THE HANDBOOK OF JOURNALISM STUDIES

This handbook charts the growing area of journalism studies, exploring the current state of theory and setting an agenda for future research in an international context. The volume is structured around theoretical and empirical approaches, and covers scholarship on news production and organizations; news content; journalism and society; and journalism in a global context. Emphasizing comparative and global perspectives, each chapter explores:

• Key elements, thinkers, and texts
• Historical context
• Current state-of-the-art
• Methodological issues
• Merits and advantages of the approach/area of studies
• Limitations and critical issues of the approach/area of studies
• Directions for future research

Offering broad international coverage from top-tier contributors, this volume ranks among the fi rst publications to serve as a comprehensive resource addressing theory and scholarship in journalism studies. As such, *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* is a must-have resource for scholars and graduate students working in journalism, media studies, and communication around the globe.

A Volume in the International Communication Association Handbook Series.

Karin Wahl-Jorgensen is Reader in the Cardiff School of Journalism, Media, and Cultural Studies, Cardiff University, Wales. Her work on media, democracy, and citizenship has been published in more than 20 international journals as well as in numerous books.

Thomas Hanitzsch is Assistant Professor in the Institute of Mass Communication and Media Research at the University of Zurich. He founded the ICA's Journalism Studies Division and has published four books and more than 50 articles and chapters on journalism, comparative communication research, online media, and war coverage.

Journalism Education

Beate Josephi

INTRODUCTION

Journalism education is seen as improving the quality of journalism by improving the quality of journalists. It is perceived as the "one way in which society can intervene to infl uence the development of journalism" (Curran, 2005, p. xiv). In other words, the kind of education future journalists receive matters because journalists matter among the many factors that make up journalism. UNESCO, in its foreword to *Model Curricula for Journalism Education for Developing Countries & Emerging Democracies* (2007, p. 5), states "that journalism, and the educational programmes that enable individuals to practice and upgrade their journalistic skills, are essential tools for the underpinning of key democratic principles that are fundamental to the development of every country."

This chapter will look at the key elements of journalism education, notably the idea of enriching journalism practice. It will go on to examine the history of journalism education as it has, for much of a century, evolved in the United States. It will review recent key texts and consider the question of professionalization, which is seen as underpinning tertiary journalism education. The chapter will then outline the discussion about what ought to be taught in journalism education and the often unacknowledged ideological assumptions underlying journalism teaching. Finally, the chapter will point to areas of future research.

LAYING FOUNDATIONS

One key element of journalism education is that it is seen as laying the foundation for the attitudes

and knowledge of future journalists. However, there are manifold views on what journalists *should* be taught. There are equally many ways that journalists *are* taught.

Another key element of journalism education therefore is its great diversity. To get the picture, one only needs to be aware of the variety of journalists' educational backgrounds, and the percentages of those who studied journalism before becoming journalists. The figures, insofar as current data are available, show a decisive trend for journalists to have university or college education (Deuze, 2006, p. 22). However, only a minority has completed degrees in journalism, media or communication studies before becoming journalists.

If we take journalism to mean predominantly news journalism and look at newspapers, we also have to acknowledge that the highest proportion of these is produced in Asia (World Association of Newspapers, 2005), reflecting the ever increasing importance of Asia in population and geo-political terms. Japan has the highest circulation newspapers. According to Gaunt (1992, p. 115), the most prestigious news organizations, the *Asahi*, the *Yomiuri* and the *Mainichi*, take only graduates from elite universities who hold degrees in political science, economics or the humanities. Few universities offer media studies, and the vast majority of journalists-to-be receive on-the-job training, which has the form of a rigid apprenticeship system.

In China, in the first decade of the twenty-first century, communication and journalism are fast becoming popular areas of study. This is indicative of the rapid transformation of Chinese society and the Chinese media market. For the moment, courses combine skills classes with studies in Chinese Communist philosophy, and are seen as lagging behind the demands of the market (Yu, Chu, & Guo, 2000).

Yet, as seen in the United States and Germany, an increase in higher education offerings in media, communication or journalism studies does not translate into journalists actually taking them as pathways to their job. As Weaver, Beam, Brownlee, Voakes, and Wilhoit (2007, p. 35) found in the United States, "from 1982 to 2002, the proportion of journalism and mass communication bachelor's-degree graduates who went into mass communication jobs declined sharply from over one-half (53 percent) to about one-fourth." This has shaped journalism education in the United States into a more general mass or public communication field (ibid). On the other hand, the percentage of journalists holding a degree stands at almost 90 percent (p. 37).

Similarly in Germany, 80.5 percent of journalists hold a university degree or have spent time at university, but only 13 percent hold a major or minor in journalism and another 17 percent have done communication or media studies (Weischenberg, Malik, & Scholl, 2006, p. 353). Importantly, almost 70 percent did an internship—in the age group under 35 years it is 90 percent—and 60 percent have passed through the two-year, for graduates one-year, in-house training (ibid).

The pathways to journalism mentioned above indicate clear national preferences despite the fact that basic journalistic "working practices appear universal" (de Burgh, 2005b, p. 6; Josephi, 2001). These figures serve to illustrate that tertiary journalism education is just one way of becoming a journalist (also see Deuze, 2006, p. 22; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha, 2003a; Weaver, 1998, p. 459; Gaunt, 1992). This puts writing about journalism education, which comes from academia and is almost entirely confined to tertiary journalism education, out of synch with the actual situation of chiefly in-house training.

