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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 influence 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.
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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.
continental Europe was closely linked with the literary field 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,
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
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 field
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
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institute could serve as a source of prestige for a school of journalism that may have been looked
down upon by academics in other fields 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 folds 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 first 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
c 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 specific—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 first 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 “flacks”, the
profession is unlikely to attract the best and the brightest students or the most qualified 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.

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 journalism 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 influences 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 first year journalism students in 22 countries from all five continents, ranging from Austria to Tanzania. Methodologically the book has its flaws. Its conjecture to view first 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 influence 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 first year students of journalism are at “the precise point in their development when one would expect to find 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 classified 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 defined 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 suffice.

If journalism demands to be a profession, then it would need at least a defined 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.
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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 reflects 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 influenced 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 find that journalists have never achieved a degree of autonomy comparable to that of doctors and lawyers. They work in large organizations where many influences 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
evasive 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-first 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 breach. 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 defined 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
difficulties.
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:
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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 reflection 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 firmly decided in favor of reflective 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 finally 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 defined 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 influence 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 significant 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
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,
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 academic 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 influence on journalism. Besides, it is not a level playing
field. 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 specific academic qualifications made it a low-qualified and low-paid profession”
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; Renning, 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 influence 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.
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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 definitions. 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 confined 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.
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