the stereotypical, extreme robust male correspondent who perhaps nurtures the adventure more. Maybe they go deeper into the actual war? [...]

There seems to be a distinct separation made between the moral obligations directly associated with the war reporter's role, and the physical capabilities and psychological tools the reporter needs. These two variables seem dependent on each other. War reporters lacking some of the personal qualities highlighted by the informants will be less able to manage being in the field and thereby less able to perform the job successfully. Hence, they are less inclined to represent the war reporter community. It seems plausible that to maintain the perceived role as a war reporter, some elements would have to be present either by nature or by repeated behavior. Put differently, a war reporter's ability to exercise his or her role function is depending on the characteristics already present in his or her personality. It can thus be argued

that successful war reporters have some innate qualities that make them more suitable for the job than others, but it cannot be suggested that war reporters lacking these qualities will do a less successful job.

The ideal self is based on the perception of the role, collective identity and the responsibility the war reporter has. It is a necessity that the reporter has values and competencies that will make him/her able to perform his/her professional duties, but it is equally important to have personal qualities that fits the life of a travelling journalist and traits that permits one to enter the field and stay there for shorter or longer time.

## **Chapter 5: Motivating factors**

Through the collection of data, three intrinsic factors and four extrinsic factors of motivation have been identified. These have been made into categories which constitute trademark motivation forces. The intrinsic motives are called Passion, Duty and Status. The extrinsic motives are called Autonomy, Collegiality, Adrenaline and Fame. These seven categories will now be analyzed and discussed in the order they were discovered during the data analysis and not listed in the order of importance. All the informants' citations have been translated from Norwegian to English by the researcher.

### **5.1 Intrinsic motives**

#### **5.1.1 Passion**

War reporters are very content and express strong individual satisfaction when reflecting upon their job situation. They are able to combine personal interests such as travelling and exploring the world, with the professional interests such as history, linguistics and political science. Writing, travelling and being able to meet people are the most desired activities. 10 out of 12 informants emphasized these as their strongest motivation trigger for deciding to become a journalist. Expressions such as being fortunate and being privileged were frequently repeated in this context. It is seen as a remarkable situation to be paid to do what you most desire in life and something that clearly separates this job from other occupations. It is perhaps not seen as labor at all, but a set of practices they are deeply committed to personally, emotionally, professionally and ideologically.

The informants emphasized the fact that they are able to do what they most want in life, regardless of the necessary tasks involved. For them as journalists, writing or telling stories is the ultimate activity. They *need* to do it. The big difference between being an author and being a journalist is the time it takes from a product is completed until it reaches its audience. The reporter is usually able to present his/her own work, transmitted in the fashion of his/her own choosing. An author might wait several months from a book is finished to the printed copy can be released and readers can give their feedback. For a reporter, this happens instantly. The digitalization of media with continuous updates and live coverage makes the journalistic experience a current affair which gives immediate satisfaction. Another, more

naturalistic perspective is the sense of being present at historical events. The desire to be where it happens when it happens, and thus contribute to bring the world's current headlines, is an attractive aspect. Rune Thomas Ege elaborates on this:

[...] There is always a war, a conflict, a crisis and a story that is not being told to the world and that is what I live for. To get out there and tell a story that otherwise would not reach any readers, this is a fantastic job. Being able to tell people how the world fits together and every day be a part of history when events happen, that is a wonderful experience. If you take away all the other stuff that happens, death and cruelty, it feels very good.

War reporters are curious people who like to travel, meet other people, be creative, and to be in the center of important events. The opportunity to combine these activities with personal interest for history and politics, and write or talk about the experiences afterwards, is perceived as a dream job. The pleasure war reporters get from doing something they truly enjoy and which gives meaning to life, constitutes the very source of inspiration. It is a reason for waking up in the morning. The job is fun, interesting, rewarding, challenging, exciting and meaningful. War reporters seemingly have no other ambitions than being better at what they do, instead of getting promoted or receiving a higher salary. This suggests strong appreciation for the work itself, and the experience of deep fulfillment for being able to continue working with something they truly love. It is by definition a selfish motive, although it may not necessarily be at the expense of solidarity. It is important not to differentiate too rigid between the individual motive that satisfies personal needs and the collective duty one has as a journalist because they often work simultaneously.

Another important drive is found in the gender issue. One female informant explains that her motive also had a higher purpose, the feminist agenda. It was a strong, personal commitment to work for female participation in a male-dominated profession in a time when women had been largely discriminated (Ottosen 2004:75-81). This was such a strong motivation that it almost exceeded all other motives. Sidsel Wold explains why:

[...] I wanted to show that women also can go to war zones and report from conflicts. I believe it is important that women cover war too, because they have a different language and another way of expressing themselves. [...] Even when men said ‘this is too tough’ and ‘you cannot handle it’, I thought, dammit, I will do it! I just had to become NRK’s first female correspondent in the Middle East, I just had to! Nothing else mattered. I was so angry, and that was an important drive for me.

It seems reasonable to suggest that the previous monopoly of male war reporters has been an additional catalyst to pursue the occupation, at least for one informant. This informant also emphasized the importance of being a supportive influence for other women. Considering her past it may not be surprising that it is an extra motivation to be able to inspire female journalists to choose the occupation as war reporter. The other two female informants did not state feminism as an additional motive, but one informant explained that she is aware of her influence on younger female reporters. Whether being a role model is an extra motivational drive for her was not expressed, but she admitted to fully relate to the context of being a woman in a male-dominated profession. According to the recent study conducted by The Global Media Monitoring Project (GMMP 2015:126), the representation of female reporters in Norwegian newspapers is 37%. The female representation is 34% for TV reporters and 31% for reporters working in radio. Since these figures include all the different tasks journalists can have, there is a high probability that the female representation of reporters covering war and conflict is smaller than that of other, more gender-neutral areas. There is no empiric evidence to argue for this claim, but journalism has traditionally been seen as a typical male occupation. Studies show that there is no difference in the proportion of women working in radio, TV, print or web-based media in Norway and that the traditional gender imbalance is transferred to social media channels (Rødland and Mæland 2015). The gender issue is interesting, and more research should be devoted to this topic.

War reporters attribute certain qualities to their job which allows them to combine personal interests and professional capabilities. But being a war reporter is more than a job. Some feel that they are born to do it, and that being a reporter is somehow ‘in the blood’. To resist would be to go against natural reflexes. Journalistic work is based on desire and not on



willpower (Ottosen 2004:53-58). The notion of ‘once a war reporter, always a war reporter’ could thus be a hypothesis for further research. The motive of Passion is very strong.