Gaunt (1992, p. 1) opens his book, *Making the Newsmakers*, with the words "Journalism training perpetuates or modifies professional practices and molds the perceptions journalists have of the role and function of the media." Journalism education, as discussed here, has the clear intent of modifying practice, enriching the quality of information produced and, with the help of this quality journalism, achieving improvement in the workings of civil society.

THE HISTORY OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION

The idea of achieving better journalism by giving journalists a college or university education was born in the United States in the second half of the nineteenth century (Weaver, 2003, pp. 49–51). For much of the twentieth century, the United States was the main site to provide journalism as a tertiary study. Only in the 1980s and 1990s did journalism become accepted as a subject field world-wide, often in new universities. One reason why the United States broke new ground was

that the country not only pioneered journalism education but also news journalism. According to Chalaby (1996), journalism as we define it today is an Anglo-American invention. Journalism in

continental Europe was closely linked with the literary fi eld which demanded a different set of talents and writing skills from those of a daily rounds reporter.

The person credited with implementing the idea that future journalists should receive a college education was the losing general of the US Civil War, Robert E. Lee. As president of Washington College—today Washington & Lee University in Lexington, Virginia—he offered scholarships for journalism studies as part of a liberal arts degree as early as 1869 (Medsger, 2005, p. 205).

Already then doubts were raised about journalism as an academic discipline. Lee's initiative came at a time when newspapers were small enterprises with the editor and printer often being one and the same person. The early courses accordingly included technical printing skills as well as writing and editing rather than focusing on reporting (Johansen, Weaver, & Dornan, 2001, p. 471). Irrespective of this earlier effort, James Carey claimed that journalism education did not begin in earnest until Joseph Pulitzer pressed money into the somewhat reluctant hands of Columbia University to establish a School of Journalism (Carey, cited in Johansen et al., 2001, p. 475). The Columbia School of Journalism opened in 1912 as a graduate school rather than the undergraduate college initially envisaged by Pulitzer (Adam, 2001, pp. 318–322). Pulitzer's motive was to improve the minds of journalists at a time when many, if not most, reporters came from working-class families. He wanted to achieve this by providing them with the liberal arts education they lacked (Medsger, 2005, pp. 206–208).

Other pioneers of journalism studies took a different direction. Willard Bleyer, in the late 1920s, placed the new study within Wisconsin University's PhD programs in political science and sociology. To him, research into journalism was an essential part of journalism education. This decision to locate journalism in the social sciences had long-term implications. The "founders of many major journalism schools elsewhere came from the Wisconsin program and carried its empirical social sciences assumptions with them" (Chaffee, cited in Johansen et al., 2001, p. 471). Bleyer also played a vital part in creating

two pillars of the journalism education establishment in the United States: the Association of Journalism Education Administrators (now also known as the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication) and the accrediting body for journalism programs (now known as the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication). (Medsger, 2005, p. 208)

Soon there were three distinct models of journalism education at the university level. These operated as independent journalistic schools at either graduate or undergraduate level, such as the program Walter Williams had established at the University of Missouri, or as separate departments within colleges of liberal arts, or the social science faculties.

A further model was added by Wilbur Schramm. Schramm was head of journalism education at the University of Iowa at the end of the Second World War and later became the founder of communication studies and communication research institutes at the University of Illinois and Stanford University (Rogers, 1994, p. 29). While Schramm initially chose to place his new communication program within the existing discipline of journalism, communication as a fi eld study soon overtook its host, and left behind journalism education which could not shed its tag of vocational training. Unlike Pulitzer, Professors Bleyer, Williams and Schramm were interested only in journalism, not journalists. As Rogers (1994, p. 127) wrote, a "communication research

institute could serve as a source of prestige for a school of journalism that may have been looked down upon by academics in other fi elds because of the perceived trade school nature of journalism training." This left journalism education in the uneasy spot between practical and academic studies where it still fi nds itself, and the discussion about the professionalization of journalism and the journalism education curriculum highlights the unresolved nature of the debate.

The United States is not the only country with a history of journalism education, but no other nation has had a similar impact on the discipline. France opened its fi rst journalism school, L'Ecole Superieure de Journalisme, in 1899, which was attached to the Ecole de Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales a year later (Gaunt, 1992, p. 46). The darker side of journalism education was shown in Spain where the national school of journalism was set up in 1941 by General Franco and placed under the control of the Falangist Party (Barrera & Vaz, 2003, p. 23; Gaunt, 1992, p. 63). The national school of journalism was the most important training center in Spain, and it

remained under government supervision until the early 1970s. The journalists in the major Spanish government-controlled papers had to pass through this journalism school. Similar examples of government-controlled journalism education could be found in the former states of the Eastern bloc, attesting to the fundamental idea that journalism education is an important element, if not tool, for shaping journalists and journalism.

KEY TEXTS

Given the diversity of journalism education, it is no surprise that there are no key texts as such on the topic. Deuze correctly remarked that

journalism education literature tends to be very specifi c—featuring case studies of what works and what does not work in a particular curriculum, course or classroom—or wildly generic— where often senior scholars offer more or less historical accounts of their lifelong experiences in "doing" journalism education. (Deuze, 2006, p. 19)

The books that take in a wider view invariably possess a survey character, charting what is done where in journalism education. The most complete—though no longer up-to-date—survey was provided by Philip Gaunt in 1992. In his book, *Making the Newsmakers*, sponsored by UNESCO, Gaunt fi rst assesses the differences in training systems, training needs and structures before proceeding continent by continent, country by country to detail the various nations' or regions' efforts in journalism education.

