Ingrid Bejerman
Dept. of Art History and Communication Studies
McGill University, Montreal
October 2011

Turning the inverted pyramid inside-out: Professional ideology, professionalization, and education of journalists reconsidered

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

© Ingrid Bejerman, 2011

Abstract

Since the rise of citizen reporters, blogging, wikis, and pro-am newsroom collaborations, both the professional and academic spheres have come to contest the very definition of a journalist. These analyses, however, often fail to consider the historical complexity of the processes of professionalization in journalism, its systematic institutionalization as an intellectual endeavor, and the fact that there is not – and never has been – a single unifying activity defined as *journalism*. The lack of a consensual body of knowledge within journalism studies as a field of inquiry, and journalism's problematic status as a discipline within the critical humanities and the social sciences in general, only exacerbate this state of affairs. This thesis proposes to address these issues by reconsidering the historical narratives which shape them, in order to offer a critical review of the social advancement of the 'profession' and the institutionalization of journalism.

The first chapter of this dissertation consists of an attempt to problematize the nature of journalism by providing a brief history of the haphazard, unplanned, and largely accidental way that journalism came into being by describing how journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication. This provides a historical background for the second chapter, which explores the materialization of the values and ideologies that structure Anglo-American journalism as a profession in the nineteenth century, and which still form the basis of its occupational norms today. Following a discussion of the emergence of the reporter, both the modern ideal of objectivity in Anglo-American journalism and the rise of professionalism are situated within the broader context of modernism. The third chapter offers a review of the literature on the professionalization of journalism by considering the journalistic occupation within the system of professions, drawing on approaches from sociology, political economy, communications, and journalism studies.

These chapters provide the foundation for an analysis of the emergence of journalism education, which has been historically linked to the notion of journalism as a profession. Considering journalism education as an agent of professional legitimization, the fourth chapter aims to historicize the establishment of journalism departments in a university setting in the United States and Canada by tracing the origins of models of journalism schools in order to provide a context for the study of journalism education and training. The fifth and final chapter of this thesis builds on the preceding chapters to demonstrate how all of these complex tensions contribute to the uncomfortable position that journalistic training occupies within the university. Academically, journalism draws on the humanities and the social sciences, while remaining outside of both. Pedagogically, journalism educators are asked to offer a 'critical' approach to phenomena while also teaching students practical skills of use to those seeking professional careers. This chapter also explores the troubled marriage between communication studies and journalism, culminating in the recent call for the reorganization of the various subjects of journalism (i.e. law, ethics, communication theory, political economy of journalism, media history, etc.) into a single field of Journalism Studies. The dissertation concludes by looking at the continuing impact of these unresolved difficulties on journalism education today.

Résumé

Depuis la montée des reporters citoyens, des blogs et les wikis, la définition même de journaliste en est venue à être contestée tant dans les sphères professionnelles qu'académiques. Cependant, ces analyses ne tiennent pas compte de la complexité historique du processus de professionnalisation du journalisme, de son institutionnalisation systématique en tant que projet intellectuel, et du fait qu'il n'y ait pas – et qu'il n'y ait jamais eu – une seule et même activité unificatrice répondant de la définition du journalisme. L'absence d'un corps consensuel de connaissances au sein des études journalistiques en tant que domaine de recherche ainsi que le statut problématique du journalisme en tant que discipline au sein des sciences humaines critiques et des sciences sociales en général, ne font qu'exacerber cet état de choses. Cette thèse se propose d'aborder ces questions en reconsidérant les récits historiques qui les constituent. Le but est de présenter une analyse critique de l'avancement social de la «profession» et de l'institutionnalisation du journalisme.

Le premier chapitre de cette thèse tente de problématiser la nature du journalisme à travers un bref historique de la manière hasardeuse, imprévue, et en grande partie accidentelle dont est apparu le journalisme. Ce survol historique met en exergue en quoi le journalisme est le fruit de l'articulation d'un ensemble de genres et traditions d'écriture et de communication. Sur cette toile de fonds repose le deuxième chapitre, lequel explore la matérialisation des valeurs et des idéologies qui ont structuré le journalisme anglo-américain en tant que profession au XIXe siècle et qui forment encore la base de ses normes professionnelles aujourd'hui. Ce deuxième chapitre aborde ensuite l'émergence du reporter pour enfin situer l'idéal moderne de l'objectivité et la montée d'un professionnalisme au sein du journalisme anglo-américain dans leur contexte plus vaste du modernisme. Le troisième chapitre propose une revue de littérature sur la professionnalisation du journalisme en considérant l'occupation de journaliste au sein du système des professions. À cet effet sont mobilisées des approches tant sociologiques, que de l'économie politique, des communications et des études journalistiques.

Ces trois premiers chapitres posent les bases d'une analyse de l'émergence de l'enseignement du journalisme, lequel a été lié historiquement à la notion de journalisme en tant que profession. Considérant l'enseignement du journalisme comme un vecteur de légitimation professionnelle, le quatrième chapitre vise à historiciser la création de départements de journalisme dans les milieux universitaires des États-Unis et du Canada en retraçant les origines d'écoles journalistiques. Ceci fournit un ancrage pour l'étude de l'enseignement et la formation journalistiques qui fera l'objet du chapitre suivant. Le dernier chapitre de cette thèse s'appuie sur les chapitres précédents afin de démontrer en quoi toutes ces tensions complexes contribuent à perpétuer le statut équivoque qu'occupe la formation en journalisme au sein du milieu universitaire. Sur le plan académique, le journalisme s'appuie sur les sciences humaines et les sciences sociales, tout en demeurant en dehors de ses deux sphères. Sur le plan pédagogique, les enseignants en journalisme sont appelés à mobiliser une approche critique à l'analyse des phénomènes tout en enseignant aux étudiants des compétences pratiques et directement utiles à ceux qui envisagent une carrière professionnelle. Ce chapitre explore également les eaux troubles liant les études en communication et le journalisme, tel que cela a récemment culminé dans l'exhortation à réorganiser les différents domaines du journalisme (droit, éthique, théorie de la communication, économie politique du journalisme, histoire des médias, etc.) en un seul et même domaine, à savoir celui des Études sur le Journalisme. La thèse conclut en examinant l'impact persistant de ces difficultés sur l'enseignement actuel du journalisme.

For Carolina and Rebeca,
in memoriam

Acknowledgements

This dissertation about professionalism in journalism reflects so much of my own trajectory; a trail of wonderful people who were not only vital in helping me achieve my goals, but who, in many ways, made me the journalist and scholar I am today.

My deepest gratitude goes, first and foremost, to my supervisor, Will Straw, with whom I had the honour of working, for his knowledge, support, patience, and guidance throughout my entire doctoral endeavor. For his invaluable encouragement, sound advice, and fabulous ideas during my thesis-writing period. For having a steady hand while always allowing me the room to work in my own way. And above all, for accepting to walk me through the forest. I would have been lost without him.

I feel very grateful to have been able to pursue my research in the invigorating and welcoming environment of the Department of Art History and Communication Studies at McGill University. I am particularly indebted to my academic mentor Jonathan Sterne, whose intelligence is only second to his generous heart, for pointing me towards the wonderful world of reflexive sociology, and for teaching me everything I know about teaching. To Carrie Rentschler, for her precious input in the formative parts of this thesis, and helping me pose the questions I wanted to ask. To Don McGregor, whose classes – and company – are as delightful and thought-provoking as a short story by Julio Cortázar. To Marc Raboy, Jenny Burman, Becky Lentz, and Darin Barney, who never failed to lend me a friendly ear. And last but not least, to Maureen Coote and Susana Machado, who kept everything in check so that I could leave Earth.

I am also heartily grateful to the Department of Journalism at my undergraduate alma mater, Concordia University, site of my formative years as a journalist, and, ten years later, of my formative years as a lecturer. Although she taught me so much of what I know about writing, I am at a loss of words to describe my gratitude to Linda Kay. To Sheila Arnopoulos for her support, and for showing me there are always new angles to cover the developing world. To Enn Raudsepp, Lindsay Chrysler, and Mike Gasher, for always guiding and supporting me. To Brian Gabrial, for his continuous encouragement. To Jim McLean, Lisa Lynch, Dave Secko, Peter Downie and Leo Gervais, and their friendly words of wisdom and experience. To Sandra Cochrane, for all her help. And, of course, to my fabulous students for talking shop with a theoretical edge.

This dissertation owes so much to the time and generosity of a number of scholars. I would like to thank Richard Foley, Dean of Arts at NYU, for planting the seed of the fruits I am now reaping by identifying my longing to go back to grad school. Although my work is no longer about hemispheric studies, it is about journalism studies, and I'm certain he appreciates this epistemological shift. Paul Knox at Ryerson was especially generous in sharing with me his own study of journalism education in Canada, much of which is referred to in this thesis. Rob Gunnison and Neil Henry at the Graduate School of Journalism, University of California at Berkeley, and Christopher Waddell at the School of Journalism and Communication, at Carleton, were always patient with my questions.

Everyone at the School of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Iowa was nothing short of fantastic while I was researching Wilbur Schramm's role in journalism education. Many thanks to Dan Berkowitz, Frank Durham, Jennifer Raghavan, Sujatha Sosale, and especially Juli Marie McLoone, Olson Fellow, Special Collections at U of Iowa Libraries.

To Ernest Bernach, Jordi Borja, Peter Desbarats, Pollyana Ferrari, and Ignacio Ramonet, who shared some of these ideas with me on the stage in São Paulo and Guadalajara. And to Betty Medsger, for an intelligent and fruitful exchange.

I would also like to acknowledge the generous support of Media@McGill, which allowed me to complete my dissertation much more comfortably than I would have otherwise.

So much of what I know about journalism I owe to Gabriel García Márquez, Tomás Eloy Martínez (RIP), Katharine Viner, Alma Guillermoprieto, Álex Grijelmo, Ramón Alberto Garza, Jean-François Fogel, Bruno Patiño, and Rosental Calmon Alves, the giants on whose shoulders I always stood on. And to my editors at *O Estado*, Luciano Martins Costa and Luiz Octavio Lima, who always had faith in me. Huge thanks to my colleagues and friends in São Paulo and all over Latin America, who filled me with inspiration and left me so much to live up to: María Fernanda Márquez, Margarita García Robayo, Verónica Riera, Alejandro Di Lázzaro, Christina Lembrecht, Paula Schmitt, Carolina Arenes, Flavia Costa, Mercedes Korin, Karin Dauch, Julio Villanueva Chang, and above all, Juana Libedinsky. To Jaime Abello Banfi at the FNPI in Cartagena de Indias, to Raúl Padilla López at the FIL Guadalajara, and to Linda Leith at Blue Met in Montreal I owe my skills in cultural administration and promotion, and then some. To my dearest friends Mayra Roffe, John Curtin, Gabriela Tortosa, Conrad Duroseau, Buffy Childerhose, Joya Balfour, Gabriela Gámez, Devyani Saltzman, Michael Dayan, John Faithful Hamer, Anna-Liisa Aunio, Clara Khudaverdian, Carlos Brockmann, Dario Flores, and Eduardo Escamilla, who were always there to cheer me on. Extra special thanks go to Marie-Claude Rabeau and her fabulous aunt, Line Grenier.

I am also obliged to my colleagues who supported me, and with whom I had the privilege of working at McGill: Alexandra Boutros, Julian Awwad, Monika Mak, Stefana Lamasanu, Rick Hink, Kat Borlongan, Susana Vargas, Ger Zielinski, Tobias C. van Veen, Cheryl Thompson, Claire Roberge, Heather Gibb, Emily Raine, and above all, Joumane Chahine.

To Ernest, for his love – and patience.

To Patricia and Ofer, my siblings, for the delight in discovering that of all the things that I am, an auntie is by far my favourite. And on that note, I thank little Allan, the apple of my eye.

To Eva and Osvaldo, my adored parents, who supported each and every one of my projects and ideas, no matter how crazy or far-fetched, as long as I did my best. For a deep understanding of the joy and responsibility that come with being Brazilian. For all the wonderful opportunities, for my intellect and imagination, for music and laughter, and for also instilling in me a sense of discipline and rigour, and most importantly, for showing me that few things in life are more rewarding than the fruit of one's labour. For their love. Without them, none of this would have ever been possible.

And to Rebeca and Carolina, my grandmothers, in whose scholarly footsteps I follow, and from whom I inherited my love of newspapers, complex literary texts, the English language, and the pleasures of reading and writing. They continuously fed my inquisitive mind, broadened my horizons, and always understood me. I dedicate these pages to their loving memory.

Table of Contents

Abstract	*iii*
Résumé	*iv*
Acknowledgements	*vi*
Table of Contents	*ix*
Preface	1
Introduction	5
Chapter I What is journalism?	11
Chapter II Professionalism: Objectivity and Journalism's Professional Ideology	55
Chapter III Professionalization	111
Chapter IV Education	169
Chapter V Theory and Practice/Journalism Studies	233
Conclusion	285
Appendices	295
Bibliography	319

Preface

> *Knowledge comes only in lightning flashes. The text is the long roll of thunder that follows.*
>
> – Walter Benjamin, THE ARCADES PROJECT

For the past decade, I've been consumed with one major question – a question that endures, a question I think about every single day, a question which essentially governs my professional life. It is a question that perhaps shall forever remain unanswered, but I take comfort in the fact that the very process of searching for this answer is as close as I could ever get to some sort of 'truth' about the profession I love so much: journalism. This question has also taken over the lives of numerous scholars, most of them journalists taking solace in academia in their attempt to better understand – and often come to terms with – their craft, and its place in the world. My unanswered question is, in essence, how do we take journalism education seriously?

Barbie Zelizer, a self-described journalist-turned-academic, borrowed a phrase coined by James Carey – "taking journalism seriously" – to entitle her quest "to establish why journalism matters and under which circumstances it matters most" while reflecting "a very personal journey" in the process.[1] Her book opens this discussion with the claim that "journalism is most appreciated when it turns into a nonjournalistic phenomenon" citing the case of Ernest Hemingway, whose

> [journalistic experiences] as a reporter for the *Kansas City Star,* the *Toronto Star*, and other newspapers during the 1920s were seen as an "apprenticeship" for his later work, and his writing was dismissed as "just journalism." But when he turned portions of that same material verbatim into fiction, it was heralded as literature, portions of which continue to inhabit literary canons around the world.[2]

[1] Zelizer, Barbie. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004, p. ix-2.
[2] Ibid., p. 1.

Zelizer proceeds to state that it was this very transformation, "from 'just journalism' to a phenomenon worthy of appreciation," which motivated the writing of her book.[3] It is the amplification of this idea initially proposed by Carey and borrowed by Zelizer to guide her work – how do we take journalism seriously? – which shall, in turn, guide my own attempt at tackling my own inquiry: how do we take journalism scholarship, specifically journalism education, seriously?

Following in the footsteps of James Carey and a number of other scholars working in the field, Barbie Zelizer poses the following crucial questions regarding

> taking journalism seriously [which] means first of all reviewing the scholarly literature, with an eye to tracking the role that scholars have played in thinking about journalism. How have scholars tended to conceptualize news, news making, journalism, journalists, and the news media? Which explanatory frames have they used to explore journalistic practice? From which fields of inquiry have they borrowed in shaping their assumptions about how journalism works? And have their studies taken journalism seriously enough?[4]

The central purpose of this dissertation is to extend these questions to the study of processes of professionalization in journalism, its systematic institutionalization as an intellectual endeavor, and the fact that there is not – and never has been – a single unifying activity defined as *journalism*. The lack of a consensual body of knowledge within journalism studies as a field of inquiry, and journalism's problematic status as a discipline within the critical humanities and the social sciences in general, only exacerbate this state of affairs. My thesis proposes to address these issues by reconsidering the historical narratives which shape them, in order to offer a critical review of the social advancement of the 'profession' and the institutionalization of journalism.