### **5.1.2 Duty**

Many journalists are drawn to the profession because of a strong desire to be part of a community (Ottosen 2004:53). It is a sense of public duty that originates from the journalist role and identity that was discussed earlier. Besides feeling a moral obligation to their organization, their readers or viewers and society in general, war reporters also have the perception of doing an important job that makes a difference in the world. Independence and neutrality was often emphasized by the informants as one of the most important capabilities in the field; to be fair, to be balanced and to be nuanced in their reporting. The important task of being an eyewitness was frequently mentioned. To distinguish between facts and myths can be difficult, especially in wars and conflict. Power relations can be hard to spot, and there is a strong need for unbiased analyses. Genocide, torture, human rights violations and other atrocities committed against minorities and victims of war need to be reported by independent witnesses. Whatever the reason is for a conflict, it is important that someone is there to tell the world what is going on. For the reporters, it feels necessary to go because it concerns them. Norwegian war reporters who are sent to the front lines seem to be more interested in the civilians rather than analyzing military strategies. An argument could be that this perspective is easily catered by political analysts at home without the necessity of being in the field. The stories of the ones suffering from the consequences of war seem too important to miss. Maren Næss Olsen describes one of her field experiences:

[...] Meeting the Yezidi refugees made a huge impression on me. Everyone I met had either lost a child or a husband. Everything they owned was gone, large families had been massacred, and no one was helping them. They just sat there with empty stares, like their eyes had been extinguished. War is extremely gruesome and it is very important to portray this side of it. [...]

These stories need to be told, but there is another pull-factor. Although war reporters are pragmatic individuals, there is an underlying philosophy based on global solidarity. It is not

idealism in the individual activist sense. It is rooted in a moralist tradition. As a witness you have a moral obligation to report wrongdoings. Many war reporters feel helpless or angry in the face of war and use their voices or pens to inform the world about atrocities happening to innocent people. They hope that the attention might result in collective or individual reactions, and consequently lead to a shift in policies or direct actions. War reporters are neither aid workers nor medical doctors. They contribute with the resources they have available. Although they cannot tell all the stories, they can tell some. And they cannot be everywhere injustice happens, but they can be in some places. Having independent reporters in the field where human rights violations happen is to bring attention to the victims and not state authorities. The responsibility war reporters feel to their journalistic 'mission' does not hinder them from becoming personally involved, and it is precisely this altruism that has a strong impact on the collective identity. It is not a choice between being a journalist and a human being. Jon Magnus explains the duality like this:

[...] You have to be compassionate at work. If you just go in and out of the field without caring, you are only a journalist with a pen and not a journalist with a heart. To me, journalism is to have both a pen and a heart. The moment I start to behave like an activist or an aid worker, I am mistaken because then I start labelling myself. But the heart has no label.

It is the philosophy of honorable journalism practice that works as a premise for this motive, not individual idealism. However, not everyone sees idealistic grounds or duty as a strong motive. The opinions differ, here exemplified by Fredrik Græsвик:

[...] Many explain their motives publically as idealism, and they feel honest when they say it. One thing is to justify their choices towards their families because they cannot say that they think it's cool to be out there. But there has to be something more. [...] For me it was mainly a selfish reason. If I wanted to help the world I could have been a doctor or an aid worker. That is not my main

motivation. What I want to do is go out and experience the thrills and tell others about what's going on in the world.

Although some informants emphasize that the desire for self-realization is a stronger motive, I do not suggest that they don't feel morally responsible to a greater ideological cause. It is helpful to see the individual motive and the collective motive as complimentary rather than opposite factors. As motivation can change over time, it may start out as a professional interest and develop into a need for personal satisfaction later. Or the opposite; a job which includes exotic travelling becomes addictive later because of a sparked interest for political processes. Or it can be a combination of both. An interesting finding is that the only two informants currently working as regular correspondents in the Middle East (one had not yet acceded to the position at the time the interview took place) emphasized only the importance of global solidarity when asked the reason for becoming a war reporter. Sigurd Falkenberg Mikkelsen elaborates:

If my motivation had been strictly egoistic I would have been a war tourist. I don't go for the personal experience of being there. For me, this is a better way to understand the world. When we cover war and international politics we have to know what it is about, and that is perhaps the fundamental drive. [...] In my opinion you have a responsibility as a journalist to go where it happens, to be an eyewitness and experience the consequences of war so that you're able to say something reasonable about it. And the strictly egoistic needs, if I have some at all, are completely subordinate. It is the task that is important.

Being employed as a correspondent might influence the priorities because the immediacy demands a justification of the war reporter's presence. The focus could have shifted from the individual to the collective because of the nature of the employment, but these claims are unsubstantiated. I am not suggesting that only regular correspondents are concerned about political processes. Nor am I suggesting that other informants do not have an interest to cover international politics or feel less moral obligations to be eyewitnesses. They do. The findings cannot be related to a specific media organization because other informants are still actively

working for the same organization, but not currently as correspondents. An explanation could be that it is the combination of the physical presence and the mental awareness that results in a different focus. This is not to say that it cannot change or adjust. Individual passion and collective duty are not opposing elements, and one does not exclude the other. It can be argued that they instead feed off each other and will be difficult to separate from one another with time.

A country with a free and independent press knows the importance and relevance of foreign-news to secure its national interests. Norway is a small nation dependent on security alliances, economic relations and maintaining its international status as a peaceful, democratic society. The international challenges of global warming, energy crises, water shortages, famine, trafficking, migration and terror attacks, to mention just a few, can potentially increase the country's vulnerability. This requires a constant glance to the world. A Presidential election or a civil war in countries far away can have dire consequences for security alliances or Norway's economy. Foreign-news journalists are the messengers that bring all these events back home. When the backdrop is war, the war reporters tell the unbiased truth about the conflict in both military and civilian perspectives. NRK has had a specific responsibility to focus on foreign-news coverage, and NRK's regular and stable correspondence network has been an important institution for this. The dissolution of the NRK-monopoly happened in the early 1980s, but NRK has been an important promotor for the coverage of foreign-news in Norway (Ottosen 1996:449). War reporters do not only have a reporting duty on behalf of the victims but they also have a duty to bring forth public information. Television did not only provide news, entertainment, sports and movies, but it was an important source for enlightenment and played a crucial role in the upbringing of the nation. Many informants feel an extra obligation to give the public a broader perspective in addition to the actual news headline. They deliberately add small bits and pieces of information to make people understand more about the conflicts.