Gaunt sees the challenges and prospects for journalism education as falling into two predictable clusters (1992, p. 157): those affecting the developing world and the industrialized countries, respectively. He names government control and the lack of resources as the two main hurdles facing the developing world, and technological change as the key challenge to the industrialized world. In detailing his concerns, Gaunt (p. 158) also draws attention to the status and pay journalists receive as having a direct impact on the kinds of students and teachers drawn to journalism studies:

In countries in which journalists are considered to be government employees, or "fl acks", the profession is unlikely to attract the best and the brightest students or the most qualifi ed teachers. In such systems, courses on ethics, professional standards, investigative reporting, press history and different aspects of communication theory have no place in the curriculum.

46 JOSEPHI

Though this observation still rings true in a number of nations a decade and a half later, much has shifted in the world politically and developmentally. The changes in Central and Eastern Europe had hardly begun to take effect at the time of Gaunt's writing, nor had the world taken note of the immense transformation taking place in China. The media systems of those countries, and also nations like South Africa, are today labeled "transitional." Not only their media system but also their journalism education is affected by these shifts. Furthermore, other countries that are on the "not free" list with regard to media freedom, such as Qatar, home to Al Jazeera, are now seen as contributing quality journalism backed by journalism education. The outdated dichotomous view of a world split into countries in which journalism and journalism education is either free or fully government-controlled is giving way to the recognition that countries may exercise long leashes (Zhou, 2000) or "calibrated coercion" (George, 2007) rather than suppression, and that the freedom of the media in democratic countries can come with commercial and ideological strings attached.

It is this awareness which informs Hugo de Burgh's collection, *Making Journalists* (2005a). While similar in its title to Gaunt's book, this volume's structure is different. *Making Journalists* is a collection of chapters on issues rather than a systematic appraisal of what is done where. The book's editor states categorically that "there is no satisfactory way to write a "world" account of journalism education" (2005b, p. 4). He considers the approach he has chosen as a way of "exorcising homogenisation by demonstrating that the old fallacy that all journalisms were at different stages on route to an ideal model, probably Anglophone, is passé" (2005b, p. 2). De Burgh's book leaves the details of training systems aside in favour of exploring more broadly "journalism and journalists," "journalism and the future" and "journalism and location" on most continents and the Indian subcontinent. The differences in journalism education, very deliberately embraced and emphasized in de Burgh's book, stem, according to its editor, not so much from the variances in political and legal systems as from differences in culture. De Burgh hopes to arrive at a new culturally based paradigm because to him the way "journalism operates in a society […] is the product of culture" (2005b, p. 17). His point, enlisting Carey, "that communication is most

revealingly examined as ritual rather than as transmission" (ibid) is a bold one. Emphasizing cultural rather than political, legal and economic frameworks for journalism allows de Burgh to sidestep any questions about the ideological infl uences on the norms and values passed on in journalism education.

Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha's earlier book, *Journalism Education in Europe and North America: An International Comparison* (2003a), consisting of 14 contributions, has something of Gaunt's survey character. The volume divides the European countries, the United States and Canada according to their journalism education predilections, into those countries which have a long standing academic tradition, those who prefer non-tertiary journalism schools and those who have mixed forms. The possibility of an emerging European journalism is also looked at. Yet while there are common trends throughout Europe, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha, in their conclusion, acknowledge a wide variety of journalism education pathways: "Although this volume was limited to the Western democracies (with an outlook on the developments in Eastern Europe) and thus to similar political systems, the chapters revealed an unexpected diversity of educational philosophies" (Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha, 2003c, p. 321). Unlike de Burgh, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha see the reason for these divergences mainly in political and historical differences.

A study of a different kind is Splichal and Sparks' *Journalists for the 21st Century* (1994), which examines the motivations, expectations and professionalization tendencies among fi rst year journalism students in 22 countries from all fi ve continents, ranging from Austria to Tanza4.

nia. Methodologically the book has its fl aws. Its conjecture to view fi rst year journalism students, who have not had any newsroom experience as "socialised" and to assume that they can give conclusive answers as to how their norms and values have been shaped by national context and political system, has to be severely doubted.

What was measured instead, it can be argued, was the relative infl uence of professional education in its early stages. In this, Splichal and Sparks' results are highly encouraging for journalism education. The most striking similarity that emerged was for these young people "to stress a desire for the independence and autonomy of journalism" (Splichal & Sparks, 1994, p. 179). Splichal and Sparks remark that fi rst year students of journalism are at "the precise point in their development when one would expect to fi nd the "idealistic" conception of journalism as a genuine profession most strongly marked" and concede that "exposure to more realities of the occupational situation would lead to a moderation of these idealistic views" (p. 182).

Splichal and Sparks' book makes an important point for journalism education: The fact that a third of these students' home countries are classifi ed as partly free in terms of press freedom did not lessen the journalism students' desire for independence and autonomy. This leads to the assumption that the norms and values taught in semi-democratic or autocratic nations are similar to those in democratic countries. Journalism education therefore, to all intents and purposes, can be perceived as an agent of change.