[3] Ibid., p. 1.
[4] Ibid., p. 2.

The work in this dissertation, in many ways, departs from a professional journey that began fifteen years ago, where I found theory and practice colliding at every corner, and where I consistently discovered my academic background and training satiated the gaps and holes that journalism just could not fill. Indirectly, my experience as a journalism student, a working journalist, a journalism instructor, and a researcher on journalism reflects on these questions. This dissertation draws on meditations on the extensive research I have conducted in order to teach my classes and deliver my conferences; most importantly, it will be about how to best apply the theory I've acquired in my doctoral studies to the benefit of the field of Journalism Studies. And more than anything, the work in this dissertation will be about making a contribution to Journalism Studies as a field by looking in part at its emergence, status and definition, as well as the relationship between professional teaching and other aspects of a journalism education in order to, ultimately, contribute to the vital and very necessary discussion about the ideal essential components for the best possible curriculum for journalism schools in North America in the 21st century.

Introduction

> *A Colombian university was asked what aptitude and vocational tests are administered to persons wishing to study journalism. The response was categorical: "Journalists are not artists." These views are, however, fueled precisely by the conviction that print journalism is a literary genre.*
>
> – Gabriel García Márquez, THE BEST PROFESSION IN THE WORLD

Writing in 1988, G. Stuart Adam noted that "the paradigm of journalism education has not changed much in 40 years despite massive changes throughout the field of mass communication"[5] while major evolution has occurred in the past decade, especially – not surprisingly – where the future of journalism is concerned. Whether or not journalism will survive, these developments have compelled journalism schools to rethink their curricula and *raison d'être.* My dissertation takes this rethinking as a point of departure.

Since the rise of citizen reporters, blogging, wikis, and pro-am newsroom collaborations, both the professional and academic spheres have come to contest the very definition of a journalist. These analyses, however, often fail to consider the historical complexity of the processes of professionalization in journalism, its systematic institutionalization as an intellectual endeavor, and the fact that there is not – and never has been – a single unifying activity defined as *journalism*. The lack of a consensual body of knowledge within journalism studies as a field of inquiry, and journalism's problematic status as a discipline within the critical humanities and the social sciences in general, only exacerbate this state of affairs. This thesis proposes to address these issues by reconsidering the historical narratives which shape them, in order to offer a critical

[5] G. Stuart Adam, "Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice: The Problems of Curriculum and Research in University Schools of Journalism," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1988), p. 7.

review of the social advancement of the 'profession' and the institutionalization of journalism.

While Mark Deuze notes that "journalism is and has been theorized, researched, studied and criticized world-wide by people coming from a wide variety of disciplines,"[6] journalism itself is an arguably indefinable, uncertain, transmuting, multifarious, and extremely intricate object of inquiry. It is the definition of journalism itself which is rendered problematic, because 'journalism' – an ideology, a profession, a craft, a trade, the act of collecting/writing/editing/presenting of news or news articles, a style of writing, to name but a few – signifies multiple realities and representations, especially where differences from one national-cultural context to another are considered. For that reason, one should begin by stating journalism's nebulous identity as an object of study, let alone a discipline and field of inquiry.

Therefore, the first chapter of this dissertation consists of an attempt to rework the definition of journalism, and to problematize the nature of journalism. Its goal is to provide a brief history of the haphazard, unplanned, and largely accidental way that journalism came into being by describing how journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication. This chapter departs from Martin Conboy's argument "that there is not and never has been a single unifying activity to be thought of as journalism; on the contrary, journalism has always been associated with dispute – dispute about its value, its role, its direction, even its definition."[7] Conboy highlights that "journalism has always been constructed as a diverse and multiple set of textual strategies, differing practices attempting to champion or challenge whatever has

[6] Mark Deuze, "What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered," *Journalism* 6, no. 4 (November 1, 2005), p. 442
[7] Martin Conboy, *Journalism: A Critical History* (London: Sage, 2004), p. 3.

been the dominant version."[8] This chapter thus provides a brief history of journalism by going into the forms of writing and publication out of which journalism emerged – the gazettes, corantos, mercuries, newsbooks, correspondence-based magazines, and so on – in order to show how newspaper writing is the articulation of many different traditions (the letter of reportage, the listing of facts, etc.).

Against this historical background, the second chapter of this work is concerned with the complex processes which came to shape this craft, trade or profession. It explores the materialization of the values and ideologies that structure Anglo-American journalism as a profession in the nineteenth century, and which still form the basis of its occupational norms today. If journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication, as argued in the first chapter, the second chapter departs from the wide range of terms used to describe those who engage in its practice, from very early on: 'authors, curranters, mercurists, newsmen, newsmongers, diurnalists, gazetteers and (eventually) journalists.'[9] This portion of the dissertation is solely concerned with the latter, for journalists are not only a product of the unsystematic emergence of English journalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the articulation of many genres and traditions, but also, and equally significantly, a product of a number of other influences from the late nineteenth century.[10] Following a discussion of the emergence of the reporter, both the modern ideal of objectivity in Anglo-American journalism and the rise of professionalism are situated within the broader context of modernism.

---

[8] Ibid., p. 3.
[9] Conboy, p. 23 / citing Harold Herd, *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1952), p. 12.
[10] Barbara M. Kelly, "Professionalism, 1900-1950," in *Fair and Balanced: A History of Journalistic Objectivity* (ed. by Steven R. Knowlton and Karen L. Freeman / Vision Press, 2005), p. 154.

Thomas Hanitzsch establishes a crucial distinction between *professionalism* and processes of *professionalization* in his early comparative research into journalism studies which treat both of these entities. The author notes that both terms were often used interchangeably, although they clearly have conceptually different meanings. "Professionalism," writes Hanitzsch, "is something that journalists embrace or pursue, while professionalization refers to a process of an occupation gradually becoming a true profession."[11] Both the second and third chapters take this distinction as a point of departure. The second chapter starts out with the conceptualization of journalism's professional/occupational ideology by looking at Mark Deuze's 'five ideal-typical values' (public service, objectivity, autonomy, immediacy, ethics), the discursively constructed ideal-typical values which condense the key characteristics of this professional self-definition.[12] The thesis then focuses on the emergence of objectivity, which is at the core of Anglo-American journalism's "powerful occupational mythology," to borrow from Aldridge and Evetts.[13] Most importantly, it posits objectivity and the emergence of a mass press, as the driving forces behind the reshaping of the term *journalist* at the turn of the nineteenth century. And in so doing, it situates both the modern principle of objectivity in Anglo-American journalism and the rise of professionalism as "an aspect of a wider movement known as *modernism*, a response to the major shifts in technology, economics and beliefs that had accompanied the Industrial Revolution."[14]

---

[11] Thomas Hanitzsch, ed.,"Comparative Journalism Studies" in *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 416.
[12] Deuze, "What is journalism?" p. 446.
[13] Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts, "Rethinking the concept of professionalism: the case of journalism," *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 4 (December 2003), p. 547.
[14] Kelly, p. 147. The author proceeds to explain that modernism is marked by the spread of reforms and social change, and that "although scholars of modernism debate the exact moment of its birth, all agree that it was in its primacy during the years following World War I, particularly in America."

The third chapter is concerned with the study of journalistic professionalization. This is a very difficult undertaking, because although professionalism has been an important concept to Anglo-American journalists for over a century, this discussion happens in notoriously ambiguous terms. It is marked by incongruity regarding concepts like profession, professionalism and professionalization, and what they mean in journalism.[15] The third chapter thus offers a review of the literature on the professionalization of journalism by considering the journalistic occupation within the system of professions, drawing on approaches from sociology, political economy, communications, and journalism studies.

The first three chapters provide the foundation for an analysis of the emergence of journalism education, which has been historically linked to the notion of journalism as a profession. The relationship between journalism education and the process of professionalization dates back to the full establishment of objectivity as a professional norm. "I suspect," writes Walter Lippmann, "that schools of journalism in the professional sense will not exist generally until journalism has been practiced for some time as a profession. It has never yet been a profession." Lippmann refers to journalism as "a dignified calling, at others a romantic adventure, and then again a servile trade. But a profession it could not begin to be until modern objective journalism was successfully created, and with it the need of men who consider themselves devoted, as all the professions ideally are, to the service of truth alone."[16]

Considering journalism education as an agent of professional legitimization, the fourth chapter aims to historicize the establishment of journalism departments in a

[15] Randal Beam, "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept," *Journalism Monographs* 121 (June 1990), p. 1.
[16] Walter Lippmann, "The American Press," *The Yale Review*, Vol. 30 (1930-31), pp. 440-441.

university setting in the United States and Canada by tracing the origins of models of journalism schools in order to provide a context for the study of journalism education and training. A more specific analysis of the historically uncomfortable position that journalism training has occupied within the university builds on the work presented here, and follows in the next chapter of this dissertation.

The fifth and final chapter of this thesis builds on the preceding chapters to demonstrate how all of these complex tensions contribute to the uncomfortable position that journalistic training occupies within the university. The historical account of the emergence of journalism education in the previous chapter points to "a double dichotomy at the heart of journalism."[17] Academically, as a cross-disciplinary subject, journalism draws on the humanities and the social sciences, while remaining outside of both. Pedagogically, journalism educators are asked to offer a 'critical' approach to phenomena while also teaching students practical skills of use to those seeking professional careers. Thus, note Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "journalistic education has to incorporate both 'idealist' and 'realist' aspirations and both 'practical' and 'intellectual' dimensions."[18]

This chapter also explores the troubled marriage between communication studies and journalism, culminating in the recent call for the reorganization of the various subjects of journalism (i.e. law, ethics, communication theory, political economy of journalism, media history, etc.) into a single field of Journalism Studies. The dissertation concludes by looking at the continuing impact of these unresolved difficulties on journalism education today.

---

[17] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "Journalism and the Making of a Profession" in Hugh de Burgh, ed., *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 69.
[18] Ibid., p. 69.

Chapter I

What is journalism?

Introduction

> *Every morning brings us the news of the globe, and yet we are poor in noteworthy stories. This is because no event any longer comes to us without already being shot through with explanation. In other words, by now almost nothing that happens benefits storytelling; almost everything benefits information.*
>
> – Walter Benjamin, ILLUMINATIONS

In the course of his attempt to define the self-posed question which entitles his essay – *What is journalism?* – Brian McNair offers some distinguishing features of journalism as information, including the straightforward statement that "journalism was born as a commodity for sale in the cultural marketplace," at the vanguard of exploiting "the technologies of text and image reproduction which drove the Enlightenment in early modern Europe."[1] For their part, in their explanation of the origins of journalism in Mediterranean Europe – including France, Italy, Spain –, Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini are firm in stating that "the media developed in Southern Europe as an institution of the political and literary worlds more than of the market."[2] And in the meantime, Mark Deuze opens his own essay – aptly titled *What is journalism?* – by declaring, plain and simply, that "journalism is and has been theorized, researched, studied and criticized world-wide by people coming from a wide variety of disciplines."[3]

Deuze's assertion is perhaps the only comprehensive statement that can be made about journalism, an arguably indefinable, uncertain, transmuting, multifarious, and extremely intricate object of inquiry. But although journalism in this sense – as a field of

[1] Brian McNair, "What is Journalism?" in Hugh de Burgh, ed., *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 28.
[2] Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini, *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics* (Cambridge University Press, 2004), p. 90.
[3] Deuze, "What is Journalism?" p. 442.

inquiry, an academic discipline, as 'journalism studies' – has been widely acknowledged,[4] it is strongly characterized by what Deuze calls its "lack of (international) consensus and disciplinary dialogue." To expose this deficiency, Deuze lists several contributing factors to the difficulties and challenges plaguing journalism studies, which shall be discussed at length in the last chapter of this dissertation. Among them are the difficult balance between industry and university (as seen in the work of G. Stuart Adam; David Skinner, Mike Gasher, and James Crompton; Enn Raudsepp; Stephen Reese); the "perceived clash of perspectives from scholars trained in the (critical) humanities with those in the social sciences" given that, for a long time, studies of journalism have taken place outside journalism, and for a large part, still do (as seen in the work of Barbie Zelizer); and the impossibility of generating a more or less consensual body of knowledge out of the existing literature, as lamented by authors like Manfred Rühl in Germany, or Michael Schudson in the USA.[5] As a result, citing a similar conclusion which formed the basis of the Journalism Studies Interest Group (JSIG) as part of the International Communication Association (ICA),[6] Deuze could only conclude that "it is therefore safe to say that many scholars, educators and students all over the world are involved in

[4] Deuze writes that "research about journalism and among journalists has been established as a widely acknowledged field, particularly in the second half of the 20th century," and that "worldwide one can find universities, schools and colleges with dedicated departments, research and teaching programs in journalism [the author cites as key the following international journals: *Journalism Quarterly*, *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, *Journalism Studies*; the following national journals devoted to journalism: *Australian Journalism Review*, *British Journalism Review*, *Ecquid Novi* (South Africa), *Brazilian Journalism Research*]." (p. 442)

[5] Ibid., p. 443.

[6] Started in the summer of 2004, the JSIC manifesto states: "The Interest Group is intended to facilitate empirical research and to bring more coherence to research paradigms, and in so doing to further support the professionalization of journalism studies and journalism education. Furthermore, while journalism is presently studied across the field, often the individuals behind these different research endeavors do not have a place to speak with each other." (p. 459)

journalism studies and education, but only rarely do their approaches, understandings or philosophies meet."[7]

At this point, the need to provide some crucial operational definitions becomes obvious. By journalism education, I am referring specifically to the imparting of technical skills of writing and reporting, and audio-visual/media production, as well as to its subset, "journalism studies," the theoretical and scholarly analysis of journalism and communication conducted in journalism schools within post-secondary educational institutions (universities). By journalism studies, in other words, I am referring specifically to the academic *study* of journalism, considering journalism as a field of inquiry to be studied using its own set of theoretical and empirical approaches, and situating the practice of journalism in its social, political, and economic contexts. The field of journalism studies claims to critically consider journalism as a practice of representation and signification, and problematizes the democratic ideals of the press, the economics of news production, journalism in a global context, depictions of race and gender, etc. But it is the definition of journalism itself which is rendered problematic, not only given its nebulous identity as a discipline and field of inquiry, but mostly because 'journalism' – an ideology, a profession, a craft, a trade, the act of collecting/writing/editing/presenting of news or news articles, a style of writing, to name but a few – signifies multiple realities and representations, especially where differences from one national-cultural context to another are considered.

Therefore, the first chapter of this dissertation consists of an attempt to rework the definition of journalism. It aims to problematize the nature of journalism by providing a brief history of the scattered and haphazard, unplanned, and largely unconscious and

[7] Ibid., p. 443.

accidental way journalism came into being by describing how journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication. Martin Conboy argues "that there is not and never has been a single unifying activity to be thought of as journalism; on the contrary, journalism has always been associated with dispute – dispute about its value, its role, its direction, even its definition."[8] Most importantly, "journalism has always been constructed as a diverse and multiple set of textual strategies, differing practices attempting to champion or challenge whatever has been the dominant version."[9] Therefore, this chapter provides a brief history of journalism by going into the forms of writing and publication out of which journalism emerged – the gazettes, corantos, mercuries, newsbooks, correspondence-based magazines, and so on – in order to show how newspaper writing is the articulation of many different traditions (the letter of reportage, the listing of facts, etc.).