Duty is a multifaceted term. Part of the responsibility as a mediator is to make complicated issues understandable to the public. The issue of public education should not be ignored, as it is the informative aspect of the journalist practice that fuels the war reporters' need to report home what they see abroad. Moral responsibility, being an eyewitness and telling the important stories are some of the reasons for the job ethical and meaningful. The motive of duty emerges as a strong factor.

### 5.1.3 Status

The third intrinsic motive is status, which is related to the recognition war reporters get from the journalist community. Journalists reporting from conflicts and front lines get a lot more attention than journalists who cover for example domestic politics or real estate. This is manifested as a form of journalist hierarchy where those employed in foreign-news editorials are seen as the top journalists and may to a larger extent be exposed to envy and admiration from other journalists. The attention war reporters get can be explained by the nature of the job which has been romanticized through movies and literature for centuries. The image of the brave and heroic journalist reporting in the midst of bullets and explosions have caused the myth of war reporting as an occupation that only the most fearless journalists choose. Besides, the travel to exotic destinations where important and sometimes traumatizing events take place can by many journalists be perceived as more rewarding than working at a local news desk. But many of the informants refuted this image and explained that the job is not nearly as exciting as depicted, here exemplified by Jon Magnus:

[...] There are a lot of boring assignments. This is how it should be, because then you might get a rush of adrenaline when things get more exciting. [...] I travelled back and forth to the Balkans for 9 years. Most of the time it was routine. One day I was escorting a Norwegian foreign minister, and the next day I was lying in a trench in Bosnia with hands covering my ears watching grenades fall. It was the full range of experiences. [...] I have always seen my role as colorful and diverse, and the wars are just a small part of it. 99% of the time, being a journalist is peaceful.

There are wars going on many places in the world, but foreign-news journalists only travel to a small portion of them. This can explain why nearly all of the informants had strong objections to the label war reporter. This ambiguity is caused by the fact that their work is not limited to reporting conflicts, but they also cover natural disasters, elections, foreign policy and international politics. The war reporter-label is disliked because it gives the impression of

someone travelling from one war to the next without any real interest for the stories or the victims. The informants see the label it as an over-simplified and misleading term to fit a very small portion of their job, and possibly placed by colleagues who wish to appear more macho as a way to exaggerate the importance of their work. This confirms the notion of many journalists being self-absorbed (Ottosen 2004:74). Some deliberately uses the cliché to surf on the reputation war reporters have as brave and heroic. The informants see this practice as unacceptable behavior because of two reasons: First, it contributes to reporters becoming self-centered and more interested in the physical and psychological benefits than the actual job. This might create a domino effect where reporters start complaining about the job and indulge in self-pity. Second, it increases sympathy from bystanders which may result in shifting the focus away from the actual story. Both alternatives have unwelcomed consequences. However, to use the label is a way to give a short, simplified and somewhat extreme description. It is not completely correct, but there is still some truth in it. Normally, it is the journalists with previous war experience that are being sent to other conflicts. It is much safer for an editor to send an experienced reporter into the field to minimize the risks. From this, the notion of ‘travelling from war to war’ has occurred.

One assumption that can be made from the informants’ stories is that there are some war reporters who elevate or glorify their job, but none of the informants said that seeking attention had in any way been a personal motive for them. Only three informants confirmed that it was known to them that foreign-news journalists had quite high status, but they did not emphasize this as a motive. Just being aware of status is not a significant finding. The other informants did not provide any evidence to sustain the argument of war reporters are consciously aware of having a job with high status, nor that it had any influence on their motivation. It might be suggested that stronger personification and a higher status may lead to increasing pride for a few, but this prevalence is not visible for the majority of war reporters. On the other hand, there seems to be a small correlation between status and performance effort. Depending on how high a war reporter is on the status scale, the recognition will affect his or her self-awareness towards the job. Put differently, the more attention a reporter gets, the more conscious he or she will become about the quality of the work which is produced. When everything work-related is extremely visible, there is a higher demand for quality and the content needs to be verifiable to a much larger extent. Because people know who they are and they have a good reputation, they feel they have to confirm their standards. Just being a famous reporter can often lead to the perception of him/her being a *good* reporter. It is their

responsibility to make sure they still produce quality reportages. Only a few informants mentioned the increased visibility as an invitation to be more quality conscious, but it was not a motive in itself. From this, it is reasonable to believe that having status might affect the production effort, but there are no indications that lower or absent status will result in less effort. Neither is there substantiated empiric evidence to suggest that the lower a war reporter is on the status scale, the less proud he/she will feel about the job. Ultimately, one should not underestimate the need and motivation for feeling appreciated and noticed. It is, after all, what the war reporters want, here exemplified by Kristin Solberg:

[...] The heroic status is a side effect of the job that I never desired. I just wanted to do what I'm doing, and then I see that it creates attention. It's a double-edged sword. In many ways it is nice that people notice my work because I want them to care or react. But it is not the journalist that should get the attention. It is the content of the story.

Getting recognition from colleagues is a natural effect of having performed successfully as a war reporter, and it should not be seen as a problem. Yet, it is exactly what the informants emphasize. The war reporters' high status is normally expressed by the reporters who want to have it the most, which becomes a trigger for self-absorption. For the majority of war reporters, status and pride is not a necessity for doing a good job, nor is it important for their psychological health. Status is a weak motive.

## **5.2 Extrinsic motives**

### **5.2.1 Autonomy**

War reporters have large amounts of variety and freedom (Ottosen 2004:83). Worldly events usually indicate which places they travel to, but many times they are free to suggest locations and topics. The informants describe a combination of being asked to go, being allowed to go, and sometimes being asked and then decline. This is accepted because a war reporter is not forced to travel somewhere that does not match with his or her background or personal interests. On a few occasions a reporter will be refused to go, and this is mostly due to issues

related to security that the home office decides is too risky. A correspondent is usually asked to cover a story, a reporter is often suggesting one, and a freelancer has total freedom to make editorial choices, plan logistics and assess the risks. In situations where they are asked to go, they will often choose the angle, methods, informants and presentation themselves. While having the ability to consult with the editor before they leave, almost every decision in the field is taken by the war reporter with little or no approval from the home office. This is not to suggest that they have *carte blanche*, but it indicates that war reporters are largely their own bosses. This way, war reporters are allowed to individually structure their time without anyone controlling their day-to-day movements. Being able to decide the importance of a story and use their creativity to design it the way they want is both a prerogative and a necessity. Most of my informants display deep gratitude towards their media bosses for entrusting them with complete responsibility.