JOURNALISM—TRADE OR PROFESSION?

The key question in journalism education to this day is whether journalism should be regarded as a trade or a profession (Tumber & Prentoulis, 2005, p. 58). The main distinction between the two is the implicit standing afforded to journalists and the educational background expected from them. A trade is defi ned as the habitual practice of an occupation. Regarding journalism as a trade would require only vocational teaching needed "to perpetuate practice" (Gaunt, 1992, p. 1), and on-the-job training without prior study would suffi ce.

If journalism demands to be a profession, then it would need at least a defi ned educational pathway to underpin this claim. However, as indicated above, journalists come to their jobs from a great variety of educational backgrounds, and most of them receive in-house training by the media organization they join. This has led to the debate about journalism education having been "framed as scholars versus practitioners" (Cunningham, 2002), and has caused a mistrust between academy and industry that shows few signs of easing. According to Deuze (2006, p. 22), "journalism education […] must negotiate rather essentialist self-perceptions of both industry and academy." Deuze (2006, p. 22) correctly points out that this dichotomy between theory and practice "adds a level of complexity to our understanding of journalism (and its education)." This dichotomy is also perceived as one of the key questions in journalism education in tertiary institutions, with discussion centering on the weighting of subjects either towards the scholarly

or the practical. Yet this debate masks another, wider issue. When looking at the theoretical subjects that are part of journalism studies, the entrenched ideological positions of journalism education become apparent. To most in the Western world, journalism—and hence journalism education—is inextricably linked to the political form of democracy. The importance of this link is one of the as yet rarely debated key questions of journalism education. So far journalism education has been seen as the exclusive domain of democracies, but geopolitical changes and transitions in media systems will force journalism scholars and educators alike to address this hallowed view.

PROFESSIONALIZATION

The debate about professionalization is hardest fought in the English-speaking world because it is here that the notion of professions exists. Tumber and Prentoulis remark that the founding fathers of sociology, Marx, Weber and Durkheim, remain "relatively vague about the role of professions" (Tumber & Prentoulis, 2005, p. 58). The reason for this can be found in the fact the German has the term *akademische Berufe* —meaning jobs that require university study—but not a concept of what the professions are. In other words, there are differing notions of what professionalization
means with regard to journalism, and the literature refl ects this diversity.

Jeremy Tunstall (in Tumber & Prentoulis, 2005, p. 71) described journalism as an indeterminate occupation and "journalist" as a "label which people engaged in a very diverse range of activities apply to themselves." This non-committal remark from the doyen of British media sociology should not surprise. The United Kingdom, unlike the United States, did not have university-based journalism schools until the late twentieth century. Traditionally journalism in the UK was viewed as a craft for which the requisite skills could be taught on the job (Esser, 2003). Unsurprisingly, the major push for professionalization came from the United States, the country with the most university-based journalism schools (Weaver et al., 2007, p. 33).

One of the most wide-ranging attempts to outline what professionalization might mean to journalism is made by Hallin and Mancini in their book, *Comparing Media Systems* (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, pp. 33–41), with the arguments partially based on Hallin's earlier chapter "Commercialism and Professionalism in the American News Media" (Hallin, 1997).

Hallin's view is strongly infl uenced by his awareness of journalism's lack of detachment from commercial and political factors, and also by the position that journalism is "very different from the classical professions—law, medicine, architecture, engineering—in that its practice is not based on any systematic body of knowledge" (Hallin, 1997, p. 245). Yet despite these drawbacks, Hallin (p. 258) sees the potential in professionalization—i.e. formal, college-based education—to act as a shield for journalists against commercial pressures and political instrumentalization.

These ideas are carried further in *Comparing Media Systems*, where Hallin and Mancini (2004) gauge journalistic professionalism against the following criteria: autonomy, distinct professional norms and public service orientation. Measured against these criteria, Hallin and Mancini fi nd that journalists have never achieved a degree of autonomy comparable to that of doctors and lawyers. They work in large organizations where many infl uences affect the production process. Yet journalists "have often been successful in achieving relative autonomy within those organizations" (p. 35). With regard to professional norms, Hallin and Mancini see important variations in the way and degree to which journalistic norms have evolved. They also argue that norms can only be established in professions that enjoy relative autonomy and suggest that journalistic practice could be considered as being too often controlled by outside actors (p. 36). Though Hallin and Mancini (2004, pp. 36–37) caution against taking journalists' claims to serve the public at face value, they do not want to dismiss this claim as "mere ideology."

The ethic of public service may be particularly important in the case of journalism, compared with other occupations claiming professional status: because journalism lacks esoteric knowledge, journalists' claim to autonomy and authority are dependent to a particularly great extent on their claim to serve the public interest.

Public service, so vital to Hallin and Mancini, differs markedly from the American professional norm of objectivity (see Schudson and Anderson, chapter 7, in this volume). To Glasser

and Marken (2005, p. 270) "being a professional means abiding by certain norms and accepting the uniformity of practice that this implies." They acknowledge, though, that such norms prove elusive in a world with diverse and often clashing ideologies and that America's "disdain for any model of journalism that violates the precepts of private ownership and individual autonomy" (ibid, p. 274) forestalls a broader agreement.