The study of how journalism is the articulation of many different traditions will clearly establish the terms of discussion crucial to the remaining chapters of this dissertation, which aims to consider the historical complexity of the processes of professionalization in journalism, its systematic institutionalization as an intellectual endeavor, and the fact that there is not – and never has been – a single unifying activity defined as *journalism*. The examination of the problematic nature of journalism shall lead to the discussion in the second chapter of this work, which is concerned with how these complex processes came to shape this craft, trade or profession. While this chapter examines the forms of writing and publication out of which journalism emerged – the newsletters, news-ballads, relations, corantos, diurnalls, mercuries, newsbooks, and so on

[8] Conboy, p. 3.
[9] Ibid., p. 3.

– the next chapter will depart from the wide range of terms used to describe those who *engage* in its practice, from very early on: 'authors, curranters, mercurists, newsmen, newsmongers, diurnalists, gazetteers and (eventually) journalists.'[10] The chapter ultimately aims to provide a historical background for the second chapter of this dissertation, an examination of the materialization of the values and ideologies that structure Anglo-American journalism as a profession in the nineteenth century, and which still form the basis of its occupational norms today.

[10] Conboy, p. 23 / citing Harold Herd, *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: George Allen & Unwin), 1952, p. 12.

Origins

> *The American newspapers are the most base, false, servile, and venile publications that ever polluted the fountains of writing – their editors the most ignorant, mercenary and vulgar automatons that ever were moved by the continually rusty wires of sordid mercantile avarice.*
>
> – Harold Innis, EMPIRE AND COMMUNICATIONS

As mentioned previously, the first chapter of this dissertation aims to problematize the nature of journalism by providing a brief critical history of the scattered and haphazard way it came into being while describing how journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication. More specifically, it provides a discussion of the unsystematic emergence of English journalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the expression of multiple forms of communication, and concludes with the 'full establishment' of the daily newspaper in Britain in the eighteenth century. It is important to note that a history of journalism recounted in a chronological, linear narrative of "the breakdown of censorship and the evolution of political freedoms" is an exercise in futility, for as Martin Conboy argues, "the narrative is as much characterized by rupture as by continuity, by impediments to freedom of public expression as by public liberation."[11] Most importantly, journalism cannot be conceived as a "single unifying activity" but rather, "on the contrary, journalism has always been associated with dispute – dispute about its value, its role, its direction, even its definition."[12] Conboy notes that even "before the historical coining of the word journalism, we can identify aspects of a news culture and a struggle over the control of

[11] Conboy, p. 2-3. The author also cites Briggs and Burke's observation that the process is "more of a zigzag, 'noting particular moments in which access to information became narrower rather than wider' (2002: 4) as indicative of the more complex path of journalism's progress."
[12] Ibid., p. 3.

the flow of public knowledge" that has been "been characterized by a constant experimentation and has become inflected by many generic features and methods."[13]

Stuart Allan claims that although "difficulties in defining precisely what should count as a news account date back over 500 years," around the time the English word 'news' displaced the Old English notion of 'tidings' and "broadly assumed the meaning familiar to us today," the concept of news has always been in public use; it is safe to say that "it has its ultimate origins in the very development of language in oral or preliterate communities thousands of years ago."[14] Whether in the form of gossip, sermons, ballads or tales, spoken news was "an effective form of communication" helping "to sustain a shared sense of social order" between communities which "often had their own, usually highly ritualized, customs for disseminating news at a distance, typically relying on strategies such as messengers running relays, fires, smoke signals or the banging of drums."[15]

C. John Sommerville asserts that "the itch to hear news did not begin with periodical publication or with printing"[16] and Conboy discusses the oral transmission of news by messengers and in manuscript form long before the arrival of printing in Western Europe in the fifteenth century.[17] As well, Conboy highlights that prior to the formalization of communication in various forms of newsbooks and newsletters, at which point we can begin to identify certain characteristics of early journalism, all levels of society had been lubricated by the more informal exchange of information known as

---

[13] Conboy, page 3. The author notes further that "its formation is characterized by such variety and the recombination of communicative elements continues from the first naming of 'diurnalists' in the mid-seventeenth century to experiments with 'blogging' today."
[14] Stuart Allan, *News Culture* (Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press, 1999), p. 8.
[15] Ibid., p. 8.
[16] C. John Sommerville, *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 17.
[17] Conboy, p. 8.

rumour and gossip.[18] The immediate predecessors of the newspaper, according to Joseph Frank, were "a mixed breed," which included not only newsletters but ballads, proclamations, political tracts, and any other form of communication that at once "gratified and whetted the public appetite for news."[19] These various forms of communication – news-ballads and news-pamphlets, business and political newsletters – mixed informational content with strong narrative and entertainment values, allowing "much scope for repetition, variation on themes and plagiarism" given its irregular production, as news came slowly for periods of time and then in rushes.[20] Circulated and sold commercially since the fifteenth century, news-pamphlets, news-ballads, and newsletters, "are ample proof that the desire for the latest information, whether amusing or informational, was well developed in Western Europe even before the advent of printed news at all levels of society."[21]

In its formal guise, this desire for the latest information "must be one of humanity's characteristic traits and was long surrounded with artistic conventions," according to Sommerville.[22] Ross Eaman explains that these sporadically circulated broadside ballads of the sixteenth century – printed on coarse paper, filled with typographical errors, and utilizing primitive woodcuts – were composed by ordinary men

[18] Conboy, p. 6. The author also writes that "while the elites may have been able to communicate through charters, manuscripts, treaties, and proclamations, the majority of communication was oral. Unattributed and often scurrilous, gossip provided a vicarious involvement in the affairs of others, often of higher social status, and also provided a platform for discussion of a proto-democratic nature concerning the subjects of gossip and their alleged activities. Rumour lies beside the recorded facts of history and the latest reliable information of the news. Successful newspapers and magazines and other technological variants of journalism have always been able to match the intimacy of the kind of relationship shared by exchangers and recipients of rumour. It also shares with news an intrinsic popular appeal. Neubauer claims that 'rumour' has as its siblings 'news' and 'gossip' (1991: 1)."

[19] Joseph Frank, *The beginnings of the English newspaper: 1620-1660* (Harvard University Press, 1961), p. 2.

[20] Conboy, p. 8.

[21] Ibid., p. 8.

[22] Sommerville, p. 17.

and women keen on defaming someone's character, written down or printed by literate members of their circle, and then sung, recited, or otherwise made public among their neighbors.[23] In this manner, they also carried out what Sommerville calls a 'folkloric' function, fulfilling the need for narratives of moralizing heroism, with all the joys of rhyme, rhythm, melody, jokes and ornamentation.[24]

But when it came to the professional bard whose ballads dealt with news, this endeavor counted on the sponsorship of a patron or some sort of independently wealthy benefactor – a requirement even more applicable to the medieval and early modern chronicler.[25] A chronicler could write with several purposes in mind, according to D. R. Wolf: for the moral edification of the reader or for his entertainment; to preserve information or documents which might otherwise be lost; to demonstrate the hand of the divine in past times; or to communicate the news of recent great deeds to a select group of readers and honour them in posterity.[26] The lines between these categories are were not clearly defined, and most chroniclers could write with simultaneously different purposes; as an ensemble they constituted the quintessence of chronicle writing.[27] Eaman, in turn, draws a parallel between both the balladeer and the chronicler, in that the two were limited to what he either saw himself as an 'eyewitness' or was 'reported to him' and that, unlike the historian, the chronicler would not try to integrate the information he received into a single, uniform narrative, a characteristic which also generally distinguishes

[23] Ross Eaman, *Historical dictionary of journalism* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2009), p. 5-6.
[24] Sommerville, p. 17. The author adds that "such professional news tellers survived in France as late as the revolution – long after the advent of newspapers – because some classes of people preferred news with a certain style."
[25] Eaman, p. 6.
[26] D. R. Woolf, "Genre into Artifact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century," *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (1988), p. 323.
[27] D. R. Woolf, p. 323.

journalism from history.[28] The author also cites two medievalists who establish close ties between these early forms of news dissemination, which may be understood and referred to as 'journalism' and worth reproducing here: of the chronicler, William J. Brandt signals the emergence of a desire to satisfy a reader's curiosity in claiming that "every new page of the clerical chronicle was potentially, at least, a new beginning; interest, not relevance, was the criterion determining selection."[29] And the balladeer, according to Hyder Rollins, "fully understood the value . . . of dispensing news while it was news;" balladeers "were not trying to write poetry, or even ballads . . . they were writing news-stories and editorials."[30] Conclusively, citing D. R. Woolf, Eaman notes that the roots of journalism in the chronicle are suggested by the number of newspapers which today call themselves chronicles.[31]

C. John Sommerville points out "that the public, published news grew steadily through the sixteenth century" in the form of news "relations,"[32] defined by Joseph Frank as "the single pamphlet describing some topical event, often with lurid or partisan details."[33] Sommerville notes further that "such news 'relations' strained to find a market, with titles that sounded like headlines: *The Happiest Newes From Ireland That Ever Came to England; Since Their First Rebellion; Being the True and Ekact Relation of a Great Overthrow given by the Earle of Clanrickards Company, Decemb. 20. being 500.*

---

[28] Eaman, p. 6.
[29] William J. Brandt, *The Shape of Medieval History: Studies in Modes of Perception* (New York: Schocken Books, 1973), 65.
[30] Hyder E. Rollins, "The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad," *PMLA* 34, no. 2 (1919), 267–70.
[31] Eaman, p. 6.
[32] Sommerville, p. 19. The author mentions that "a quarter of all English publications from 1591 to 1594, for example, were devoted to current affairs. In the year 1590 alone there were thirty-eight English newsbooks concerning events in France, almost one a week devoted to that one country."
[33] Frank, p. 2. The author writes that "such 'relations,' which go back almost as far as Gutenberg, became more frequent and influential during England and on the continent they began to be superseded by more regular, if often less lively, periodicals of news.

Foot and 100. horse, to the tree great Rebels."[34] In contrast to the "organized market for private newsletters" (which shall be discussed later), it was "an unorganized market for printed news" which, according to Sommerville, accounted for such sensationalism: "printed news was chosen for its entertainment value and moral reflections rather than its realism or utility."[35]

This unorganized market was not only notable for the proliferation of printed news, but also in the many different forms which news was taking, including not only pamphlets and newsletters, but proclamations and ballads which dealt with plots, rumours, rebellions, battles and executions.[36] In effect, according to Conboy, ballads were often "informal news-sheets although they had more heroic and hyperbolic features compared to more official and licensed sources."[37] Moreover, the author points to the first known surviving news pamphlet – *Hereafter ensue the trewe encounter or Batayle lately done between Englande and Scotlande* about the Battle of Flodden, printed and disseminated in 1513 – and draws attention to the fact it also features "a woodcut illustration of troops preparing to fight in the battle," which he calls "an astute attempt to bridge its appeal between a literate readership and those whom [Tessa] Watt describes as on the fringes of literacy, enabling them to become involved in the cumulative process of cultural change."[38] Conboy proceeds to cite Watt's remark that "printed words were disseminated by word of mouth, transforming the culture of the 'illiterate', and the oral modes of communication shaped the structure of printed works." Most significantly, "the interesting process was not only the spread of literacy and readership, but the complex

[34] Sommerville, p. 19.
[35] Ibid., p. 19.
[36] Conboy, p. 17.
[37] Ibid., p. 17.
[38] Ibid., p. 9-10.

interweaving of the printed word with existing cultural practices."[39] Ian Atherton writes of a constant 'recirculation' of news, "a perpetual motion of news by word of mouth and in fresh newsletters"[40]

Along with ballads and relations and news-pamphlets, these newsletters were among the earliest forms of news dissemination, most especially regarding the provision of formal news which, according to Conboy, came at this time as private letters, not as a public discourse.[41] Commissioned by the wealthy and by aristocrats and senior clerics, they developed in great part thanks to the growth of private and state postal networks in the 16th century.[42] Eaman provides an example dating as far back as late 15th-century Italy, when Giovanni Sabadino degli Arienti of Bologna prepared a regular newsletter for Ercole d'Este, Duke of Ferarra.[43] The most famous form of these newsletters, according to Conboy, was developed in the sixteenth century by the Augsburg banking family, the Fuggers, in order to keep their agents informed of relevant developments which might have been of concern to the commercial and political interests of their business.[44] In addition, Frank points that the Fugger letters, which extend from 1568 until 1605, "contain much that is exciting and penetrating, while the letters of John Chamberlain provide an incisive if somewhat oblique commentary on the English scene for the first quarter of the seventeenth century."[45] In fact, the private newsletter writers in England of the 1590s – like the abovementioned John Chamberlain, along with Rowland Whyte,

[39] Tessa Watt, *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640* (Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History,1991), p. 8 [cited in Martin Conboy, p. 9-10.]
[40] Atherton, p. 44.
[41] Conboy, p. 7.
[42] Eaman, p. 217.
[43] Ibid., p. 8.
[44] Conboy, p. 7.
[45] Frank, p. 2.

John Pory, William Lock, Rev Larking, Rev Mead and others[46] – would come to be to be known as intelligencers.[47]

According to Richard Cust, these newsletters were originally "largely unformalized, consisting simply of news items sandwiched between personal and business correspondence in letters to friends or relations," a form of communication which continued "and probably remained the most common method for conveying written news."[48] Moreover, Ian Atherton writes that "newsletters were recopied in whole or part under varying controls, as well as passed around among groups of friends."[49] Atherton cites as an example the sharing of John Pory's newsletter by Sir Thomas Puckering and Sir Thomas Lucy; Puckering and Lucy split the cost of buying "separates,"[50] which took the form of transcripts or detailed reports of proceedings in parliament, state trials, advice to the crown, diplomatic negotiations, military campaigns and so on, according to Richard Cust.[51] In other words, "news was constantly recirculated, a perpetual motion of news by word of mouth and in fresh newsletters," and "the writing of newsletters was an accomplishment the gentry were expected to possess: a gentleman's handbook of 1616 included advice on the composition of *Letters of Newes*."[52]

---

[46] Conboy, p. 15.
[47] Eaman, p. 8. According to the author, however, by then "a new force was beginning to shape the production of news. Instead of being entirely dependent on the investment of governmental, organizational, or personal resources, news and journalism began to come under the influence of capitalism."
[48] Cust, p. 62.
[49] Ian Atherton, "The itch grown a disease: Manuscript transmission of news in the seventeenth century," *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism* 21, no. 2 (1998), p. 44.
[50] Atherton, p. 44.
[51] Cust, p. 62. The author notes further that: "As the newsletter developed and altered its form so too did the "separate." From providing an occasional account of a really notable public event in the late sixteenth century, it had been extended to cover almost anything which attracted the public interest; in particular, it provided the means for circulating the first public account of events in parliament, the proceedings and debates for 1628. Moreover, unlike the newsletter, which was by nature ephemeral and frequently open to correction, the "separate" was regarded as an authoritative record, and as such was copied into commonplace books and preserved in library collections. (p. 63)
[52] Atherton, p. 44.

More significantly, Joseph Frank singles out their regularity, mentioning that "the handwritten letter of news, commissioned by a person or group to whom the political and economic events of the day were matters of urgent importance – was quite common; and at least as early as 1568 a *regular* newsletter was sent out from London." (italics mine)[53] In addition, Eaman emphasizes that "regular intelligence" accounted for the preparation of handwritten newsletters for these "government officials, prominent individuals, bankers, and wealthier merchants;"[54] this 'regular intelligence' is a central constituent of the 'organized market for private newsletters' mentioned previously.

