PROJECT MUSE®

Editor's Reflection: Here we are now, entertain us

Elizabeth Hendrickson

Journal of Magazine Media, Volume 12, Number 1, Fall 2010, (Article)

Published by University of Nebraska Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/jmm.2010.0000>

➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/773747/summary>

Editor's Reflection

Here we are now, entertain us

Elizabeth Hendrickson, University of Tennessee—Knoxville
ehendri2@utk.edu

During my nearly ten years working as a magazine editor in New York City, one might say I got around. No, not in the *Sex in the City* way. Rather, I worked as an entertainment editor for three very different types of magazines: women's, men's, and teen. At the women's magazines a typical workday usually consisted of barks from the editor-in-chief along the lines of, "I want Jennifer Aniston for the cover!" At the men's magazine the barks were more akin to, "Can you call George Clooney's publicist, please?" In other words, the top decision-makers always claimed to know whom the audience wanted or, at least, whom they wanted to be like.

But not so at the teen magazines, where editors often agonized over reader demographics, trying to make sense of their fluctuating "likes" and "dislikes." Indeed, planning a teen magazine's content for three months in the future sometimes felt akin to playing poker with only a working knowledge of the game. But in this case, folding was not an option. You either learn to think like a teenager or leave the casino.

These days, that big publishing playground is struggling to survive. As industry watchers know, the publishing game is now a niche, niche world. Just consider that the top three categories for magazine growth this past decade are ethnic, regional interest, and real estate, and a general interest category seems about as timely as a Linotype machine. But yet mass niche magazines, such as the women's, men's, and teen, have not only survived but, in some cases, thrived.

This issue brings you three studies that examine different angles of one magazine niche: the female teenage audience. Two articles and one book review even delve into the same magazine—*Seventeen*. Authors Jaime Loke and Dustin Harp use a discursive analysis to examine the magazine's constructions of masculinity during two very different decades, and Suchi P. Joshi, Jochen Peter, and Patti M. Valkenburg apply a content analysis to one decade of the magazine's feature stories to consider relationship and gender role ambivalence messages. Authors Amy Sindik and Marianne Barrett approach the niche with a more economic perspective—whether teen magazine consumers will transition from the young adult version to the parent publication of the same brand. And trust us, it was only providence that reviewer Miglena Sternadori chose to assess *Fashioning Teenagers: A Cultural History of Seventeen Magazine*. While we didn't set out to craft this semi-special "teen choice" issue of *JMNMR*, we're certainly delighted to bring you our accepted articles.

However, as we all know that variety is the spice of life, we're pleased to offer Ted Geltner's "Hype Artists, Con Men, Pimps, and Dopesters: The Personal Journalism of Harry Crews," which certainly adds a jolt of masculinity to our research mix. In addition, we have Ann Schierhorn's article on "Teaching Collaboration: A Model for Multimedia Projects" and Daniel van Benthuyzen's interview with Milton Glaser to round out the issue.

And as always, Carol and I are grateful to those who sent us their research and for those kind souls who reviewed it. We also thank those who submitted articles and book reviews.

Happy reading and see you in St. Louis.