Also, the Internet has challenged conventional notions of professionalism. On one hand, an increased "communication autonomy" of citizens has cast journalistic work as an "intervention" (Bardoel, 1996, p. 290) rather than a helpful conduit to information. On the other, the professional ideals of objectivity and disinterestedness have been seen as a barrier to contentious journalism (George, 2006, p. 179). This has led to the concern that professionalization can make journalism elitist and exclusive rather than inclusive (Nordenstreng, 1998, p. 126). While in the early years of the twenty-fi rst century the professionalization debate is less energetic than in the past, the deliberations about journalism education curricula have never ceased.

THE QUESTION OF CURRICULA

Any judgment about what is to be considered "state of the art" in journalism education is dependent on what is considered "state of the art" journalism. State-of-the-art journalism, in many people's opinion, is rarely found, thus giving journalism educators and critics ample room to step into the breech. Yet state-of-the-art-journalism in the minds of university-based educators is often incongruent with the objectives of the media industry, perpetuating the fault line between industry and educators.

News journalism was mainly an Anglo-American invention, yet interestingly, the United Kingdom and the United States went very different ways with regard to journalism education. The pathways historically chosen by the two countries can in fact be seen as the boundaries within which the discussion about the state of the art in journalism education moves. There are "those who advocate a singular focus on vocational training and those who would have journalism students follow a much broader program of study" (Skinner, Gasher, & Compton, 2001, p. 341), making the curriculum "one of the most contentious and problematic issues" in journalism education (Morgan, 2000, p. 4).

While no one doubts the necessity of imparting skills—and these are defi ned as interviewing, reporting, researching, sourcing, writing and editing—the relevance of the inquiry into the nature and rituals of journalism has been questioned, in particular by future employers. Their argument is not against tertiary educated journalists, but against having them educated in journalism or communication studies, rather than holding a degree in another discipline. In many Western countries journalism is therefore taught as a postgraduate degree as an addition to prior studies, for example in history, politics, laws economics or business (Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha, 2003a). A particular challenge, therefore, is the design of undergraduate courses which make up the whole of a journalist's education (Adam, 2001, p. 318), but graduate courses also pose their diffi culties.

One of the most highly regarded postgraduate schools of journalism is at Columbia University in New York. An example of how little the discussion of teaching craft or knowledge has been resolved was demonstrated in the very public debate that surrounded the search for a new vision for that school. In April 2003 Columbia University's president, Lee Bollinger (2003), announced the new vision for the school:

A great journalism school within a great university should always stand at a certain distance from the profession itself. … Like journalism itself with respect to the general society, journalism schools must maintain an independent perspective on the profession and the world. Among other things, they are the profession's loyal critics. The habits of mind developed in the academic atmosphere of engaged refl ection will inevitably suffuse the educational process, leading to an emphasis on some aspects of professional life and the neglect of others.

Though Bollinger also said that "a professional school must instill certain basic capacities in its students" (ibid), Columbia University's president fi rmly decided in favor of refl ective learning for its graduate students. So have most scholars, irrespective of whether designing undergraduate or post graduate journalism courses (Adam, 2001; Reese & Cohen, 2001; Skinner et al., 2001; Weischenberg, 2001; Bacon, 1999; de Burgh, 2003; Deuze, 2006).

Suggestions as to what constitutes an ideal curriculum vary in their weighting of skills and knowledge. Skinner, Gasher and Compton's integrated curriculum "*refuse*[*s*] to accept journalism

as a simple technique and, instead, emphasize[s] that journalism is a complex professional practice" (Skinner et al., 2001, p. 349, original emphasis). Their suggestions are broadly gathered under the following heading (pp. 349–355): "Journalism as a practice of meaning production", in which it is "fundamental that students understand the signifying power of language" and grasp that "journalism is not simply "a transparent stenography of the real'" (p. 351). "Journalism within its broader cultural context" teaches students "how to deal responsibly in their work with alternative values, belief systems, social systems, traditions and histories," citing Edward Said who "assigns journalists an 'intellectual responsibility' for the depictions they produce" (p. 352). "Journalism as a practice of knowledge production" insists that "journalists become more than uncritical recorders" (p. 354). The assumption underlying these curriculum suggestions is that journalists need to be equipped with knowledge, sensitivity and "virtue" (Rosen, 2002) that will ultimately lead to an improvement in journalism.

The discussion about the state-of-the-art in journalism education is largely, but by no means entirely, carried out in Western developed nations. UNESCO (2007) has published model curricula for developing countries and emerging democracies, which have to be seen as the most concerted effort towards wide-reaching state-of-the-art journalism education curricula to date.

NOT METHODOLOGY BUT IDEOLOGY

The question of methodology in journalism education often exhausts itself in discussions about how to weigh practical and theoretical subjects. Few probe the underlying assumption that journalism—and by extension journalism education—is an invaluable pillar in the workings of democracy. But this cannot be taken for granted.

A look at twentieth century history, for example in Europe, shows numerous instances in which journalism education was used to train journalists in the service of dictatorships (Barrera & Vaz, 2003, p. 23; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha, 2003b, p. 198; Wilke, 1995). In variations, this instrumentalization can be seen in many countries around the globe today, given that over half of the world's nations are deemed partly free or not free in terms of press freedom (Freedom House, 2006). The norms and values underpinning journalism education in those countries have so far received scant attention.