Referring to this 'regularity' as 'periodicity,' C. John Sommerville highlights its significance in the formation of journalistic practice, comparing its importance to the introduction of printing.[55] According to the author, "there is no evidence that any attention was given to creating a regular schedule for *printed* news" before 1600, and "the first hint of a commercial motive behind periodicity is found in the sixteenth-century almanacs that printed summaries of the previous year's events."[56] However, Sommerville notes "it took time to connect the newsletters' principle of regular intervals with the market for printed newsbooks."[57] Moreover, Michael Warner writes of a 'temporality of circulation' and credits "the appearance of newsletters and other temporally structured forms oriented to their own circulation" as "the *key development* in the emergence of modern publics." (italics mine)[58] The author refers to newsletters and other "regular and dated papers" – such as almanacs, annuals, essay serials – in terms of the 'developed

[53] Frank, p. 2.
[54] Eaman, p. 8.
[55] Sommerville, p. 161.
[56] Ibid., p. 19.
[57] Ibid., p. 19. The author credits the 'relations' with the origins of periodicity: "From 1590 to 1610 "relations" appeared in England, on average, about every two weeks, and they may, slowly have created an expectation of a regular schedule."
[58] Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (Zone Books, 2005), p. 66.

reflexivity' about their circulation, "both through their use of temporality and through the ways they allow discourse to move in different directions: I don't speak just to you; I speak to the public in a way that enters a cross-citational field of many other people speaking to the public."[59] This public *d'après* Michael Warner, "constructed on the basis of its metonymic embodiment in printed artifacts,"[60] forms the basis of the Habermasian Öffentlichkeit (public sphere), "a domain of our social life where such a thing as public opinion can be formed [where] citizens … deal with matters of general interest"[61] emerging as a vital part of modernity. Most important for our purposes here, the public sphere and the concepts of 'periodicity' and 'temporality of circulation' are crucial developments which inform the practice of journalism and shall be discussed independently and at length further on in this dissertation.

Though Ian Atherton asserts that "only a broad definition, from professionally written newsletters to ordinary correspondence that refers in passing to an item of news, can convey the wide range of manuscript sources of news in the seventeenth century,"[62] Richard Cust discusses the specific development of the "pure newsletter," which was "given over wholly to news, both domestic and foreign."[63] Most significantly, Cust notes that these "pure newsletters" were "the forerunners of the internal news-sheets of the 1640s and were in many cases being produced by an emerging class of semi-professional journalists who ranged from well-connected men of affairs, such as John Chamberlain to the sort of anonymous hack caricatured in Ben Jonson's 1620 play, *News from the New*

---

[59] Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, p. 66.
[60] Warner, *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America* (Harvard University Press, 1990), p. 62.
[61] Jürgen Habermas, "The public sphere" in Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit (eds) *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Anthology*, (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1982), p. 150.
[62] Atherton, p. 41.
[63] Cust, p. 62.

World,"[64] worth reproducing below:

> a factor of news for all the shires of England, I do write my thousand letters a week ordinary, sometimes twelve hundred, and maintain the business at some charge both to hold up my reputation with mine own ministers in town, and my friends of correspondence in the country. I have friends of all ranks and of all religions, for which I keep an answering catalogue of dispatch, wherein I have my puritan news, my protestant news and my pontifical news.[65]

According to Cust, it is possible to learn more about the more prominent members of this group, the aforementioned 'intelligencers,' by looking at their networks of correspondence – which "reveal much about the way provincial readers were kept in touch with public affairs," citing one case in point worth reproducing here:

> Sir John Scudamore in Herefordshire, for example, paid £20 a year for the services of John Pory, who was at various times a geographer, overseas adventurer and M.P., and who numbered among his contacts Archbishop Abbot, Sir Dudley Carleton, the earl of Warwick and two leading Warwickshire gentlemen, Sir Thomas Lucy and Sir Thomas Puckering.[66]

It therefore comes as no surprise that "in addition to their written output, these writers were also highly prized for the networks of contacts and sources which they developed in pursuit of their information."[67]

Hugh de Burgh writes that "as early as the 1500s the more important trading families of Europe such as the Fuggers and Rothschilds had already had their own private information networks," adding that "by the 1600s they were selling their news to other traders and by 1700 *Lloyds List,* a newspaper of business information, was established as

---

[64] Cust, p. 62-3. In describing the "emerging class of semi-professional journalists," the author cites: Holmes, "County Community in Stuart Historiography," p. 61; G. Cranfield, *The Press and Society* (London, 1978), pp. 5-10; W. Notestein, *Four Worthies* (London, 1956), pp. 29-119; *The Works of Ben Jonson,* ed. F. Cunningham and W. Gifford, 9 vols. (London, 1875), vii, p. 336.
[65] Ben Jonson, *News from the New World* / cited in Richard Cust, p. 63.
[66] Cust, p. 63. The author adds that "Scudamore also employed at least eight other correspondents during the 1620s and 1630s, including Amerigo Salvetti, the Tuscan envoy, Sir John Finett, the master of ceremonies at court, and Ralph Starkey, a London antiquary."
[67] Conboy, p. 15.

a commercial venture."[68] At this point, the concept of news can be seen "as something distinct from chronicle, story or record," and it is, therefore, at least 400 years old.[69] It is also at this point that we can speak of journalism "born as a commodity for sale in the cultural marketplace;"[70] in other words, news/journalism can be articulated in terms of consumption and production. Brian McNair writes that along with religious, scientific and pornographic texts which benefited from the printing revolution, journalism was "certainly in the vanguard" of cultural forms exploiting the technologies of text and image reproduction which drove the Enlightenment in early modern Europe.[71] But according to the author, this was the case

> even before print, when news was dispatched through the medium of handwritten letters as correspondence, journalists were suppliers of a commodity with, to use Marxian terminology, both use value (information about the world was needed for the pursuit of government and business, trade and war – journalism was *useful*) and exchange value (the price this information could command in a marketplace, when packaged and offered for sale as news). From the beginning the correspondence supplied by journalists depended on the existence of a market of paying customers who could read, or who had access to those who could read on their behalf.[72]

In other words, "news was increasingly being traded as a commodity in lubrication of other commodities" as these merchants depended on the provision of regular and reliable information.[73] As a result, "the means of transmitting this information was in the handwritten newsletters of the day" and we can begin to see the emergence of an information profession, as "what had begun as a family correspondence service for the wealthy had become professional newsletter writing."[74] Although the writers of these

---

[68] Hugh de Burgh, p. 27-28.
[69] Ibid., p. 27-28.
[70] McNair, p. 28.
[71] Ibid., p. 28. The author cites the work of Elisabeth Eisenstein (1983) here, as well.
[72] Ibid., p. 28-29.
[73] Conboy, p. 15.
[74] Ibid., p. 15.

letters were not yet referred to as journalists, Martin Conboy notes that many had started providing information services for particular families who had paid them well but the trade was so much in demand and so lucrative that they soon became fully professional, able to live off their intelligence distribution and employing scriveners to copy material for distribution to a widening clientele.[75] According to Ian Atherton, these news writers performed services other than news writing, as professionals like Pory and Flower "provided much more than a weekly newsletter," including a weekly package "the full contents of which are only sometimes incidentally mentioned: corantos, proclamations, copies of letters, bills of mortality, verses, banned books, pamphlets, books of masques, and foreign newspapers were all sent."[76]

The contents of these newsletters became precious, as information about war, disruption of routes of communication, disease, change of policy in foreign countries were all things which merchants needed to know about as quickly as possible.[77] Most significantly, Conboy writes that with the establishment of commodity capital, "possession of high quality news was every bit a matter of political and economic survival as it was a mark of status," and cites a point made by Jürgen Habermas in his thesis on the development of early news media in Europe: 'With the expansion of trade, merchant's market oriented calculations required more frequent and more exact information about distant events.'[78] Clearly, according to Conboy, changes in the flow of

[75] Ibid., p. 15. The author cites John Chamberlain, John Pory, William Lock, Rev Larking and Rev Mead as "the most prominent" of these writers.
[76] Atherton, p. 51-2.
[77] Conboy, p. 7.
[78] Habermas (1992: 16), cited in Conboy, p. 7.

information would have profound implications for the structure of society and the role of knowledge within that structure.[79]

As such, Conboy points to the complexity of the implications of the trade in news in early capitalism, and again cites Jürgen Habermas in explaining how they slowly "began to make themselves apparent in first reinforcing and then breaking open social patterns of communication," worth reproducing here:

> On the one hand this capitalism stabilized the power structure of a society organized in estates, and on the other hand, it unleashed the very elements within which this power structure would one day dissolve. We are speaking of the elements of the new commercial relationships: the traffic in commodities and news created by early capitalist long distance trade.[80]

Hugh de Burgh explains that the expansion of commerce in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries created a different demand; the most interested customers of all media were now the traders.[81] This is in stark contrast to medieval times, when "most trade had been dominated by the state, rural communities were self sufficient, cities tiny, artisans local and traders the appendages of royal and noble households, but this changed over the following centuries and there was a tremendous growth in business."[82] In addition to this growth in business, Martin Conboy mentions England's position towards the end of the sixteenth century, when it was becoming "a more dynamic economic nation and more prominent on the world stage."[83] According to the Conboy, its acquisition of colonies and its rise as a maritime power after the victory over Spain in 1588 "led to an increase in the commodity wealth in England and the corresponding rise of a commercial class to

[79] Conboy, p. 7.
[80] Habermas (1992: 15), cited in Martin Conboy, p.15.
[81] de Burgh, p. 27-28.
[82] Ibid., p. 27-28.
[83] Conboy, p. 15.

rival the landed aristocracy"[84] and Ian Atherton, moreover, asserts that "indeed, it was such struggles against Spain that had first stimulated the English appetite for news in the 1580s and 1590s."[85] In fact, Fritz Levy writes that "everything changed once the war with Spain became open," explaining that "from 1585, the desire for news and, correspondingly, the number of news pamphlets, increased rapidly."[86] As a result, an increased demand for all sorts of news ensued, but news could not yet be channelled through print media due to restrictions imposed by the Stationers' Company, and therefore this demand could not yet be channelled through print media.[87] Levy concurs that this demand was accompanied by the pressure of censorship, and points to the crucial role played by Stationers' Company as "nothing was to be published without first being entered in the Company's register, and the entries required licenses from the appropriate officials."[88] That said, Conboy points to the Stationers' Company undermined authority resulting from both this expanding market and the gradual increase in apprentice printers with no prospect of work in the trade once they had served their time. Drawn by economic necessity "to the printing of illicit material for which there was always a ready market and a good profit margin, this perspective of the trade was complemented by responses from readers."[89] Conboy cites Fred S. Siebert's eloquent description of the culture of print expanding its reach, as "the low rumble of the demand of the people to see, hear and to know what was gathering momentum."[90]

---

[84] Conboy, p. 15.
[85] Atherton, p. 43.
[86] Fritz Levy, "The Decorum of News," *Prose Studies* 21, no. 2 (1998), p. 17.
[87] Conboy, p. 15.
[88] Levy, p. 17.
[89] Conboy, p. 13-14.
[90] Fred S. Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776: The Rise and Fall of Government Control* (Urbana: IL: Urbana University Press, 1965), p. 87 / cited in Martin Conboy, p. 14.

Fritz Levy mentions that rumour – which he defines as "news passed on orally" – propagated rapidly despite governmental efforts at repression, and series of letters containing news also proliferated, notwithstanding the fear expressed by their writers." The author adds that "even the amount of printed news – the material most susceptible to the activities of the censor — began to grow," because, paradoxically, the government itself on some occasions seems to have found it useful.[91] Evidently, "the narrow dissemination of officially sanctioned information was at odds with the wider reality of the age which was that printed information was becoming widespread and increasingly difficult to police." Conboy adds that despite attempts of prohibition and restriction, printed news was commonly in circulation by the middle of the sixteenth century, noting that "where often medieval markets had provided the literal commodification of information and travelling hawkers and peddlers had long trod the routes which were to become more formalized paths of news dissemination, chapmen and mercury women facilitated the spread of print culture and news as part of it."[92]

As a result, according to Conboy, rumour remained the main source of communication which leaked from those in power, or with privileged access to power, throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries and it was profitable to those who dealt in it, despite the aforementioned early attempts to contain the information flow within the social and political elites.[93] That said, the unreliable reputation of the market which developed for the provision of such information was already drawing criticism, as early as 1591. As an example, Conboy cites a character in John Florio's *Second Fruits*

[91] Levy, p. 32.
[92] Conboy, p. 7. The writer adds that "often the sellers of mercuries or pamphlets were the wives or widows of printers."
[93] Ibid., p. 8.

cautioning: 'A man must give no more credit to Exchange news and Paul's news than to fugitives' promises and players' fables,' as well as and St Paul's Walk in London described by Bishop John Earle in 1628 as 'the eares Brother.'[94] Interestingly enough, Atherton writes that the problem was not only one of writing the news, but also one of audience, explaining that the circulation of news came in for criticism on two counts in the seventeenth century:

> The first was that the news had spread to the vulgar. Matters of state, once the *arcana imperil* restricted to those fitted by birth and education to a wise understanding of their intricacies, had become the common discourse of the masses. Shortly before the Restoration, the Earl of Newcastle bemoaned that "Every man now Is becomed a state man" and advised strict limitations on the circulation of the news. The common people were often considered intemperate and inconstant, unable to weigh up the significance of the news but swayed this way and that by each new report. The "vulgar," thought Rous, "judge of all things by events, not by discretion." Ben Jonson characterized their opinions as "a Babel of wild humours"; to the Earl of Arlington they were "licentious discourses." The second criticism was that the circulation of the news encouraged division and faction. Thomas Lushington complained that "Chronicle-News" was "the Talk of the Factious and Pragmatick"; as people stood "diverse in Religion, so they feign and affect different News. By their News ye may know their Religion, and by their Religion foreknow their News."[95]

Equally noteworthy, as Atherton points out, is the fact that the very people who criticized the spread of news were often also consumers or purveyors of news. The author cites a few examples of this apparent hypocrisy, such as the Bristol grand jury in 1682 presenting a number of news writers and newspapers for "infamous scandalous & seditious libels" and requesting the newspapers be burnt, then a few months later asking city council put an item of news in the *Gazette* "for the just vindicacon of this Court &

---

[94] H. R. Fox Bourne, *English Newspapers, Vols. 1 and 2* (London: Thommes/Routledge, 1998), p. 2; Joad Raymond, "The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere in the seventeenth century," in J. Raymond (ed.), *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain* (London: Frank Cass, 1999), p 115 / cited in Martin Conboy, p. 8.