Transferring autonomy is necessary because the editor back home has limited opportunity to understand ground situations and evaluate activities. The notion is that he/she is best suitable to make the right decisions. Logistics planning, risk assessment and using local sources is essential and becomes a natural part of being present in the field. 12 out of 12 informants believe that they have the main responsibility for own safety and that the blame cannot be put on somebody else if anything goes wrong. A good marker for analyzing own choices can be done through consultation with the editor prior to or during an assignment. Both actors are free to accept or decline any suggestion, but the war reporters will often try to persuade the editor if they believe the risk is acceptable. However, when final decisions are made, any necessary restrictions on their autonomy are met with acceptance. Acknowledging shared responsibility is an important factor in this dual relationship. When advancing or withdrawing from a situation is discussed, the war reporters have large co-determination. Decision making about safety is done together, but the reporter usually has the final say. This is credited to the vital knowledge of the environment that only he/she possess. Still, the discussion is seen as a safety line for personal reasoning, and having to justify your own choices in the presence of others will confirm that they are in fact the right ones.

Based on the employment type there are various degrees of freedom. When deciding on which stories to cover, correspondents seem to have slightly less choices than the ambulatory reporters but both have autonomy to structure the timetable as they see fit. For the independent freelance journalists, even if they accept to follow certain guidelines for a media



organization, the responsibility and freedom is total. Correspondents have to be constantly available to the news desk at home and thus have smaller space to maneuver. Their area of coverage is large and this may cause intense periods with extensive travels, but even with uneven workload they are seemingly very satisfied with their job. Reporters who are being sent out to cover volatile news stories often agree with the editor on the terms in advance, and then they operationalize freely. This point is illustrated by Tom Bakkeli:

[...] We had some ground rules, policies that we followed. But in the field we often had to travel huge distances. It was a big improvement when we got satellite phones, then we could communicate better and more often. [...] An assignment can take a long time. Sometimes we would say ‘if you don’t hear from me by 12 pm tomorrow, start asking questions’. But generally it’s a good thing to trust the reporters who are in the field. They don’t want to be kidnapped. If the reporters take too many risks they have to be willing to take the responsibility too.

Trust and responsibility increase the war reporter’s independence and confidence, but also constitute the basis for autonomy. To have the freedom to choose stories, make appropriate decisions and structure the day as they please is key to make the working conditions very favorable. This flexibility is not only an appreciated feature of the job, but it can be a catalyst for both creativity and productivity. All my informants find autonomy as both valuable and necessary. Autonomy is a strong motive for war reporters.

### **5.2.2 Collegiality**

War reporters of all nationalities meet in the field where they form a communication central of information sharing and help. They share their experiences and give each other advices on safe routes, fixers with bad reputation and valuable contacts. Experienced reporters help inexperienced ones. There is usually an official press hotel where all the journalists live and work, often when big international events happen. Residing together, the international reporters establish a social network where providing safety is the most important element. In this universe there is rule of thumb to give and take. War reporters help each other out

because the saying goes that you have to be generous to get something back. It is seen as an investment because the day one lacks something, it is time to ask for that favor in return. It is an exchange of services. Tomm Kristiansen elaborates:

[...] In the field you have a mix of journalists taking care of each other, colleagues who know each other and people who realize that it might be better to cooperate than work alone. I have travelled with Swedish TV reporters, used one cameraman, shared the footage, each with his own story. I always had many international journalists following me because it was always better to go through Norwegian embassies with good service for national journalists. I have seen much more cooperation than competition in the field, and I think it is because we're vulnerable and far away from home. We have to look after each other, not from sentimental compassion, but because 'this time it was me, next time it is you'. We are stronger together.

Reporters are rivals, but the impression is that there is more competition among the international journalists than between the Norwegian reporters. This has to do with resources and time, and because Norway is a small country and doesn't compete internationally at the same level as for instance The Guardian or the New York Times. The competition between reporters is not perceived as a priority because in the field where you risk getting hit by bullets, it is not important to get there first. It is to get there safe. A few believe the competition is stronger between photographers than reporters. The informants stressed that the level of collegiality is depending on personal chemistry, friendship and trust. Many of the informants had good relations to their Norwegian colleagues from competitive media organizations, and a few even pointed out that they considered a Norwegian competitor as the favorite colleague in the field. The competition between Norwegian war reporters is often displayed dramaturgical in the use of sources and editorial content. Even though collegiality is widespread, they are all ambitious reporters and have the desire to be first and best.

The reporters help each other out with logistics, transportation, security and technical equipment. They support each other lending out cables, Bgan satellite phones, and even help each other to broadcast news reports back home. The philosophy is that everyone benefits from getting a good story printed or aired. They share transportation because it is often safer to drive more cars together because of ambush or they split the last rental car. If someone needs a translator, another one might offer his. They share or pass along important information that can help someone avoid serious problems or at best, save lives. A few of the older war reporters talk about caring deeply for each other.

Freelancers often work alone in the field and will not have the same safety net. This is not to say that they are working in solitude or do not support each other when they meet. Freelance journalists have a substitute network consisting of journalists travelling solo. They often keep in touch and help each other out, particularly about security. Working together in the field might be even more important for freelance journalists who don't have the same institutionalized framework as permanent employees have, which can explain the need to form a social network of their own. Journalists who choose a different method seem to be aware of what they are missing out on. Maren Næss Olsen confirms this:

[...] The drawback with working solo is that you get less for free. Reporters are often nice to each other and help each other out, especially when you come from different countries and are not in direct competition. [...] There is a lot to gain from being with other reporters, but I usually work on my own and try to not mix with the rest of them. My impression is that a lot of the stories tend to get very similar because it is difficult not to influence each other. If my ambition is to try to do something different with my journalism, it is easier to be alone. I think more freely then.