James Curran (2005, p. xii) put it down to the American dominance in journalism scholarship that the "American model of fact-based, neutral professionalism [… and] the libertarian, marketbased model of organising journalism" directs the discussions, and that alternative models rarely

stand a chance of being noticed though they evidently exist. Paolo Mancini (2000, 2003), in article after article, and fi nally in his book with Daniel Hallin, *Comparing Media Systems* (2004), patiently points to the very different expectation of journalists in Italy:

What counts in journalists is above all the devotion, political and ideological loyalty, and the ability to create consensus regarding clearly defi ned ideas advocated by the newspaper or television channel for which they work …One becomes a professional journalist on the recommendation of a party or politicians who have direct control over a newspaper or considerable infl uence on its management. (Mancini, 2003, p. 97)

This shows that even among democratic countries—and few countries can boast as many elections as Italy—the spectrum stretches from the ideology of objectivity to the ideology of loyalty. For the latter, however, it is crucial to distinguish between voluntary and involuntary loyalty.

In a review of United States journalism text books, Bonnie Brennen (2000, p. 106) came to the conclusion "that all of these books address the practice of journalism from an identical ideological perspective." The constant in all of these books is the steadfast belief that journalists act as members of the Fourth Estate by providing a necessary check on other branches of government (Brennen, 2000, p. 110).

Given this emphasis on the watchdog function, investigative reporting is the most revered form of journalism in US journalism educational texts, with little consideration of how this might serve the *status quo* (Ettema & Glasser, 1998; de Burgh, 2000). Brennen (2000, p. 111) concludes that the actual role journalists "play in the late industrial capitalist society is never questioned."

The ideology of loyalty—both of the voluntary and involuntary kind—can be found in the majority of the world's nations, sometimes in interesting mixtures, where the ideology of objectivity

can be a cover for loyalty, as has happened in the United States in the wake of 9/11, or, as in the Chinese case, where the ideology of loyalty can accommodate investigative reporting. Yu et al. (2000, p. 75) show the changes in China's journalism education as "characterized by gradual movement towards the market without seriously violating traditional norms of propaganda." Market consciousness, in Yu et al.'s words, has made journalism education a testing ground for authority tolerance. However, their survey also reveals that what happens in the classroom does not necessarily transfer to the newsroom, resulting in a "disconnection between class-room teaching and real world needs" (ibid). This "disconnection," which is replicated in many countries, especially those considered "transitional" in their media system, can also be interpreted in a positive way: At least ideas can be discussed in class, even if they may only partially be implemented in the newsroom, leading in China to what Zhou has called "Watchdogs on Party Leashes" (2000).

Africa, largely characterized by partisan media, is closer to the ideology of loyalty than objectivity. All the same, this permits the press to "play a signifi cant role as interpreter of events, and in communicating information to the public" (Rønning, 2005, p. 175). Though journalism education is on the rise in Africa, its media institutional and organizational culture and practices need to be as much transformed as journalism education expanded to bring about real change (Boezak & Ranchod, cited in Steyn & de Beer, 2004, p. 396).

South America has probably the most eclectic mix of the ideologies of objectivity and loyalty, being on the one hand within the US ambit, yet on the other having inherited the partisan, clientilistic structures of journalism from Spain and Portugal. Waisbord (2000) and Alves (2005) see the rise of investigative journalism as proof that Latin American journalists are turning from

lapdogs into watchdogs. A generational split, similar to the one outlined by Barrera and Vaz for Spain (2003, p. 44), can be observed here: The older group is characterized by a more loyal ideological outlook, tending towards an interpretative kind of journalism, while the younger group places greater emphasis on impartiality and tends towards a factual journalism more inclined to criticize the power structures.

While the two ideologies, as bases for journalism teaching, are reconcilable in transitional countries, the loyalty shown to government—be it a party, a group of clerics, or royal rulers—will always be regarded with suspicion by Western democracies. This forces the question of whether there is an inextricable link between journalism and democracy, and how journalism and journalism education should be viewed in non-democratic countries.

ACADEMY VERSUS INDUSTRY

Journalism education, as increasingly provided by tertiary institutions around the globe, is seen as a preparation for and a corrective to journalism. This dual role is its strength and its weakness. It puts tertiary journalism education at arm's length to the industry but also entrenches the mistrust between academe and the media's working world. As Skinner et al. (2001, p. 356) point out, "media owners and managers do not generally welcome critical perspectives on media practices, especially if they are contrary to commercial considerations." Similarly, Cunningham (2002) regrets that the intellectual capital of journalism schools is at odds with industry: "Unlike law and business schools, they are not think-tanks for their profession."

Deuze (2006, p. 27) has put this split down to the fact that many journalism programs work "with the philosophical notion of journalism as an act of individual freedom and responsibility, rather than a social system located in and managed by corporate media." This recognition goes a long way towards explaining why the academy and industry are at odds to each other, but it is unlikely to resolve the contest for infl uence on journalism. Besides, it is not a level playing fi eld. While journalism schools may well try to modify journalism as practiced, their success is measured "by the number of internship opportunities it affords and the kind of jobs graduates are able to land" (Skinner et al., 2001, p. 356). In other words, journalism schools are dependent on the industry, whereas the industry is only partially convinced of the validity and usefulness of journalism degrees.