[95] Atherton, p. 56. The author also includes "Ben Jonson's news hack in his 1620 masque, *Newes from the New World,* says: "I have friends of all rancks, and of all Religions, for which I keepe an answering Catalogue of dispatch; wherein I have my Puritan newes, my Protestant newes, and my Pontificial newes," previously reproduced in this dissertation.

consequently of this City" [sic]; there was also the Bristol town clerk, who had recently complained of newsletters in a coffee-house while subscribing to a newsletter service on behalf of the city corporation; or James I complaining of the circulation of news verses then seeking to command their disuse by issuing his own poem.[96]

But regardless of whether the news had spread to the vulgar, or news circulation encouraged division and faction, or for that matter, whether news were true at all, we cannot fail to note that "such exchanges are the earliest manifestation of the spaces between authority and the people in England which would lead to a public sphere of information,"[97] as Conboy points out. Atherton mentions that historians have recently taken up these criticisms in an argument about the role of the circulation of the news – and manuscript news in particular – in polarizing debate. The author mentions Richard Cust's argument that the news undermined contemporary rhetoric, which stressed harmony and consensus as the normal political modes, by emphasizing conflict and presenting politics as a process involving division and struggle. According to Cust, "the discourse of news helped to develop notions of adversarial politics and so contributed to a process of political polarization."[98]

In addition to the proliferation and circulation of printed news, Fritz Levy speaks of "the extraordinary growth of London, not only in terms of population, but as a centre for government, for conspicuous consumption, even for a national marriage market" as an equally significant factor behind the rise in speed of the proliferation of news. According to the author, "London was the centre of fashion, the place where well-connected young men spent the later years of their adolescence as students at the Inns of Court, where they

[96] Atherton, p. 58.
[97] Conboy, p. 8.
[98] Atherton, p. 56.

became accustomed to parading their finery at the Queen's Court and up and down the centre aisle of Paul's." In other words, "London was the market-place for all sorts of commodities, including the intellectual." Therefore, "London was the place to exchange news, and the Inns, the Royal Court, and Paul's were the three places where the exchange most often took place" and these precincts were haunted by old-timers like John Chamberlain. Levy also notes that "aspirants, the younger men, marked their status by the richness of their clothes and the quality of their inside information – as they later did by way of their knowledge of the arts and of science," and "only thus could the new men stay ahead of those still newer."[99]

Inevitably, Levy questions the extent to which these activities construct what has come to be called the "public sphere," and paraphrases the recent work of Alexandra Halasz, arguing that one of the necessary conditions for constituting a public sphere has been fulfilled by the existence of a market-place of print, stabilized by the Stationers' Company's regime of copyright, and regulating the relations between author, textual property, and a reading audience. Levy points out that "unlike Jürgen Habermas, whose conception of the public sphere, despite its abstractness and resemblance to a Weberian ideal type, nevertheless retains some air of physicality in positing actual meeting places, Halasz

> places her public sphere entirely within the realm of discourse. Such discourse is an abstract entity, a limitless source on which capital draws in order to produce textual property, a property then commodified by being put into as wide a circulation as possible to maximize profits. Such circulation is not free of constraints: the state, the church, the market, even an intimate private sphere all try to control the flow of textual property for their own ends. Instead of lying in an intermediary position between the sphere of the state and the private sphere, this

[99] Levy, p. 32.

> "public sphere is [not only] inseparable from state, market, and 'intimate sphere,' it is the medium of their interweaving."[100]

Levy proceeds to discuss the work of Douglas Bruster, who also calls for a distancing from the physicality of Habermas' 'conversations' towards constituting the public sphere "as a matter of language."[101] As such, Levy concludes that for both Halasz and Bruster, the pamphleteering of the late 1580s and 1590s, "served to expand the limits of print and, more especially, the sort of language permissible in print" and thus "the private had been made public through the medium of print" by people who came from, and wrote for, the middle orders of society.[102]

At any rate, these publications – news-ballads, relations, newsletters, etc. – spoke to an ever expanding audience thanks to the rapid incline in literacy levels throughout the 1600s. They were "available in towns and cities in bookshops and coffee houses, and sold in rural areas by hawkers and peddlers," bringing 'sex and scandal, fantasy, sensationalism, bawdiness, violence and prophecy to their readers: monstrous births, dragons, mermaids, and most horrible murders; but they also brought items of news.'[103]

Joseph Frank writes that in retrospect, the earliest printed weeklies were "the highly predictable offspring of a century of evolution." The author notes that "the postmasters of Europe's leading cities had long functioned as the men who collected the

---

[100] Alexandra Halasz, *The Marketplace of Print. Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), p. 163-169. / cited by Fritz Levy, p. 33.
[101] Douglas Bruster, "The Structural Transformation of Print in Late Elizabethan England," typescript sent to Levy by the author, p. 17. / cited by Fritz Levy, p. 33.
[102] Levy, p. 33-4. The authors cited by Levy point to the Marprelate tracts onward as a marker of the expansion of the limits of print, as well as "the sort of language permissible in print. By attacking the bishops in language hitherto used only for the personal, Martin Marprelate decoupled the decorum of language from the decorum of subject; and Thomas Nashe, by defending the *status quo* in similar language, only widened the gap further."
[103] Allan, *News Culture*, p. 10. The author cites: L. Craven, "The early newspaper press in England" in D. Griffiths (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of the British Press* (London: Macmillan, 1992), p. 3 / Boyce G., Curran, J. and Wingate, P. (eds.), *Newspaper History*, (London, Constable: 1978)

news in their areas and then forwarded it to such central transmission points as Venice, Rome, Vienna, Nuremberg, and Antwerp," concluding that "in short, the postmasters were a rudimentary press service."[104] Their modus operandi consisted of assembling a series of short paragraphs, each with a rubric specifying the place of origin and date in their dispatches when assembled in professional letters, and they retained both this method of collecting, and this manner of presenting, when the news began to be printed.[105] The *Mercurius Gallobelgicus*, a semiannual publication written in Latin ,and published in Cologne, was among the earliest of a number of these periodical summaries of news that began to appear in Europe in the late sixteenth century. Though the Encyclopedia Britannica dates this publication as far back as 1588,[106] while Frank to 1594, both sources refer to the periodical's forty-year career "of publicising and summarizing the diplomatic and military vicissitudes of the dying Holy Roman Empire." Frank also notes that even if it was not the earliest printed periodical of news, the *Mercurius Gallobelgicus* was the first to circulate in England, "where it achieved enough notoriety to call forth a derogatory epigram from John Donne." In turn, "the earliest journal of news to appear with approximately weekly regularity was published in Augsburg in 1600, though Amsterdam in 1607 may have been briefly able to boast some kind of weekly paper." But most significantly, "by 1620, under the stimulus of the

[104] Frank, p. 3.
[105] Ibid., p. 3.
[106] "**Mercurius Gallobelgicus**." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2010. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 17 Jul. 2010 <**http://0-www.britannica.com.mercury.concordia.ca/EBchecked/topic/375803/Mercurius-Gallobelgicus**> This entry also refers to the popular title "Mercury," the messenger of the gods, and adds that: Newspaper names like *Mercury*, *Herald*, and *Express* have always been popular, suggesting the immediacy or freshness of the reading matter. Other names, such as *Observer*, *Guardian*, *Standard*, and *Argus* (a vigilant watcher), stress the social role played by newspapers in a democratic society.

spreading Thirty Years' War, Amsterdam had become the centre of European journalism."[107]

Frank writes that "in addition, it became almost as easy for a publisher to synchronize his printed compilations with the weekly posts which now connected most of the major continental cities as it had been for him to synchronize them with the semi-annual trade fairs," as was the case with the *Mercurius Gallobelgicus*[108] and the first regular news digest, Michael von Aitzing's *Relatio historica or Messrelationen* (1588-93), a summary of political and religious news prepared for the biennial Frankfurt book fairs.[109]

In turn, it would naturally follow that these new weeklies be translated into different languages, in order to produce – and to supply – a potentially larger demand for news. Given that this step merely involved problems of literal translation, first from Latin, then from Italian, German, and Dutch, Frank points out "it required no change in the newspaper's content or format, no major enlargement of the one-man staff who normally assembled and edited the postmasters' reports."[110]

The Venetian republic would set a precedent by charging an admission fee of one *gazeta* (approximately three-fourths of a penny) to public readings of the latest news concerning the war with Turkey (1563), thus recognizing a commercial demand for news, even on the part of the illiterate.[111] Conboy writes that "the *Gazetta* of Venice was an indicator of the commercial and political anxieties engendered by a danger from a

---

[107] Joseph Frank, p. 2.
[108] Ibid., p. 3.
[109] Eaman, p. 9.
[110] Frank, p. 3.
[111] "**Mercurius Gallobelgicus**." Encyclopædia Britannica. 2010. Encyclopædia Britannica Online. 17 Jul. 2010 <**http://0-www.britannica.com.mercury.concordia.ca/EBchecked/topic/375803/Mercurius-Gallobelgicus**> This entry also mentions that "the term gazette was to become common among later newspapers sold commercially."

different source, the threat of invasion by the Turkish Empire." The primary purpose of this early news-sheet of modern times was to provide the merchant and political classes of Venice "with eagerly anticipated news of the perceived threat of the Turk to the whole of central Europe and the progress of the war being waged against them." According to Conboy, "they were at first handwritten from about 1536 but later, from about 1570, they made best use of print technology." As well, "their contents were read aloud in public arenas which mean that the contents were written partially with an ear for public performance and that the culture of the written word was more efficiently disseminated through alignment with older oral traditions."[112]

Stuart Allan makes the widespread claim that "many historians of the press have argued that the roots of the modern newspaper are most clearly discernible in the weekly news-sheets which originated in Venice close to the end of the sixteenth century (the first of which were still being written by hand)."[113] Historian of the press Joad Raymond, however, points to a contribution by a Scottish antiquary named George Chalmers circa 1790, who "using bibliographical evidence alongside literary satire, [he] traces the development of periodicity as the defining characteristic of the newspaper and sketches the parallel growth in the rest of the world with sensitivity to the distinction between

[112] Conboy, p. 11. The author concludes by stating that "less foreign trade and a more centralized monarchy," account for the fact that "developments in print culture and, in particular, its ability to deal with news were slightly slower than elsewhere on the Continent, which would explain how regular news in print arrived in England as late as it did in the early seventeenth century."

[113] Allan, *News Culture*, p. 10. The author adds that: "Referred to as a *gazette* after the name of the coin (*gazetta*) used to pay for a copy, they typically consisted of a single sheet of paper folded over to form four pages. These gazettes reported on events from across Europe, largely of a political or military nature, mainly by drawing upon the accounts of travelling merchants and diplomats. As their popularity grew, they began to expand in the range of their news coverage until, by the 1600s, they were beginning to resemble a form broadly consistent with today's newspaper."

printed and manuscript news."[114] Thus, according to Raymond, Chalmers commented that while Venice had entertained 'Gazetta' since 1536, these were not printed, as "a jealous Government did not allow a *printed* newspaper." Chalmers also "notes the appearance of *Mercurius Gallobelgicus* (which he dates incorrectly to 1605, rather than 1594), and claims that it is not a newspaper as it is both too large and too infrequent." Conclusively, Raymond cites Chalmers' proud writings about the *English Mercurie* of 1588, worth reproducing here:

> After inquiring, in various countries, for the origin of news-papers, I had the satisfaction to find what I sought for in England. It may gratify our national pride to be told, that mankind are indebted to the wisdom of Elizabeth, and the prudence of Burleigh, for the first news- paper. (...)
>
> Yet, we are told, that posts gave rise to weekly news-papers, *which are likewise a French invention* ... the *English Mercurie* will remain an incontestible [sic] proof of the existence of a printed news-paper in England, in an epoch, when no other nation can boast a vehicle of news of a similar kind.[115]

Joseph Frank, in turn, writes that "the direct ancestors of the newspaper devoted to English news were the Dutch corantos and then the newsbooks dealing with foreign events."[116] Frank begins his *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper: 1620-1660* with a first chapter entitled "The Un-English English Newspaper: 1620-1642," wherein, as mentioned previously, the author discusses the strategic positioning of Amsterdam as "the centre for European journalism."[117] According to the author, the year of 1620 marks the publishing of the first French newspaper in Amsterdam and, on December 2, the appearance of the first newspaper in English.[118] The "single sheet of small folio size, consisting of two columns of news on each side, in English" was brought out by an

---

[114] Raymond, "Introduction: Newspapers, forgeries, and histories," *Prose Studies,* Vol. 21, Issue 2, 1998, p. 2.
[115] George Chalmers, *The Life of Thomas Ruddiman* (London: John Stockdale; Edinburgh: William Laing, 1794), 1026, 108 / quoted in Joad Raymond, p. 2.
[116] Frank, p. 19.
[117] Ibid., p. 2.
[118] Ibid., p. 3.

ambitious and successful Dutch map-engraver named Pieter van den Keere, who kept in contact with English printers and booksellers he met in the days he had lived and worked in England.[119] In Amsterdam, van den Keere was involved in the printing and selling of news, and it was in his shop that this first English newspaper appeared. According to Frank, this **coranto** – defined by the author as "the term normally applied to these single-sheet compilation of news" – was usually given the title *Corrant out of Italy, Germany, &c.* [sic] Frank writes that between December 2, 1620 and September 18, 1621, van den Keere issued fifteen numbers of this paper which, while "not a weekly, the time between numbers ranging from four to forty-six days," did "approach a twice-monthly frequency and it was continuous."[120] C. John Sommerville, in turn, refers to the "very fugitive character of these productions" and while also referring to the fifteen other issues of this sheet which appeared by the following September and amount to about one issue every other week, points out that "the term varied from four to perhaps forty-six days, so that one would hesitate to call it periodical."[121] This perhaps accounts for Martin Conboy's dating of corantos all the way back to 1590, attributing their origin to printer and publisher John Wolfe, who was recruited by Lord Burghley, the principal Minister of the Queen, "to distribute translations of Protestant propaganda to Catholic countries such as France and Italy."[122] According to Conboy, it was then that Wolfe developed the first corantos translated into English, for example, *Credible Reportes from France, and Flanders. In the moneth of May. 1590* and experimented with the compilation of news

[119] Frank, p. 3.
[120] Ibid., p. 3. The author notes further that "in fact, the *Corrant*'s coverage of the Thirty Years' War during this period left no large gaps, and it was this war that was the major stimulus to the growth of the newspaper in western Europe."
[121] Sommerville, p. 23.
[122] Conboy, p. 16.

pamphlets in a series, albeit one which lacked regularity. Citing Richard Cust, Conboy writes that "they were above all profitable ventures and provided recipients with an increasingly detailed insight into current affairs, much of it provided by semi-professional journalists with a reputation for accurate reporting."[123]

C. John Sommerville writes that the term *coranto,* of course, refers to the 'current' of information that was provided, the 'stream' of consciousness that readers were entering.[124] Sommerville dates the first surviving coranto from among those produced in England to 24 September 1621; entitled the *Corante, or newes from Italy, Germany, Hungarie, Spaine and France,* "printed for N.B."[125] According to Joseph Frank, "N.B. was probably Nathaniel Butter, a man who had been involved in book-publishing since 1604, though Nicholas Bourne, another person who figures large in the early newspaper, is an alternate candidate."[126] At any rate, Sommerville writes that this coranto "was followed by at least seven more from the same source, translated from Dutch and German papers and allowed by license from king's council," with title lines remaining close to that original, despite variations in their spelling.[127]

Joseph Frank describes several characteristics of these Amsterdam-published English newspapers, which "certainly would not have been treasured because of their literary sparkle," in his view. Given that these corantos consisted largely of verbatim translation of Dutch periodicals, they were not tailored for a specifically English audience, and "the news was arranged in a haphazard fashion, presumably as it came into

---

[123] Cust, p. 69 / cited in Martin Conboy, p. 16.
[124] Sommerville, p. 22.
[125] Ibid., p. 22.
[126] Frank, p. 6-7. The author adds that "yet the name of Butter had been connected with some fifty relations of news in the early 1600s, and now it promptly called forth a series of predictable puns from various satirists."
[127] Sommerville, p. 22.

the publisher's office." In turn, "the publisher or his editor, if he bothered with one, made no attempt to integrate the various items, to provide continuity, or to avoid repetition." Having said that, "each number did manage to transmit, if only in their externals, the major political and military events that had occurred on the continent since the previous issue." Frank mentions that these corantos tended to be "plodding and impersonal," stylistically speaking, and "they lacked both highlights and human interest." According to the author, "the passive voice and impersonal "it," not to mention the editorial "we,' are thus by no means modern innovations." Frank provides an instance, from the first English newspaper, featuring the preliminary report on one of the major early battles of the Thirty Years' War, worth reproducing here:

> Out of Ceulen [Cologne], the 24 of November [1620]
>
> > Letters out of Neurenburghe . . . make mention, that they had advise from the Borders of Bohemia, that there had beene a very great Battel by Prage, between the King and the Duke of Beyeren [Bavaria], & many I000. slaine on both sides, but that Duke of Beyeren should have any folks with in Prage is in yet uncertaine … The cause that here comes no certainty thereof is this, That all passages are so beset, and so dangerous to travaile, that it is to [be] wondered at, & not enough to be written of, what roveing, spoyling and killing is done dayly upon all wayes.[128]

These single-sheet corantos, according to Frank, were able to print a large quantity of semiofficial news given their avoidance of "the personal and the poignant." They occasionally included "stories that had made their slow and hazardous way from Turkey or the East Indies," however "most of the news came from and was centered on central and western Europe." In terms of news quality, Frank mentions that "at least on the surface this news was generally accurate and rumors were usually labelled as rumors." Finally, according to Frank, "despite the handicaps of bad roads, mutual suspicion, and

[128] Frank, p. 4-5.

official secrecy, all made worse by war, the postmasters continued to do an efficient job of forwarding the news."[129]

Most significant, as mentioned previously, is the fact that "the most conspicuous feather of these first newspapers in English was their total avoidance of any news having to do with England."[130] According to Frank, they may have contained a few references to British soldiers serving in continental armies, or even briefly note the arrival of an English ambassador at a foreign court, but "the rest, as far as English news is concerned, was silence."[131] As a result, Frank notes that van den Keere's fifth number was shorter than the Dutch coranto from which it was translated, due to the fact that he deleted thirty-four innocuous lines concerning James's foreign policy. Conclusively, "these first English newspapers were, then, English only in language and point of sale, not in source or content."[132]

Meanwhile, Thomas Archer, an English bookseller, was trying his hand at serial news. Archer began issuing corantos sometime before August 1621, and while none of these first English-published newspapers has survived, contemporary letters indicate that they resembled their Amsterdam counterparts and that they came out at approximately weekly intervals.[133] Frank adds that Archer was in jail by mid-summer, "charged with having published an unlicensed news-sheet on the war in the Palatinate."[134] Sommerville notes further that Archer "was imprisoned for "adding to his corantos," the implication being that it might have been acceptable simply to translate the foreign papers."[135]

---

[129] Ibid., p. 4-5.
[130] Frank, p. 6.
[131] Ibid., p. 6.
[132] Ibid., p. 6.
[133] Sommerville, p. 22; Joseph Frank, p. 6.
[134] Frank, p. 6.
[135] Sommerville, p. 22.