After many years of meeting the same reporters in the field, friendships develop. Time is not spent by the front line every day, and they are able to get to know each other. This is a remarkable social gathering of colleagues who are rivals at home, but through being put in extraordinary situations seek together and form a fellowship. Friendships that occur in

dramatic circumstances can often feel stronger and more intense because they are influenced by extreme events. Sidsel Wold shares her view on collegiality:

[...] This is what I appreciate most about working in conflict zones. When you have long days and multiple deadlines it is an important bonus for me to meet international colleagues and to be able to sit down and talk with them over a nice meal. I love being part of the international correspondent community.

Communication, cooperation and competition between war reporters in the field are common and appreciated elements. All the informants emphasized this as a strong element to the job because they got social, mental and physical rewards from being close with the other reporters. Even domestic competitors help each other out and there's a common agreement of what, how and when they share. This field philosophy gives an added value to the overall experience as war reporter. Collegiality is a very strong motive.

### **5.2.3 Adrenaline**

War reporters are not normally interested in seeking danger. For them, risk assessment is compulsory when safety has highest priority. Still, four out of 12 informants describe the sensation of going into the field as a *rush*. They emphasized the excitement of being there when things happen, to feel the rush and the thrills of taking part in history. The majority of war reporters are not only interested in the journalistic work but they also have a fascination for social, historical and political changes. The desire to witness important events is met by the ability to be present and then share their experiences. Some informants equate the adrenaline-rush with war tourism. It is possible that some thrill-seekers pose as war reporters to be able to play out the war fantasy, but it is also possible that some genuine war reporters like parts of the tension and excitement without being thrill-seekers. It could also be that many war reporters are hesitant to admit appreciation for the thrills because they worry that they might be perceived as the journalist travelling undercover as a war tourist. Jon Magnus exemplifies this with an experience from Bosnia:

[...] When the war reached Mostar, Harald and I met a young female American journalist who was working freelance and wanted to see the war in Europe up-close. She had been tricked by American-Croatian PR-people and found herself in a car full of weapons and grenades. Had she been stopped in a Serbian roadblock, they would have shot her on-site. She had no other transportation, and I don't know who she wrote for or if she even wrote at all. Too often they are young adventurers who want to experience something exciting in order to establish their name somewhere. [...]

It is a broad assumption that freelance reporters often, but not always, take larger risks and sometimes seek out dangerous situations to satisfy a need for excitement. This cannot be empirically confirmed. War reporters want to report the war, not to be in it. The adrenaline-rush that was described as something positive by the informants was not in relation to experiencing front line shootings or explosions. Perhaps it is the essence of adventure, action and drama that excite war reporters, not unlike the thrills one can have at an amusement park. In situations with a lot of stress, anxiety or even panic, the body releases adrenaline. This is a chemical reaction that prepares the body for a fight-or-flight reaction as a response to an actual physical threat or an imagined threat. It is the body's release of extra energy to handle crises, danger or fear. "When we find ourselves under intense pressure, fear unleashes reserves of energy that normally remain inaccessible" (Wise 2009). Some of the informants describe having a physical reaction before going into the field. It is a tension building up in their bodies which feels like a combination of dread and excitement, or fearful joy. Fredrik Græsвик shares his thoughts on the need for excitement:

I think there are few war reporters without some adrenaline-rush drive. They want to be where it happens. I discussed this with Joshua French and Tjostolv Moland and found some similarities. We seek the excitement, but it seems like I chose the right occupation. I experience the same thing when talking to criminals. I was giving a lecture in prison and the prisoners said that they could

relate to the way I am thinking. [...] Again, it is to seek excitement. I have been very lucky. I am glad I chose journalism instead of seeking excitement through other, maybe unlawful, ways.

It is fair to indicate that some war reporters feel a *rush* from being present in the moment and experiencing the tension from dangerous situations. It is a very human reaction. Some acknowledge that they feel the excitement building up prior to departure, while others admit that it is a sensation they get during their stay. This confirms that the adrenaline-rush is experienced differently and is not a general sensation that can be attributed to all. Adrenaline is not a strong motive, but it can be a positive side effect.

#### **5.2.4 Fame**

Humans have through history always had a fascination for the sensational, and news from conflicts attracts large attention in society. War is often devoted special publicity which can be witnessed by the frequent use of live stand-ups in TV news reports. To put it bluntly; death sells, because it satisfies the human interest for violence and morbidity. Front line reports tend to produce more headlines than famine, drought and natural catastrophes, which can suggest a stronger enthusiasm for man-made destructions than biological disasters. A general explanation could be that modernization has been able to remove most of the existential threats. War thus symbolizes the ultimate activity because it is linked to survival of the species. Another, more relative explanation is that life, at least in industrialized countries, has been made so comfortable that people have a natural craving for adrenaline. TV images of war are therefore capable of producing intense emotions, and the individual participation through a mediator becomes a substitution for real danger.

The unofficial news desk rule “if it bleeds, it leads” is a well-known marker for what is considered sensational and important. A large part of the attention is thus devoted to the reporter in the field. This is because he or she is by professional authority the best suited to simplify and explain the situation to a larger audience. Television as a visual medium has a particular strong impact, in contrast to newspapers where the previous novelty ‘dies’ with the latest publication. The faces and voices of war reporters become a normalized, familiar element to the public. It is not necessarily their physical looks that make them famous, but the

fact that they are visible on a regular basis. It is hard to say what causes some reporters to become more famous than others, but Fredrik Græsвик has a suggestion:

When I was in Baghdad in 2003 I had pneumonia which gave me a very hoarse voice. A newspaper made a serial where they wrote about me and my hoarse voice for days, and I think that contributed to my fame. [...] As a journalist, being a foreign-news reporter is perhaps an easier way to get celebrity status, but I don't think that as a motivation would hold in the long run. At least I didn't consider this when I wanted to work with foreign-news. But it is very nice to be recognized by people who are encouraging and give compliments. The problem now is that I get recognized all the time!

Famous reporters are mostly being admired because of their academic authority and less for their appearances. Nevertheless there has to be something about them which the public can relate to and associate with. It can be a specific dialect, a certain look or a special expertise area. Some names becoming directly associated with a specific conflict because if a reporter covers a certain location over a long time, people tend to associate them with this area. Time, medium, employment type, segment and conflict area are all important variables to determine the degree of fame a reporter gets. It can be claimed that fame is dependent on the working mechanisms of different mediums. War reporters in television receive more attention than the war reporters working for newspapers. This was largely confirmed by the informants, but it cannot be generally substantiated because this also depends on the type of conflict.