All the same, one of the strongest arguments in favor of journalism education is that it improves journalists' lot in the workplace. What has been said about Portugal applies to many countries: "Traditionally, journalism has not been a prestigious profession. Censorship and the non-existence of specifi c academic qualifi cations made it a low-qualifi ed and low-paid profession"

(Pinto & Sousa, 2003, p. 181). While in some countries the remuneration is adequate, as for example in the United States (Weaver et al., 2007, pp. 97–106), in many countries, especially in the developing world, the pay and conditions for journalistic work are poor (International Freedom of Expression eXchange, 2006; Rønning, 2005).

For Britain, which until recently preferred on-the-job training for journalists, Delano (2000) had to conclude, "No Sign of a Better Job: 100 years of British journalism". Delano wondered why journalists had not been "able or willing to exert the infl uence *inside* their professional world that they are able to wield *outside* it?" (p. 271, original emphasis). But then, Britain, in contrast to the United States, only recently embraced tertiary education for journalists and the weak professional position of British journalists can in fact be used as argument in favor of university education for journalists.

FUTURE AREAS OF RESEARCH

While the "graduatization of journalism" (Splichal & Sparks, 1994, p. 114) is progressing fast, this fact should be tempered by the knowledge that only about a quarter to a third of those studying journalism take up jobs in the industry. The research into journalism education therefore needs to extend to encompass the training received in places other than tertiary institutions, such as in newsrooms or in the media industry, to complete the picture of the forces that shape journalism. Furthermore, researchers need to recognize global geo-political shifts. The media are no longer American (Tunstall, 2007). As a list of the 100 highest circulation newspapers shows, 75 of these are Asian (WAN, 2005). In audience numbers no other continent can rival Asia. It follows that Asia, and in particular China and India, produce the largest number of journalists. Yet Asian journalism education hardly features in the discussion so far.

For historical reasons, discourses on journalism and journalism education have been American dominated (Curran, 2005, p. vi). This has led to the perception that there is only one valid form of journalism underwriting journalism education. However, future writing on journalism education will have to accept a broader range of journalisms. Even when staying within the dominant language of the discourse, that of English, adding the British model of journalism considerably widens the visions of journalism. The British model, with its dual strands of public service and commercial media, offers elements that are far more adaptable globally than the American, purely commercial, model. The Qatari channel Al Jazeera, built largely on BBC norms and practices, is a case in point (Sakr, 2005, p. 149).

Research into journalism education cannot remain confi ned to democratic countries only. As Splichal and Sparks' book shows, journalism education can be seen as an agent of change, and the characteristics of journalism education in partly free and not free countries need to be delved into. Only by exploring more fully the global picture can scholarship into journalism education support efforts towards an informed and deliberative society.

REFERENCES

Adam, G. S. (2001). The education of journalists. *Journalism*, *2*(3), 315–339.

Alves, R. C. (2005). From lapdog to watchdog: The role of the press in Latin America's democratization. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 181–202). London: Routledge.

Bacon, W. (1999). What is a journalist in a university? *Media International Australia*, *90*, 79–90.

Bardoel, J. (1996). Beyond journalism. A profession between information society and civil society. *European Journal of Communication*, *11*(3), 283–302.

Barrera, C., & Vaz, A. (2003). The Spanish case: A recent academic tradition. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 21–48). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Bollinger, L. (2003). *President Bollinger's statement on the future of journalism education*. Retrieved March 26, 2007, from http://www.columbia.edu/cu/news/03/04/lcb_j_task_force.html

Brennen, B. (2000). What the hacks say. The ideological prism of US journalism texts. *Journalism*, *1*(1), 106–113.

Chalaby, J. (1996). Journalism as an Anglo-American invention. *European Journal of Communication*, *11*(3), 303–326.

Cunningham, B. (2002). The mission. Search for the perfect j-school. *Columbia Journalism Review*, *2002*(6). Retrieved 2 April, 2007, from http://www.cjr.org/issues/2002/6/school-cunningham.asp

Curran, J. (2005). Foreword. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. xi–xv). London: Routledge.

de Burgh, H. (Ed.). (2000). *Investigative journalism*. London: Routledge.

de Burgh, H. (2003). Skills are not enough. The case for journalism as an academic discipline. *Journalism*, *4*(1), 95–112.

de Burgh, H. (Ed.). (2005a). *Making journalists*. London: Routledge.

de Burgh, H. (2005b). Introduction: Journalism and the new cultural paradigm. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 1–21). London: Routledge.

Delano, A. (2000). No sign of a better job: 100 years of British journalism. *Journalism Studies*, *1*(2), 261–272.

Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism*, *6*(4), 442–464.

Deuze, M. (2006). Global journalism education. A conceptual approach. *Journalism Studies, 7*(1), 19–34.

Ettema, J., & Glasser, T. (1998). *Custodians of conscience: Investigative journalism and public virtue*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Esser, F. (2003). Journalism training in Great Britain: A system rich in tradition but currently in transition. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 209–236). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Freedom House (2006). *Table of global press freedom rankings*. Retrieved September 5, 2006, from http://www.freedomhouse.org/uploads/PFS/ PFSGlobalTables2006.pdf

Fröhlich, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (Eds.). (2003a). *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Fröhlich, R. & Holtz-Bacha, C. (2003b). Journalism education in Germany. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 187–205). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Fröhlich, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. (2003c). Summary: Challenges for today's journalism education. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 307–323). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Gaunt, P. (1992). *Making the newsmakers. International handbook on journalism training*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

George, C. (2006). *Contentious journalism and the Internet. Towards democratic discourse in Malaysia and Singapore*. Singapore: Singapore University Press in association with University of Washington Press.