Citing Frederick Siebert, Joseph Frank discusses the subsequent more successful attempt at starting a newspaper in England. Soon after the dismantling of Archer's presses, in September 1621, someone writing under N. B. "got licence to print them [corantos] and sell them, honestly translated out of the Dutch."[136] This certain N. B. proceeded to publish several corantos during those two months, "each an acknowledged translation of an Amsterdam journal" according to Frank. The author speculates that "N. B. was probably Nathaniel Butter, a man who had been involved in book-publishing since 1604, though Nicholas Bourne, another person who figures large in the early newspaper, is an alternate candidate." He writes that Butter was more likely the man in question, given that his name "had been connected with some fifty relations of news in the early 1600s, and now it promptly called forth a series of predictable puns from various satirists." Frank concludes by noting that if Butter was indeed N. B., "he and Archer share the honor of being England's first newspapermen."[137]

It was at this point that, according to Frank, the pioneer English newspaper began to transmogrify, leaving behind the traits of its Dutch origins.[138] According to the author, following a two to three month gap after the publication of these seven tentative corantos, in early 1622, N. B. – along with other booksellers and printers – modified the format in which the approximately weekly news again began to be printed.[139] Shifting from a single sheet of small folio size to a quarto pamphlet usually ranging from eight to twenty-four pages, all English newspapers began to be published in this semipamphlet form until

[136] Siebert, *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776*, p. 151 / cited by Joseph Frank, p. 6.
[137] Joseph Frank, p. 6-7.
[138] Ibid., p. 7.
[139] Ibid., p. 7.

the founding of the *Gazette* in 1665. They were viewed by readers "as 'books' of news; hence their title pages and their being *authored* rather than *edited*."[140]

Joad Raymond writes about the collaborative aspect of the production of newsbooks, which, like pamphlets, were produced by an editor, a printer and a publisher, each making a specific contribution to the newsbook's form, style and commercial success.[141] The dominant role in this "triadic relationship," according to Raymond, was taken by the publisher, "except in cases where the editor had a distinctive style or a considerable reputation."[142] Like N. B., however, most editors were anonymous; Raymond points out "they were editors rather than authors"[143] in contrast to Joseph Frank's previously mentioned statement that newsbooks were viewed by readers as authored rather than edited. Regardless, and most significantly, Raymond notes that titles of individual newsbooks, by which readers distinguished between them, could therefore be associated with either publishers or editors, and that as these men and women established their credentials, they would frequently face competitors who would steal their titles and imitate their typography in order to profit from the markets they had developed.[144]

According to Nicholas Brownlees, newsbooks replaced corantos as the principal form of periodical printed news in late 1641.[145] The author notes that despite having the same format as the small quarto corantos of the two previous decades, two important aspects distinguished newsbooks from their predecessors: first, their periodicity of

---

[140] Frank, p. 7.
[141] Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks,1641-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 22.
[142] Ibid., p. 22.
[143] Ibid., p. 22.
[144] Ibid., p. 22.
[145] Nicholas Brownlees, "Spoken Discourse in Early English Newspapers" in *News networks in seventeenth century Britain and Europe*, edited by Joad Raymond (Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 74.

publication was much more constant, and second, their printed news included not only foreign events but domestic matters as well.[146] Brownlees also notes that while the very significant inclusivity of domestic news is often attributed to the breakdown of the censorship regulations, it only partially explains "the advent of periodical home news reportage: apart from a loosening of censorship, one also needs to recognize the willingness of parliamentarians to exploit the possibilities of periodical news publications for their own purposes."[147]

This disposition to exploitation on the part of the parliamentarians is discussed at length by Joseph Frank, who talks of a "collateral ancestor" to the Dutch corantos and the newsbooks dealing with foreign events which turns out to be "eminently native." Going back to early 1621, the year in which the first English-printed corantos appeared and Parliament reconvened after a seven-year hiatus, Frank notes that "James not only had increasing trouble with this Parliament, but his privy council was kept busy trying to curtail the widespread attacks in pamphlet and pulpit on his apparent ally the king of Spain."[148] The author writes of the "public's growing concern over a foreign policy that seemed anti-Protestant," which explains why "interest in both the dramatic events of the Thirty Years' War overseas and the verbal battles at Westminster rose to an unprecedented high."[149] Consequently, Frank notes that "at about the same time that Thomas Archer was jailed for printing foreign news, the professional writer of domestic news was getting his start: not the man who penned newsletters for a single patron or a

[146] Ibid., p. 74.
[147] Ibid., p. 74.
[148] Frank, p. 19.
[149] Ibid., p. 19.

small group, but the scrivener who, at approximately weekly intervals and for a fee, sent out large numbers of handwritten reports."[150]

Joad Raymond refers to a "commercial roller-coaster" when writing of "the rapid turnover in titles and the intervention of more publishers," as William Cooke, Nathaniel Butter, Humphrey Blunden, Robert Bryson, Humphrey Tucker, Thomas Banks, Francis Leach, and George Thompson had all published newsbooks in January of 1622.[151] Raymond describes these newsbooks as "fairly homogenous, cheaply produced pamphlets of parliamentary news" which differed in their quality of news-gathering, which he attributes to their editors – who, while "inadvertently inventing a new profession, did not yet intervene to produce a journalistic style."[152] Significantly enough, the author explains that "the term 'journalism' is thus somewhat anachronistic, though it does suggest the amorphous variety of practices used by the newsbook editors of the time."[153] Raymond explains that "manuscripts of parliamentary news had circulated for some time, and this material was sent to the printers largely unaltered, perhaps simply cut to size," but "the first real effort to produce a distinctive periodical was made by Humphrey Blunden (or his editor) who for the week 10-17 January [1642] produced *A True Diurnall of the Last Weeks Passages* in Parliament."[154] This title set it apart from the various *Diurnall Occurrences* on the market, and "it was the first newsbook to have consecutive pagination, signatures, and issue numbers: consecutive signatures, used for larger books,

[150] Frank, p. 19.
[151] Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks,1641-1649* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), p. 22.
[152] Ibid., p. 22.
[153] Ibid., p. 22.
[154] Ibid., p. 22.

assisted binders in placing material in the correct order: this implied that newsbooks would be collected and bound as a set. Some readers took the hint."[155]

Joseph Frank writes that these earliest newsbooks were closer to the modern newspaper than the corantos in two significant ways:

> First, their title pages anticipated today's headlines both by synopsizing, even if at excessive length, the leading stories in that issue and by tending to emphasize the more sensational items. Second, the hand of an editor, though it was a very faint hand, can begin to be seen. Thus in one instance the English editor accused his foreign rivals (and sources) of "shameless exaggeration"; in another he announced that he thought it a good idea "to muster the Newes, which belongs to the same place, as it were into one Armie" so that the reader would "receive the occurrences all together"; in a third he complained about the large number and contradictory qualities of reports from abroad.[156]

In addition, Brownlees mentions that "the plethora of newsbooks published during 1641-1660, and particularly those published during the Civil War years of 1642-1648, offer an immeasurably greater range of style than that provided by corantos." Most significantly, the author discusses their stylistic diversity, which incorporates the use of spoken discourse:

> The most common genre involving the use of direct speech is narrative. In the reporting of speech presentation in narrative one finds in descending order of frequency: reported speech, reported speech and direct speech combined, and direct speech alone. (…) Apart from narrative, direct speech is also found in the reporting of parliamentary proceedings, speeches of political personages, religious address and liturgy, public confessions of criminals and other assorted ill-doers, politically inspired dialogue newsbooks, and court proceedings. In these contexts

[155] Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper,* p. 22.

[156] Frank, p. 7-8. Earlier on, the author notes that: "Though the public may have viewed them as books, people were still greedy for current news of the Thirty Years' War. Butter and his colleagues took advantage of this. Between May and October 1622 they issued their unnumbered and variously titled newsbooks at the rate of about two a week. Together these approximately forty newspapers constituted an adequate narrative of what was happening on the continent. Indeed, besides much repetition in successive issues, they constituted more than one narrative, since during the middle of 1622 there were at least two competing series. Yet in style and content these competing papers were not only very like one another but, except for the change in format, very like the Dutch corantos from which they continued to derive the bulk of their news. Perhaps for the London market a little more of a Protestant bias was allowed to show, but under the sharp scrutiny of the censor English news remained taboo."

> the language reported can range from the highly formulaic to the much more personal.[157]

Regarding content, Martin Conboy points to a significant distinction between the newsbooks – and the corantos before them – from previous literary forms "in that they claimed to be composed of facts," in contrast to "ballads, poems and pamphlets [which] were allowed great latitude (…) a reflection of their more entertaining and provocative purpose."[158] Moreover, Conboy notes that this new factual discourse was not rooted "in the eternal truths and symbols of religion" but rather in what Daniel Bell terms the 'Absolute Present' "of discrete, closed narratives, fixed in specific times and places and having a claim to authenticity and reliability," clearly seen in this excerpt from the *Mercurius Britannicus*, issue of June 28, 1625: "For I translate onely [sic] the Newes verbatim out of the Tongues or Languages in which they are written, and having now skill in Prognostication, leave therefore the judgement to the Reader, & that especially when there are tidings which contradict one another."[159]

It is also worth mentioning that mistrust and criticism of this 'higher purpose' of fact-centred discourse dates all the way back to this era. Eaman notes that commentators worried about the impact of news on society long before it was available on a daily basis, citing the "long tradition of criticizing journalists for their unreliability" in Elizabethan England, begun by bishop Joseph Hall and playwright Ben Jonson.[160] In Jonson's *News from the New World* (1620), commended for remaining "for at least a century the most thorough English analysis of newsreporting," an imaginary newswriter laments "I have

---

[157] Brownlees, p. 74-75.
[158] Conboy, p. 21.
[159] Ibid., p. 21 / citing Daniel Bell, *The Cultural Contradictions of Capitalism* (New York: Basic Books, 1976), p. 48.
[160] Eaman, p. 14. / citing Mark Muggli, "Ben Jonson and the Business of News," *Studies in English Literature*, 1500–1900 32, no. 2 (1992), p. 336.

been so cheated with false revelations in my time that I have found it a harder thing to correct my book than to collect it."[161] Eaman notes further that "newsbooks were subjected to particularly scathing criticism for their debased literary quality, for being "paper bullets" leading to civil war, and for engendering a so-called crisis of eloquence," citing Joad Raymond's account of their rejection by contemporary historians as "speech acts with doubtful or collective authorship, questionable accuracy, seditious intent, and no vocal guarantee."[162] Eaman concludes by citing a verse by popular royalist poet John Cleveland, entitled *Character of a London Diurnall* (circa 1644), worth reproducing here: "A *Diurnall* is a puny Chronicle, scarce pin feather'd with the wings of time."[163]

Finally, in the words of Ian Atherton, "news was a problematic form of knowledge in the seventeenth century, causing problems of writing and problems of audience," as "the affinity between truth and falsehood in the news was a complex one, and the news was often held to be unreliable."[164] Atherton notes further that "the relationship between fact and fiction was a central literary problem of the seventeenth century, and the development of English newspapers has been placed in the context of the breaking down of the epistemological barrier between knowledge and opinion."[165]

In summation, as Martin Conboy writes, "journalism has been formed by the convergence of many miscellaneous elements over several centuries and the variety of practices and the complexity of relationships between new writers and the publications they wrote for even at this early point were manifest in the range of different names by which they and their output was described: 'authors, curranters, mercurists, newsmen,

---

[161] Eaman, p. 14.
[162] Ibid., p. 14. / citing Joad Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 287.
[163] Ibid., p. 14. / as quoted in Raymond, *The Invention of the Newspaper*, p. 276.
[164] Atherton, p. 48.
[165] Ibid., p. 48.

newsmongers, diurnalists, gazetteers and (eventually) journalists' (Herd, 1952: 12) wrote Corantos, Relations, Newes, Posts, Gazettes, Proceedings, Accounts, Passages and Diurnals and the seventeenth century saw a great variety of descriptions for the phenomenon of news, occurrences, intelligences, advices, advertisements."[166] Conboy notes that, most significantly "amidst all of the generic experimentation, [is] the crucial component that these regular printings of news and opinion on contemporary affairs were written for profit, in a regular cycle of periodicity." In other words, "news was a commodity which was created according to the perceived demands of specific readers and survived or failed on the accuracy of its perception of an audience."[167]

[166] Conboy, p. 23 / citing Harold Herd, *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: George Allen & Unwin), 1952, p. 12.
[167] Ibid., p. 23.