To illustrate this I will use the Norwegian press coverage of the Gaza war in 2014 as an example. This is a very polarized conflict, and every journalist covering Israel and Palestine has to be prepared for some kind of criticism. Several of the informants who were present in Gaza at the time received an enormous amount of emails, phone calls, phone messages, tweets and letters. Public reaction in the wake of a conflict is not a new phenomenon, but the difference here was the scale and timing. Accusations, complaints, threats and hate mail were received by the reporters directly in the field. The informants admit that this critique felt particularly hard because it added an extra burden to an already strenuous situation. Some

might say that reporters should be able to withstand being called liars or in other ways be personally attacked. However, it goes with this story that it developed into a Facebook-initiative of dividing the population where one page was created to support the reporter while another page was used to show disassociation and contempt. This form of public humiliation is a direct result of the new democratic space that Internet has provided. The idea of *shooting the messenger* instead of discussing the political content is a well-known technique, especially when debating in social media. Reporters who are obligated to represent their media organization publically are in weak positions to defend themselves. This can be seen as discouraging and unfair. Reporters feel on a general basis that insults directed to them as professionals are especially hurtful because it attacks their personal integrity rather than being content-oriented. The Gaza example is an atypical situation because it is an extremely polarized conflict. Regardless of medium type, the majority of reporters covering this particular conflict tend to get criticized.

The digitalization of media has also changed the nature of journalism (Lindholm 2015:17). Journalists today are expected to devote more time on the interaction with readers and viewers, which has led to increased workload on the reporters. Sidsel Wold explains:

It is a big challenge when you have a name which many people know. I get so many questions and requests, almost every day someone asks me to do a lecture. A lot of people think that I should be available 24/7. It takes a lot of time because it becomes additional to my regular work. I am not complaining about it, but it takes a lot of time. Perhaps when you are a familiar to people you have an additional responsibility. We are role models and are expected to be available, but social media takes more and more time. Our bosses want us to be active and have contact with our listeners and viewers, but when are we supposed to do this? In our spare time? This job has changed a lot. [...] I have now learnt the hard lesson that when I write something on Facebook it may all of a sudden find its way to the front page of VG. I am not a private citizen anymore and it bothers me. I know that I



am employed by NRK and I represent that organization, but because of that there are some things I cannot write. So in reality I have no real freedom of speech.

This story illustrates the personification dilemma: First, the reporter is representing a specific media organization. This can limit the privacy sphere and decrease the feeling of autonomy. Second, the public will associate any personal political statements with the organization. This could lead to journalists censoring their own statements. According to a recent study, one out of five Norwegian journalists who have experienced harassment or received threats say that this has resulted in self-censorship (Gjestad 2015).

Increased celebrity status can also have positive consequences. First, it can be used to achieve access to local and foreign authorities because a well-known and respected name increases trust. Second, it can help establish contacts necessary to facilitate a field experience, for instance by recommendations or direct help. Two informants exemplified this by a situation where their reputation had been useful. The first example showed an informant able to acquire an important source through an aid organization because it was familiar with the reporter's work. The organization helped set up the appointment, and this source proved to be tantamount to produce the actual story. Being able to get help from communities who can provide beneficial tools might not happen if the journalist was unknown. The other example was to be able to lean on previous contact and reputation. Per A. Christiansen elaborates:

I was in Jerusalem and Cairo to cover the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary for the 6-days war and was tipped off about an Israeli military historian that could be very useful for my article. I got his name, and while I was in Cairo I asked my fixer in Jerusalem if she could get in touch with him and request an interview. When I went to Jerusalem she told me "he is home and ill, but he said that we can come and visit him at home because he remembers you from the time he was working as a spokesman for the military in the 1970s!" Sometimes it pays off to be recognized.

Fame is a positive factor for individual advantages but it can also be used to progressively share more knowledge. Attracting attention from a bigger audience might give opportunities to further enlighten, teach and influence others. This is a strong incentive because reporters will feel useful to society when they can exploit their full potential as important messengers. This may also provide an answer to the question why many war reporters feel the urge to publish books because there are so many things about a conflict zone that they are not able to express during short stand-ups or limited newspaper space. Sidsel Wold explains:

[...] I believe I do a useful job because I reach out to many people and people listen to what I have to say. I don't know why I have this impact, but I just do. Every day I get approached by people who want to express gratitude for the work I'm doing. Yesterday I was giving a lecture and the auditorium was packed. [...] When you have a familiar face because you work with TV, the most important thing is what you use that position for. I use it to spread public enlightenment and to teach, and I think it's important to give interviews, help students to write their theses and to share my experiences.

Although some reporters consciously seek fame to improve their status, the majority of war reporters do not wish to be in the limelight. Celebrity status is seen as a distracting element, irrelevant to the job and disrespectful to the story. Some informants believe that fame is contributing to idolize war reporters and make the job appear more glamorous than it really is. If fame was a strong incentive it would clearly be other professions better suited for taking care of this ambition. The informants displayed an attitude towards the issue of fame that can be explained by Anthony Giddens' structural theory. Giddens emphasize the dual relationship between actor and structure to explain how rules and practices over time can create a specific culture (Giddens 1984). The framework for social practices is set by an external structure which over time will influence individual choices. That is how you can claim that a certain culture has developed specific norms and behavior (Ottosen 2004:17-18).

Some informants claim that personification of TV reporters was stronger in the early days of foreign-news reporting, and that we don't really see an increase of the phenomenon but just

an increasing number of reporters. Odd Karsten Tveit shares his thoughts on being one of the first Middle East-correspondents in Norway:

[...] Some of us forget that what made us famous were not our personalities, but the medium. Many people have left the institutions believing they will get the same treatment and that they still matter. Then they realize they don't really have any significance. It was the medium that made them important. [...] I was very happy when TV2 and all the other local radio stations started broadcasting because I was not comfortable with being 'the voice of truth in Norway', so to speak, and besides, with competition you also sharpen up a bit. It is important that people have other references, not just one.

The majority of war reporters are genuinely interested in the journalistic work and not becoming celebrities. For some war reporters the attention is unwanted, for others it might be desirable. Some proclaim that it is an unnecessary side effect of doing their job and that increased personification may lead to less focus on the story and more focus on the messenger. At the same time, receiving attention for the stories is a priority. This is a known dilemma. Some famous reporters see the opportunity to use their status in an ideological sense and to reach out to a broader audience. Others see it as a limitation to their private sphere. Fame can furthermore produce discouraging effects in relation to specific war coverages, as I have shown in the example of the Gaza war coverage. On the other hand it can also create helpful opportunities because a familiar name is perceived as more reliable. Fame is a weak motive, but produces both positive and negative consequences.