George, C. (2007). Consolidating authoritarian rule: Calibrated coercion in Singapore. *The Pacifi c Review*, *20*(2), 127–145.

Glasser, T., & Marken, L. (2005). Can we make journalists better? In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 264–276). London: Routledge.

Hallin, D. (1997). Commercialism and professionalism in the American news media. In J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (Eds.), *Mass media and society* (pp. 243–262). London: Arnold.

Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems—Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

International Freedom of Expression eXchange. (2006). Majority of Indonesian Journalists vastly underpaid: Aliansi Jurnalis Independen [AJI] survey. *IFEX Communique 15*(35). Retrieved April 2, 2007, from http://www.ifex.org/en/content/view/full/76840/

Johansen, P., Weaver, D., & Dornan, C. (2001). Journalism education in the United States and Canada: Not merely clones. *Journalism Studies*, *2*(4), 469–483.

Josephi, B. (2001). Entering the newsroom: What rite of passage? The induction of cadets at the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* in comparison with young journalists' training at English language papers in Hong Kong, Singapore and Australia. *Communications: The European Journal of Communication Research 26*(2), 181–195.

Mancini, P. (2000). Political complexity and alternative models of journalism. The Italian case. In J. Curran & M.-J. Park (Eds.), *De-Westernizing media studies* (pp. 265–278). London: Routledge.

Mancini, P. (2003). Between literary roots and partisanship: Journalism education in Italy. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 93–104). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Medsger, B. (2005). The evolution of journalism education in the United States. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 205–226). London: Routledge.

Morgan, F. (2000). Recipes for success: Curriculum for professional media education. *AsiaPacifi c Media-Educator 8*, 4–21.

Nordenstreng, K. (1998). Professional ethics: Between fortress journalism and cosmopolitan democracy. In K. Brants, J. Hermes, & L. van Zoonen (Eds.), *The media in question* (pp. 124–134). London: Sage.

Pinto, M., & Sousa, H. (2003). Journalism education at universities and journalism schools in Portugal. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 169–186). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Reese, S., & Cohen, J. (2001). Educating for journalism: The professionalism of scholarship. *Journalism Studies*, *1*(2), 213–227.

Rogers, E. (1994). *A history of communication study: A biographical approach*. New York: The Free Press.

Rønning, H. (2005). African journalism and the struggle for democratic media. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 157–180). London: Routledge.

Rosen, J. (2002, September 6). Taking Bollinger's course on the American press. *Chronicle of Higher Education, 42*(2), B10.

Sakr, N. (2005). The changing dynamics of Arab journalism. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 142–156). London: Routledge.

Skinner, D., Gasher, M., & Compton, J. (2001). Putting theory into practice. A critical approach to journalism studies. *Journalism, 2*(3), 314–360.

Splichal, S., & Sparks, C. (1994). *Journalists for the 21st Century*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Steyn, E., & de Beer, A. (2004). The level of journalism skills in southern African media: A reason for concern within a developing democracy? *Journalism Studies, 5*(3), 387–397.

Tumber, H, & Prentoulis, M. (2005). Journalism and the making of a profession. In H. de Burgh (Ed.), *Making journalists* (pp. 58–74). London: Routledge.

Tunstall, J. (2007). *The media were American: U.S. mass media in decline.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO (2007). *Model curricula for journalism education for developing countries & emerging democracies*. Paris: UNESCO.

Waisbord, S. (2000). *Watchdog journalism in South America. News, accountability, and democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Weaver, D. (1998). *The global journalist.* Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weaver, D. (2003). Journalism education in the United States. In R. Fröhlich & C. Holtz-Bacha (Eds.), *Journalism education in Europe and North America. An international comparison* (pp. 49–64). Creskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Weaver, D., Beam, R., Brownlee, B., Voakes, P., & Wilhoit, G. C. (2007). *The American journalist in the 21st Century. U.S. newspeople at the dawn of a new millenium.* Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Weischenberg, S. (2001). Das Ende einer Ära? Aktuelle Beobachtungen zum Studium des künftigen Journalismus [End of an era? Topical observations about studies of future journalism]. In H. Kleinsteuber (Ed.), *Aktuelle Medientrends in den USA* (pp. 61–82). Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Weischenberg, S., Malik, M., & Scholl, A. (2006). Journalismus in Deutschland 2005 [Journalism in Germany 2005]. *Media Perspektiven*, *7/ 2006*, 346–361.

Wilke, J. (1995). Journalistenausbildung im Dritten Reich: die Reichspresseschule [Journalism education during the Third Reich: The Reich press school]. In B. Schneider, K. Reumann, & P. Schiwy (Eds.). *Publizistik. Beiträge zur Medienentwicklung. Festschrift für Walter J. Schütz* (pp. 387–408). Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz.

World Association of Newspapers [WAN]. (2005). World's 100 largest newspapers. Retrieved April 2, 2007, from http://www.wan-press.org/rubrique75.html

Yu, X., Chu, L., & Guo, Z. (2000). Reform and challenge. An analysis of China's journalism education under social transition. *Gazette, 64*(1), 63–77.

Zhou, Y. (2000). Watchdogs on party leashes? Contexts and implications of investigative journalism in post-Deng China. *Journalism Studies, 1*(4), 577–597.