Chapter II

Professionalism: Objectivity and Journalism's Occupational Ideology

Introduction

> *In this question, therefore, there is no medium between servitude and license; in order to enjoy the inestimable benefits that the liberty of the press ensures, it is necessary to submit to the inevitable evils that it creates.*
>
> – Alexis de Tocqueville, DEMOCRACY IN AMERICA, VOL. I

While the first chapter of this dissertation problematizes the definition of journalism by providing a brief critical history of the scattered and haphazard way it came into being, the second chapter of this work is concerned with the complex processes which came to shape this craft, trade or profession. As noted previously, journalism is the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication, evident in the wide range of terms used to describe those who engage in its practice, from very early on: 'authors, curranters, mercurists, newsmen, newsmongers, diurnalists, gazetteers and (eventually) journalists.'[1] This portion of the dissertation is solely concerned with the latter, for journalists are not only a product of the unsystematic emergence of English journalism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries as the articulation of many genres and traditions, but also, and equally significantly, as this chapter will demonstrate, "a product of a number of other influences from the late nineteenth century," in the words of Barbara Kelly.[2] According to the author, "by 1900 the terms *journalist* and *journalism* had become synonymous with news-gathering and reporting, rather than with diarists and diaries, daybooks and record keepers, as in the nineteenth century."[3] The author notes further that the term derives from the Latin word for "daily" (*diurna*, which the French

[1] Conboy, p. 23 / citing Harold Herd, *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day* (London: George Allen & Unwin), 1952, p. 12.
[2] Barbara M. Kelly, "Professionalism, 1900-1950," *Fair and Balanced*, p. 154.
[3] Ibid., p. 155.

modified to '*jour*') and had "originally defined the individual who gathered, organized and printed the news of the day."[4]

It is the process of turning this individual into a professional – or not – that is of interest here. This is a very difficult undertaking, because although professionalism has been an important concept to Anglo-American journalists for over a century, "there is a remarkable lack of consensus about what concepts like profession, professionalism, and professionalization mean in journalism" according to Randal Beam.[5] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis agree that "classifying the occupation of journalism is never an easy task," and point to the complicated fact that "from the nineteenth century, when the processes of professionalization began for journalism, until the present, a debate has raged as to whether journalism is a craft, a trade or a profession."[6] Kenneth Starck and Anantha Sudhaker draw attention to the fact that "researchers' opinions regarding the attributes of journalism professionalism, or what constitutes a professional and what does not, have been less than unanimous, and discussion of the subject occasionally has been acrimonious."[7] Highlighting the lack of dialogue between the disciplines operating in this area, Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson note that "the field of journalism studies and the subfield of sociology that examines professionalization and professional systems — the sociology of the professions— have coexisted in a state of mutual indifference for

[4] Barbara Kelly, *Professionalism*, p. 155. The author proceeds to remark that "by 1920, this was no longer the work of any one individual, having been broken down into its component parts. The owner/printer became the owner/editor, then the owner/publisher as the news became an industry."
[5] Randal Beam, Monographs, p. 1.
[6] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "Journalism and the Making of a Profession" in *Making Journalists*, p. 58.
[7] Kenneth Starck and Anantha Sudhaker, "Reconceptualizing the Notion of Journalistic Professionalism Across Differing Press Systems," *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 4, no. 33 (1979), p. 33.

decades."[8] In addition, John Soloski notes that while "much ink has been spilled over arguments about whether journalism is a bona fide profession," even "more ink has been used by scholars who have attempted to identify the criteria that make an occupation a profession."[9] In sum, different disciplines hold disparate views about what the journalistic occupation consists of, and what constitutes a profession in the first place – and to make matters worse, there is virtually no interaction between them. For instance, Marianne Allison opens her literature review of approaches to the professionalism of journalists by asserting that "there is a great deal of discussion in the occupational sociological literature about what occupations qualify as professions, and what occupations are doing or might do to obtain professional status."[10] In turn, Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts explain that "the episodic debate about modes of occupational control in journalism has persisted with an implicit model of professionalism as a set of professional 'traits' that was abandoned by sociology thirty years ago."[11]

Thomas Hanitzsch establishes a crucial distinction between *professionalism* and processes of *professionalization* in early comparative research in journalism studies on professionalism and processes of professionalization. The author notes that both terms were often used interchangeably, although they clearly have conceptually different meanings. "Professionalism," writes Hanitzsch, "is something that journalists embrace or pursue, while professionalization refers to a process of an occupation gradually becoming

---

[8] Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson, "Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism" in Thomas Hanitzsch and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, eds., *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (London: Routledge, 2008), p. 88.
[9] John Soloski. "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News" in Dan Berkowitz, ed., *Social Meanings of News: A text-reader* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), p. 138-9.
[10] Marianne Allison, "A Literature Review of Approaches to the Professionalism of Journalists." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 1, No. 2 (Spring/Summer 1986), p. 5.
[11] Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts. "Rethinking the concept of professionalism: the case of journalism." *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, Issue 4 (December 2003), p. 548.

a true profession."[12] This chapter takes this distinction as a point of departure, and starts out with the conceptualization of journalism's professional/occupational ideology by looking at Mark Deuze's 'five ideal-typical values' (public service, objectivity, autonomy, immediacy, ethics). These discursively constructed ideal-typical values, as the author notes, offer a summary of the key characteristics of this professional self-definition.[13] The thesis then focuses on the emergence of objectivity, which is at the core of Anglo-American journalism's "powerful occupational mythology," to borrow from Aldridge and Evetts.[14] It then discusses how this 'objective' ethic, along with the commercial rise of a mass press, are the key contributing factors to the rising sense of journalism as a profession, as indicated in the remaking of the term *journalist* at the turn of the nineteenth century. And in the process, finally, both the modern principle of objectivity in Anglo-American journalism and the rise of professionalism are situated within the major shifts in technology, economics and beliefs brought forth by the Industrial Revolution as an aspect of modernism, marked by the spread of reforms and social change.[15]

[12] Hanitzsch, "Comparative Journalism Studies" in *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, p. 416.
[13] Deuze, "What is journalism?" p. 446.
[14] Aldridge and Evetts, *Rethinking the concept of professionalism: the case of journalism*, p. 547.
[15] Kelly, p. 147.

Professionalism: Objectivity and Journalism's Occupational Ideology

> *Early in life I had noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper.*
> – George Orwell

> *The genius of professionalism in journalism is that it tends to make journalists oblivious to the compromises with authority they routinely make.*
> – Robert McChesney

> *Objective journalism is a contradiction in terms.*
> – Hunter S. Thompson

As mentioned previously, this chapter departs from the conceptualization of journalism's professional/occupational ideology by looking at Mark Deuze's 'five ideal-typical values' (public service, objectivity, autonomy, immediacy, ethics), prior to focusing on the role of objectivity, always at its core. Deuze establishes that "in decades of journalism studies, scholars refer to the journalists' professionalization process as a distinctly ideological development, given that the emerging ideology served to continuously refine and reproduce a consensus about who was a 'real' journalist, and what (parts of) news media at any time would be considered examples of 'real' journalism."[16] The author explains the significance of "conceptualizing journalism as an ideology (rather than, for example, other options offered in the literature such as a profession, an industry, a literary genre, a culture or a complex social system) primarily means understanding journalism in terms of how journalists give meaning to their newswork."[17] Having said that, I consider this professional meaning-making practice which Deuze refers to as 'occupational ideology' as *professionalism*, in the Hanitzsch sense discussed in the introduction to this chapter: as 'something' that journalists embrace

[16] Deuze, "What is journalism?" p. 444.
[17] Ibid., p. 444.

or pursue, which is at once equated with objectivity, as this chapter will demonstrate. Again, this is not to be confused with *professionalization*, the subject of the third chapter of this dissertation, defined for our purposes as the process of an occupation gradually becoming a true profession.

Following a brief overview of the literature in journalism studies which speaks of 'journalism's occupational ideology,'[18] Deuze signals its failure to "make explicit what this ideology consists of, other than claiming it contains 'self-contradictory oppositional values' (Reese, 1990)."[19] In the particular context of journalism as a profession, ideology is seen here "as a system of beliefs characteristic of a particular group, including – but not limited to – the general process of production of meanings and ideas (within that group)."[20] It is also "seen here as an (intellectual) process over time, through which the sum of ideas and views – notably on social and political issues – of a particular group is shaped, but also as a process by which other ideas and views are excluded or marginalized."[21] Deuze summarizes a few key approaches to the meaning-making practices of journalism's occupational ideology, from "a 'strategic ritual' to position oneself in the profession vis-à-vis media critics and publics," as seen in the sociology-

[18] Deuze (p. 444) cites the major scholars and their terms of discussion in the past four decades or so: Philip Schlesinger in *Putting 'Reality' Together* (London: Methuen, 1978) writes about 'newsmen's occupational ideology'; Peter Golding and Philip Elliott in *Making the News* (London: Longman,1979) speak broadly of 'journalism's occupational ideology'; John Soloski in "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News," *Media, Culture and Society* (Vol. 11, Issue 4, 1990) talks, a decade later, about an 'ideology of professionalism'; Barbie Zelizer in 'When Facts, Truth and Reality are God-terms: On Journalism's Uneasy Place in Cultural Studies' in *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* (Volume 1, Issue 1, 2004a) mentions 'journalists' professional ideology.'

[19] Ibid., p. 444. The author is citing a seminal work by Mitchell Stephens, *A History of News* (New York: Penguin: 1988).

[20] Ibid., p. 445.

[21] Ibid., 445-6. The author proceeds to draw a distinction between this notion of ideology in the more Marxist sense of the term, writing that "although the notion of a 'dominant' ideology (or 'dominant discourses' through which the ideology is perpetuated) denotes a worldview of the powerful, the term is chosen here not in terms of a struggle, but as a collection of values, strategies and formal codes characterizing professional journalism and shared most widely by its members. This ideology is generally referred to as a dominant way in which news people validate and give meaning to their work."

based work of Gaye Tuchman, to "an instrument in the hands of journalists and editors to naturalize the structure of the news organization or media corporation one works for," as seen in the political economy-based work of John Soloski. "In short," writes Deuze, "there seems to be a consensus among scholars in the field of journalism studies that what typifies more or less universal similarities in journalism can be defined as a *shared occupational ideology* among news-workers which functions to self-legitimize their position in society." (italics mine) And although "scholars are comfortable to refer to journalism as an occupational ideology, the distinct building blocks of such an ideology are sometimes left to the imagination of the reader." Finally, Deuze draws attention to the fact that "some scholars tend not to venture much further than an acknowledgement that there exists a professional ideology and that it is not a 'set of things' but an active practice and that it is continually negotiated (Reese, 1990)."[22] It is in this context that Deuze identifies the core characteristics of this ideology, which, according to the author, can be located in the concept and historical development of journalism professionalism. These discursively constructed ideal-typical values, as Deuze notes, offer a summary of the key characteristics of this professional self-definition and are worth reproducing here:

- Public service: Journalists provide a public service (as watchdogs or 'news-hounds', active collectors and disseminators of information);
- Objectivity: Journalists are impartial, neutral, objective, fair and thus credible;
- Autonomy: Journalists must be autonomous, free and independent in their work;
- Immediacy: Journalists have a sense of immediacy, actuality and speed (inherent in the concept of 'news');
- Ethics: Journalists have a sense of ethics, validity and legitimacy.[23]

[22] Ibid., p. 446.
[23] Ibid., p. 446.

Deuze then proceeds to briefly analyze each category, and then investigates these values in terms of how they are challenged and/or changed in the context of current cultural and technological developments, which is the ultimate purpose of his article (to offer a reassessment of the professional identity and ideology of journalists). In turn, for the purposes of the work in this chapter, which aims to provide an analysis of *professionalism*, I shall focus on the emergence (and role) of objectivity, the central force which governs and structures journalism's occupational ideology. Deuze's five ideal-typical values outlined above are essentially one, rooted in the overarching journalistic value of objectivity, which "stands out as the unchallenged commonsenses of journalists, politicians and public."[24] Richard Kaplan writes that "the ethic of objectivity has long been seen, at least within the United States, as the single best ideal for the operation of media in modern democracy." Characterized by "its refusal of interpretation, its critical distance from all authorities, and its elevation of 'balance,' objectivity operates as something akin to the lifeblood of the US press."[25] Finally, journalism historian David Mindich has memorably noted that "if American journalism were a religion, as it has been called from time to time, its supreme deity would be 'objectivity'."[26]

According to Dan Schiller, "it is objectivity that protects journalists in the role as 'the strongest remaining bastion of logical positivism in America' (Gans 1979: 184), and whose scientistic aura sets up a formidable barrier to comprehension of actual news

[24] Richard Kaplan, "The Origins of Objectivity in American Journalism" in *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2010), p. 26.
[25] Ibid., p. 26.
[26] David T. Z. Mindich, *Just the Facts: How "Objectivity" Came to Define American Journalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1998), p. 1.

values."[27] As a result, in Schiller's view, "news remains credible in its insistence that, in ideal principle, it animates and displays no values whatsoever."[28] Furthermore, James Carey writes that "with the rise of 'objective reporting' in the latter part of the nineteenth century, the journalist went through a process that can be fairly termed a 'conversion downwards,' a process whereby a role is de-intellectualized and technicalized." According to Carey, "rather than independent interpreters of events, journalists became reporters, brokers in symbols who mediated between audiences and institutions, particularly but not exclusively government." He notes that in this role, "they lose their independence and become part of the process of news transmission," and "they principally use not intellectual skills as critics, interpreters, and contemporary historians but technical skill at writing, a capacity to translate the specialized language and purposes of government, science, art, medicine, finance into an idiom that can be understood by broader, more amorphous, less educated audiences."[29] Sociologist Gaye Tuchman shares this view, writing that "rather than stress facts, journalists such as Walter Lippmann invoked the importance of the *methods* used to gather facts." (italics original) Tuchman notes that "by stressing methods – gathering supplementary evidence, presenting conflicting truth-claims, imputing facts through familiarity with police procedures, and using quotation marks, to name some techniques analyzed earlier – newsworkers produced a full-blown version of the *web of facticity*"[30] (italics mine), a concept

---

[27] Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, *The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), p. 197 / The author cites Herbert J. Gans, *Deciding What's News: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time* (Northwestern University Press, 1979), p. 184.
[28] Schiller, p. 197.
[29] James Carey, "The Communications Revolution and the Professional Communicator" (first published in 1969), in *James Carey: A Critical Reader*, ed. Eve Stryker Munson, Catherine A. Warren (University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 137.
[30] Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study of the Construction of Reality* (New York, London: The Free Press, 1978), p. 160.

previously explained by the author as "to flesh out any one supposed fact one amasses a host of supposed facts that, when taken together, present themselves as both individually and collectively self-validating."[31] Tuchman notes that "the task of the news media and newsworkers, conveying information, remained the same," but "their interpretation of that task was now radically different: not only must newsworkers be factual but facts must also be fair."[32] This is highly problematic, for in this sense, as Todd Gitlin remarks that anything could be news,

> for news is what news-gatherers working in news-processing organizations say is news. Therefore, it is historical and contestable; all deep social conflicts are in part conflicts over what is news. Despite the widespread claim that objectivity in news is possible, any attempt to exact a general definition of news – a routine, universalizable definition – comes to naught. Ask a reporter what is news and one is likely to elicit vague references to 'what is important' or 'what is interesting' or 'what is new.'[33]

Naturally, scholarship on the emergence, influence, definition, and magnitude of objectivity is vast, but despite the myriad differing views across the disciplines and time, one thing remains undisputed: its importance and all-encompassing nature. Theodore Glasser and Lise Marken also make an important observation:

> Claims about an "ideology of American journalism" are more likely to resonate with academics than journalists, especially American journalists. Journalists in the United States cling tenaciously to the view that news at its best renders the world transparent. Despite decades of derision, including several thoughtful critiques by prominent American journalists (e.g., Wicker 1978; Fuller 1996), "objectivity" remains a regulative ideal; it stands as a cornerstone of American professionalism, a commitment and a conviction—an occupational ethos—that presumably transcends time and space. To the examples of "universalistic values" that Curran cites—'freedom, equality and mutuality"—most American journalists would add the value of being value-free.[34]

---

[31] Ibid., p. 86.
[32] Ibid., p. 161.
[33] Todd Gitlin, *The whole world is watching: mass media in the making & unmaking of the New Left*. (University of California Press, 1980), p. 268.
[34] Theodore L. Glasser and Lise Marken, "Can We Make Journalists Better?" in *Making Journalists* (ed. Hugh de Burgh, London: Routledge, 2005), p. 265.