### **5.3 Impact on motivation**

The sources of motivation for war reporters consist of intrinsic and extrinsic factors. They have been discussed through the data analysis, and as I have shown there is great variation to be found. The factors can be categorized as being strong, medium strong, neutral or weak motives.

**Figure 1: Motivation Factors (MF)**

<b>Motive Strength</b>	<b>Intrinsic Factors</b>	<b>Extrinsic Factors</b>
Strong	Passion	Collegiality
Medium strong	Duty	Autonomy
Neutral		Adrenaline
Weak	Status	Fame

I will now analyze the factors one by one. The measured effects will be divided into strong and weak impact on motivation, which will provide either motivation or demotivation (high), or neither motivation nor demotivation (neutral).

The first intrinsic factor identified is Passion. This is related to the work itself and is the cognitively shaped self-realization based on individual identity. If someone is allowed to do what one finds most enjoyable in life and is able to make a living out of it, the personal and professional aspects are in perfect harmony. Passion is a strong motive with a strong impact. War reporters with the ability to live out their full potential will thrive, but when they are denied this possibility they will be unsatisfied. When Passion is present it will lead to motivation. When Passion is absent it will lead to demotivation.

The second intrinsic factor is Duty. This is also related to the work itself, but is the cognitively shaped self-realization based on collective identity. Belonging to a social group that has clear ideological and ethical roots is a medium strong motive. When duty is present it has a strong impact, but when duty is absent it has a weak impact. War reporters who feel they have an important, useful job will feel motivated, but the lack of collective ideology will not influence their motivation particularly.

The third and last intrinsic factor is Status. This is related to the recognition from others but the outcome is symbolized by the individual and collective pride one feels from being admired, hence intrinsic. Status is a weak motive with weak impact. Status can be either present or absent, but it will not make a big difference. Some war reporters like to have it while others neither like nor dislike the effects of it. Having status will not lead to motivation, but not having status will not lead to demotivation.

The first extrinsic factor is Autonomy. This is related to the flexibility, responsibility and freedom in the field. This is a medium strong motive with different impacts. When Autonomy is present the impact is strong, but when it is absent the impact is weak. War reporters who can be their own bosses in the field will feel motivated, but being told what to do will not lead to demotivation.

The second extrinsic factor is Collegiality, which is related to the war reporter community. As with Passion, this motive binds the professional and personal aspects together and is therefore a strong motive with a strong impact. War reporters who are able to meet international colleagues feel they belong to a circle of trust and they are satisfied on both individual and collective levels. Reporters without the collegial support will feel that a social safety net is missing or removed. When Collegiality is present it gives motivation, but when it is absent it leads to demotivation.

The third extrinsic factor is Adrenaline which is a neutral motive with weak impact. It is related to the excitement of being present where and when important events take place, or the thrills of being close to intense conflicts. War reporters travel to war zones, but not because they seek the excitement. As with Status, it can be either present or absent, but it will not influence the reporters significantly and it has no motivational or de-motivational effects.

The fourth and last extrinsic factor is Fame. This is an interesting factor because it is a weak motive, but with a strong and weak effect. War reporters do not intentionally seek publicity, but it is an inevitable part of becoming a famous person. When fame is absent it does not motivate nor demotivate, but when it is present it has an impact on both the high and low ends of the motivation scale. This is much related to individual experiences because it is impossible to be truly indifferent to this factor. For the war reporters, having fame either motivates or demotivates them.

The analysis result is displayed in the table below. The motivation factors are categorized in the order they were analyzed followed by their motive strengths, their effects when absent, the impact of motivation when absent, their effects when present and finally the impact of motivation when present.

**Figure 2: Motivation Factor Analysis**

	<b>MF</b>	<b>Strength</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Absent</b>	<b>Present</b>	<b>Present</b>
Int	PASSION	Strong	Strong	Demotivation	Strong	Motivation
Int	DUTY	M. strong	Weak	Neutral	Strong	Motivation
Int	STATUS	Weak	Weak	Neutral	Weak	Neutral
Ext	AUTONOMY	M. strong	Weak	Neutral	Strong	Motivation
Ext	COLLEGIALITY	Strong	Strong	Demotivation	Strong	Motivation
Ext	ADRENALINE	Weak	Weak	Neutral	Weak	Neutral
Ext	FAME	Weak	Weak	Neutral	Strong	Motiv + Demotiv

Strong motives have generally strong impact, which means that if they are present they lead to motivation and if they are absent they lead to demotivation. Medium strong motives in general have strong impact on motivation if they are present but when they are absent they lead to neither motivation nor demotivation. Neutral motives have weak impact, meaning they don't produce any change. Weak motives usually give weak impact when they are absent, but they can lead to motivation, demotivation or neither when being present. There seems to be a correlation between motive strength and produced effects. It can thus be argued that the stronger a motive is, the stronger its impact will have on motivation. Strong and medium strong motives are not surprisingly the most prominent examples, but also a weak motive can have strong effect. Individual differences and personal experiences will decide the impact weak motives have on motivation. However, it is difficult to make a general assumption regarding the interplay between intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Extrinsic factors can be facilitated by the working conditions, while intrinsic factors rely on the individual's relation to the job itself. Because the intrinsic factors comprise the strongest motives they should be seen as essential for motivation. Extrinsic factors also impact motivation, but more importantly, they don't generally lead to demotivation.

In the interplay between strong and weak factors, some findings have been detected: Passion is the one factor that will lead to motivation even when all other factors are absent. It can be seen as the foundation which the other factors rest upon. Passion works in interaction with Collegiality, and when these two factors are present, motivation is high. When Collegiality is absent, Passion will still give motivation but it will have a less strong impact. Collegiality does not have the same significance. When Passion is absent, Collegiality will have a weak effect and not lead to motivation. Fame works in proportional interaction with Passion. If

fame produces motivation, it will strengthen the motivation of Passion. If fame produces demotivation, it will strengthen the demotivation of Passion, but it will not have a significant effect when Passion is present. In other words, it is the interaction between the strong intrinsic factor, the strong extrinsic factor and the weak extrinsic factor that provides the strongest motivation and the strongest demotivation.

## **Chapter 6: Conclusion**

War reporters who find their jobs to be meaningful and interesting will not be demotivated by the absence of other factors. But if they have passion and additionally are facilitated with large responsibility in the field, trustworthy colleagues and positive relations with the public, motivation will be high. War reporters who don't feel passionate about their jobs will be demotivated, and although they are free to make their own decisions and feel recognition and pride, it will not increase motivation. War reporters with negative experiences with the public will not be discontent if they truly appreciate their work, but if passion is lacking, negative publicity will add to the demotivation. Based on these empirical findings it is my argument that having passion for the job is the most important motivation factor, and the one superior motive that exceeds all the others. But on a final note, it should be remembered that motivation is a process, and the interplay of strong or weak motives, strong or weak effects and intrinsic and extrinsic factors depends on individual experiences.

I have shown in this research analysis that war reporters have several motivation factors, but the one superior motive is the personal appreciation for the work itself. To follow your own selfish interests, to be able to reach your full potential while making a living of it should be the ultimate choice for every individual. War reporters don't experience the same day twice. Every day is different, and they never know where they are going to be. The unpredictable nature of a war reporter's life is exactly what constitutes the addictive part of the job.



## REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C. (1972) *Existence, Relatedness, and Growth: Human Needs in Organizational Settings*. The Free Press, New York.
- Berg, L. B. & Lune, H. (2014) *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Pearson Education Limited, 8th edition, United States.
- Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G. and Williams, J. M. (1995) *The craft of research*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Structures and the Habitus. Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom.
- Charmaz, K. (2008) "Grounded Theory", chapter five in Smith, J.A. (ed.) (2008). *Qualitative Psychology. A Practical Guide to Research Methods*. Second Edition. Sage Publications Ltd. London
- Committee to Protect Journalists (2015) "61 Journalists killed in 2014/Motive confirmed". CPJ 2015, New York. <https://www.cpj.org/killed/2014/>  
Accessed on Dec 9, 2015
- Deci, E. L. (1975) *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum Publishing
- Driks M. & Mills J. (2011) *Grounded Theory. A practical Guide*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Feinstein, A. (2006) "A Hazardous Profession", chapter 1 in *Journalists under Fire: The Psychological Hazards of Covering War*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore
- Gjestad, R. H. (2015) "Mer trusler og netthat mot norske journalister". Aftenposten <http://www.aftenposten.no/kultur/Mer-trusler-og-netthat-mot-norske-journalister-7999275.html>  
Accessed on Dec 12, 2015
- Glaser, B. G. (2001) *The Grounded Theory Perspective: Conceptualization Contrasted with Description*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press. <http://www.groundedtheory.com/soc14.html>  
Accessed on Nov 17, 2015.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine Publishing Company.
- Giddens, A. (1984) *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles.
- GMMP (2015) "The GMMP 2015 Report". Who Makes The News? Published by the World Association for Christian Communication (WACC) [http://cdn.agilitycms.com/who-makes-the-news/Imported/reports\\_2015/global/gmmp\\_global\\_report\\_en.pdf](http://cdn.agilitycms.com/who-makes-the-news/Imported/reports_2015/global/gmmp_global_report_en.pdf)  
Accessed on Dec 12, 2015

Herzberg, F., B. Mauser, & B. Snyderman (1959) *The Motivation to Work*. New York: John Wiley.

Kaufmann, G. and Kaufmann, A. (2009) *Psykologi i organisasjon og ledelse*. 4th edition. Fagbokforlaget Vigmostad & Bjørke AS, Bergen.

Kelle, U. (2005) “ ‘Emergence’ vs ‘Forcing’ of Empirical Data? A Crucial Problem for ‘Grounded Theory’ Reconsidered”. *Forum Qualitative Social Research* (Sozialforschung), 6(2), Art. 27. <http://www.qualitative-research.net/fqs-texte/2-05/05-2-27-e.html>  
Accessed on Dec 2, 2015.

Leonard, N.H, Beauvais, L.L., & Scholl, R.W. (1999) “Work Motivation: The Incorporation of Self-Concept-Based Processes”. *Human Relations*, Vol. 52, No. 8, pp. 969-998. SAGE Publications.

Lindholm, M. (2015) *Journalistikkens autoritet. Yrkesideologi og autoritetsmarkering i norsk journalistikk 1954-2014*. Avhandling ph.d. Senter for Profesjonsstudier Høgskolen i Oslo og Akershus

Maslow, A. (1954) *Motivation and Personality*. Harper & Row, New York

Ottosen, R. (1996) *Fra Fjærpenn til Internett. Journalister i Organisasjon og Samfunn*. H. Aschehoug Co. (W. Nygaard), Oslo

Ottosen, R (2004). *I journalistikkens grenseland. Journalistrollen mellom marked og idealer*. IJ-forlaget AS. Kristiansand.

Rødland, A. and Mæland, E. (2015) “Færre kvinner i norske medier i 2015 enn i 2010”. Kilden, kjønnsforskning.no <http://kjonnsforskning.no/nb/2015/11/faerre-kvinner-i-norske-medier-i-2015-enn-i-2010>  
Accessed on Dec 13, 2015

The World Bank (2015) “Norway Population Count. World Development Indicators”. The World Bank Group. <http://data.worldbank.org/country/norway>  
Accessed on Dec 10, 2015

Thomas, K. and Jansen, E. (1996) *Intrinsic Motivation in the Military: Models and Strategic Importance*. Report prepared for the Eighth Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation, Arlington, VA. Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA, NPS-SM-96-001

Vroom, V.H. (1964) *Work and Motivation*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Wikipedia (2015) “Liste over NRKs korrespondenter”. [https://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liste\\_Over\\_NRKs\\_korrespondenter](https://no.wikipedia.org/wiki/Liste_Over_NRKs_korrespondenter)  
Accessed on Nov 4, 2015

Wise, J. (2009) “When Fear Makes Us Superhuman”. *Scientific American*, a division of Nature America, Inc. Palgrave Macmillan. <http://www.scientificamerican.com/article/extreme-fear-superhuman/>  
Accessed on Dec 7, 2015

**This page is intentionally left blank**



Norwegian University  
of Life Sciences

Postboks 5003  
NO-1432 Ås, Norway  
+47 67 23 00 00  
[www.nmbu.no](http://www.nmbu.no)