It is interesting to note this lack of self-awareness on the part of journalists regarding their occupational ideology, which permeates all aspects of their work. Herbert J. Gans writes that "virtually all national news organizations continue to swear by objectivity, and journalists still aim for fairness and detachment in reporting the news." However, the author remarks that "the same journalists also remain stubbornly ignorant about ideology and the ways it shapes the public officials who currently make so much of the national news." Gans summarizes this paradox by stating that journalists "do not comprehend the persistence with which ideologues pursue their objectives, play hardball politics, and refuse to compromise, but then they still do not see how much their own professional values constitute an ideology."[35] Additionally, Robert Hackett describes this disconcerting idea by explaining that "the ideal of objectivity suggests that facts can be separated from opinion or value judgements, and that journalists can stand apart from the real-world events whose truth or meaning they transfer to the news audience by means of neutral language and competent reporting techniques."[36] Timothy E. Cook writes that by adhering to 'the strategic ritual of objectivity' – to borrow from the title of Gaye Tuchman's seminal study – journalists "can persuade their readers and themselves that their report is as neutral as it can be." But Cook notes that while reports often present conflicting possibilities, rarely do they go beyond a 'both sides of the story,' for "narrowing a complex situation down to two and only two sides, however, already

[35] Herbert J. Gans, *Deciding What's News: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time* (Northwestern University Press, 1979), p. xviii.
[36] Robert A. Hackett, "Decline of a Paradigm? Bias and Objectivity in News Media Studies" in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, No. 3 (Sept. 1984), p. 232.

defines the politics and power that is likely to follow."[37] In the words of Jay Rosen, "what is insidious and crippling about objectivity is when journalists say: 'We just present you with facts. We don't make judgments. We don't have any values ourselves.' That is dangerous and wrongheaded."[38] In short, according to W. Lance Bennett, "professional journalism standards introduce a distorted political perspective into the news yet legitimize that perspective as broad and realistic."[39]

As a brief aside, as Hanno Hardt reminds us, "much has been written about journalistic work, the process of news gathering, and its underlying purpose of serving society and catering to the principles of enlightenment in progress." Hardt explains that this due to the fact that "journalism histories and reporting textbooks in the United States reinforce an emerging myth of the press as a paternalistic, top-down cultural phenomenon that allowed journalists' labor to proceed under the protection of First Amendment guarantees that were couched polemically in the name of the press and, ultimately, in the name of democracy." This is a major issue because "these writings [journalism histories and reporting textbooks] have strengthened popular versions of the relationship between the press and society by dissemination concepts like 'fourth estate,' 'voice of the people,' and 'watchdog of society' without direct reference to the role of journalists or relations

---

[37] Timothy E. Cook, *Governing With the News: The News Media as a Political Institution* (University of Chicago Press, 1998), p. 6. The author proceeds to write that "Colorful judgments are usually found in quotes, not in the journalist's own language, even if reporters have sought out particular sources with the hope that they will saw exactly what the reporters expect them to say. Passive voices abound ("It was learned today that…"), inanimate objects and concepts come to life ("Questions continued to dog President Clinton…"), and first-person pronouns are frowned upon ("When Mr. Gorbachev greeted a visitor today…"), as if journalists' presences, let alone their queries, had not affected what was learned and asked."
[38] Jay Rosen, quoted by William Glaberson, "Fairness, bias and judgment: Grappling with the knotty issue of objectivity in journalism," *New York Times* (December 12, 1994), p. D7.
[39] W. Lance Bennett, *News: The Politics of Illusion* (London: Longman, 1988), p. 118.

between journalists and these claims of the press."[40] This discourse serves to reinforce an uncomplicated ideal of objectivity which operates on the assumption that 'neutral' language and a 'detachment' from 'reality' will correctly represent it, and is not only possible, but desirable. It also reinforces the prevailing ideology of newsgathering and reporting which emphasizes an unproblematic eyewitness accounts of events, as well as an artificial corroboration of 'facts' via the usage of multiple sources and a (constructed) 'balance' of viewpoints. According to Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester, the 'objectivity assumption' is a paradoxical assumption, which implies that there is indeed a world 'out there' and that an account of a given event reflects that world, or a piece of it, with some degree of accuracy.[41] The authors note further that the 'objectivity assumption' states not that the media are objective, but that there is a world out there to be objective about.[42] Most significantly, it serves as a foundation for the institutional role for journalists as fourth estate, a body that exists apart from government and large interest groups, whose purpose and self-imposed mission is to serve as the watchdog of society and the voice of the people.

Wolfgang Donsbach and Bettina Klett offer an excellent summary of the contributions by three key scholars to the analysis of the several functions fulfilled by the aforementioned restricted understanding of objectivity:

> It gave the responsibility for providing news content to the sources and freed the reporter from the need to acquire knowledge about the subject (Roshco, 1975: 29). It introduced a routine procedure in handling arguments from contending sides and, thus, defended journalists against charges of bias (Tuchman, 1978). Finally,

[40] Hanno Hardt, "The End of Journalism," in *Interactions: Critical Studies in Communication, Media and Journalism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998), p. 125.
[41] Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester, "Accidents, Scandals and Routines: Resources for Insurgent Methodology" in *The TV Establishment,* ed. Gaye Tuchman, (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1974), p. 53.
[42] Harvey Molotch and Marilyn Lester, "Accidents, Scandals and Routines: Resources for Insurgent Methodology," p. 53.

> the fairness notion of objectivity helped to perpetuate the existing power structures of society (Bennett, 1988: 118).[43]

Referring to objectivity as "one of the most troubling yet most fascinating concepts in journalism," Stephen Knowlton writes that

> Most professionals hold to it (by that name or some other) as an ideal to strive for, while critics treat a belief in objectivity with the condescension they would have for an adult who swears by the tooth fairy – as generally harmless enough unless taken to extremes, but so far beyond the pale as to make serious discussion a laughable waste of time.[44]

That said, scholars in various disciplines take objectivity extremely seriously. Andrew Calcutt and Philip Hammond go as far as saying that the discussion of objectivity is where "the tension that has often existed between the study and the practice of journalism" is felt most sharply.[45] A discussion of objectivity will also inevitably bring forth one – or all – of the remaining ideal-typical values outlined by Deuze. For instance, in establishing the dual nature of objectivity, Steven Klaiman and John Heritage inevitably discuss the journalistic ideal-typical value of "public service," or watchdogs or 'news-hounds', active collectors and disseminators of information.

> On the one hand, there is objectivity as impartiality: journalists are expected to be disinterested and neutral in their questioning of public figures. On the other hand, there is objectivity as adversarialness: to achieve factual accuracy and a ''balance'' of perspectives journalists should actively challenge their sources.[46]

---

[43] Wolfgang Donsbach and Bettina Klett, "Subjective Objectivity: How Journalists in Four Countries Define a Key Term of Their Profession," *International Communication Gazette,* Vol. 51 (1993), p. 55. Cited studies by Roshco, Tuchman and Bennett are included the bibliography of this dissertation.

[44] Steven R. Knowlton. "Introduction: A History of Journalistic Objectivity," in *Fair & Balanced: A History of Journalistic Objectivity* (ed. Steven R. Knowlton and Karen L. Freeman / Northport, Alabama: 2005), p. 3.

[45] Andrew Calcutt and Philip Hammond, "The rise and fall of objectivity," *Journalism Studies: A Critical Introduction* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge: 2011), p. 99.

[46] Steven Clayman and John Heritage, *The news interview: journalists and public figures on the air* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002), p. 29.

Jörgen Westerståhl, in turn, has designed a model distinguishing the two basic dimensions of objectivity: factuality and impartiality.[47] Both dimensions, according to Westerståhl, consist of two components: factuality's components are relevance and truthfulness, while impartiality is composed of balance/non-partisanship and neutrality. And both emphasize, along with objectivity a sense of autonomy (i.e. "let the facts speak") and fairness (i.e. "balance," "two sides to every story," etc.). Robert A. Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao, for their part, draw on political economy and discuss how journalists wear objectivity as a mask of 'the fourth estate, defenders of the public good,' which hides their actual face as the employee of a profit-driven corporation:

> The pursuit of professionalism and objectivity enables journalists to dramatize the cultural and political meanings of their work (as the fourth estate, defenders of the public good), while downplaying their functions as employees of profit-driven corporations. It likewise provides some degree of psychological comfort, social legitimation, and practical insulation vis-à-vis the compromises that the editorial side of the daily newspaper must make with its business side.[48]

And the reverse is also the case: in writing about one – or all – of the ideal-typical values mentioned above, a scholar will unavoidably come to discuss objectivity. W. Lance Bennett goes as far as instructing that "if the reader prefers the term 'fairness,' feel free to substitute it, bearing in mind that *whether we call it fairness or objectivity, the words may change while underlying journalism practices remain much the same*."[49] (italics original) In his survey of fifty years of scholarship in media ethics, Clifford G. Christians writes that, since the 1920s, "journalistic morality

> became equivalent to an objective, i.e., unbiased, reporting of facts. The seeds of this definition existed already in Henning, though he continually highlighted the "shared experience motif" of the twenties. The journalist "ought to present

[47] Jörgen Westerståhl, "Objective News Reporting," *Communication Research* 10 (1983), p. 403-24.
[48] Robert A. Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao, *Sustaining democracy? Journalism and the politics of objectivity* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 1998), pages 55-56.
[49] W. Lance Bennett, *News: The Politics of Illusion* (London: Longman, 1988), p. 120.

> unvarnished facts"; that was heralded as the standard of good performance. We began applauding the one supreme goal of publishing as much information about as many events as quickly as possible from a non-partisan, "facts only" point of view. The ideology of objective reporting emerged, with the press declaring as virtuous the impartial transmission of pure information.[50]

But what, exactly, does this controversial presentation of 'facts' which, in the words of Gaye Tuchman, newspapermen invoke "almost the way a Mediterranean peasant might wear a clove of garlic around his neck to ward off evil spirits"[51] actually consist of? When did it emerge? Finally, how is objectivity conceived of in scholarship about the professionalization of journalists?

The first two questions simply cannot be answered due to a lack of consensus between scholars and disciplines; I will, therefore, offer some of the central positions which draw on approaches from sociology, communication studies, political economy, media history and journalism studies. The third and final question shall also be treated in the following chapter of this dissertation, which offers a literature review of journalistic professionalization. Steven Knowlton singles out the significance of historians having looked for the origins of journalistic objectivity for many years.[52] Additionally, Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson establish that "the link between professionalism, objectivity, and truth seeking would come to be accepted, not only by journalists themselves in the form of an occupational ideology but by media researchers and journalism scholars as a related series of problems susceptible to historical and sociological investigation."[53] Charlotte Wien notes that concepts such as 'truth' and

---

[50] Clifford G. Christians, "Fifty Years of Scholarship in Media Ethics" in *Journal of Communication* 27, no. 4 (December 1977), p. 19.
[51] Gaye Tuchman, "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity," *American Journal of Sociology* (Jan. 1972), p. 660.
[52] Steven Knowlton, Intro, *Fair and Balanced*, p. 3.
[53] Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson, "Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism," in *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, p. 92.

'reality' cannot be separated from the concept of objectivity, and that, therefore, if one can speak of a paradigm within journalism, it would be in the requirement for objectivity in disseminating news.[54] But the author makes an important distinction, adding that "it is one thing to operate with objectivity as a beacon, and something else to operationalise objectivity in the everyday task of journalism."[55] In sum, Schudson and Anderson point out that "understanding the emergence of objectivity would, in short, provide the key to understanding the emergence of professionalism."[56]

It is useful to begin with Knowlton's observation that journalistic objectivity may be traced "from the middle of the 17th century – John Milton's *Areopagetica*, with its truth and falsehood grappling, being but the most famous – to the new millennium, with its instant, global factoids for all and yet continuing nagging sense that the best journalism, in the words of National Public Radio's Scott Simon, 'comes from somewhere and stands for something'."[57] For instance, scholars as Stephen Ward describe the editors of newsbooks and corantos as "announcing their commitment to norms such as factuality – a preference for plain facts, unbiased news, eyewitnesses' accounts, reliable sources and judicious editing" going as far back as the 1600s.[58] William David Sloan points out that "although the term 'objectivity' would not be coined until the 20th century, the principle was generally acknowledged even before the country gave birth to its first newspaper," basing himself on "the original idea that printers were obligated to print whatever the public presented to them, whether they agreed with the

[54] Charlotte Wien, "Defining Objectivity Within Journalism: An Overview," *Nordicom Review*, Vol. 26, No. 2 (2005), p. 4.
[55] Ibid., p. 4.
[56] Schudson and Anderson, p. 92.
[57] Steven Knowlton, Intro, *Fair and Balanced*, p. 3.
[58] Stephen Ward, *The Invention of Journalism Ethics: The Path to Objectivity and Beyond* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press: 2004), p. 107.

content or not."[59] Referring to objectivity as "perhaps the most significant dimension of an industrializing press to be given professional sanction," Douglas Birkhead cites references made at the time to news collecting in a professional 'scientific spirit,' and to investigations 'as painless as a mathematical deduction.'[60] Regardless, Birkhead states that what came to be expressed as professional objectivity in the twentieth century had a 'long and pragmatic' history of evolution in the nineteenth, beginning with the decline of the Party Press and in the rise of penny newspaper and its meaning growing from a commercial strategy of formal nonpartisanship.[61] David Mindich draws a parallel between the emergence of the 'objective' ethic in the last part of the nineteenth century and "a rising sense of journalism as a profession."[62] Todd Gitlin writes that "the professional insistence that objective journalism is desirable, and that objective determinations of newsworthiness are possible, arose during the nineteenth century, albeit fitfully, as part of the sweeping intellectual movement toward scientific detachment and culture-wide separation of fact from value."[63] Stephen Banning proposes a view of journalistic professionalization "as part of a gradual process, rather than a phenomenon that appeared suddenly after 1900 with the proliferation of professional associations,

---

[59] William David Sloan, "Neutrality and Colonial Newspapers" in *Fair and Balanced*, p. 36-37. The author proceeds to write that this idea "was to play an essential part – perhaps the most critical part – in the thinking of early Americans about the proper role of newspapers and in publishers' journalistic philosophy and practices. The concept that newspapers should be objective – 'impartial' and 'neutral' were the terms the colonists normally used to express the idea – originated with the concept of the printing press as a mechanical device used simply to produce material for customers. Later, this function would be called 'job printing.' Today, we may think of it as related to photocopying at Kinko's."

[60] Douglas Birkhead, "News media ethics and the management of professionals," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1, no. 2 (1986), p. 40-41.

[61] Ibid., p. 41

[62] David Mindich, *Just The Facts: How "Objectivity" Came to Define American Journalism* (New York: New York University Press, 1998) p. 115.

[63] Todd Gitlin, *The whole world is watching: mass media in the making & unmaking of the New Left*, (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), p. 268.

schools, and codes of ethics" – along with objectivity.[64] Other scholars focus on more recent history, pinpointing a pivotal moment or specific conditions anywhere between the eighteenth and twentieth century; some, as Robert Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao even speak of two versions of objectivity, a progressive nineteenth-century version and an inferior twentieth-century version.[65] "Historiography, in fact," writes Richard Kaplan "offers conflicting accounts of when and why the US press broke from a traditional ethic of avid partisanship and adopted the professional code of objectivity." The author explains that "media scholars variously situate the transformation in the 1830s Jacksonian Revolution, the 1870s Mugwump revolt against party loyalty, a late nineteenth-century shift in press economics, or the emergence of a new, distinct occupational identity in the 1920s."[66]

Andrew Calcutt and Philip Hammond explain that "the history of journalistic objectivity can be viewed in narrow or wide focus." When viewed narrowly, we have "a relatively short story that begins properly only in the early twentieth century," which takes into account some important preparatory steps in the preceding half-century, but focuses mainly on the explicit articulation of the concept of objectivity in the years following the First World War.[67] In turn, "viewed more widely, the history of objectivity begins much earlier, during the eighteenth-century Age of Enlightenment (though again with some important preceding developments)."[68] In terms of quantitative analyses, Harlan S. Stensaas carried out a study which examined the news reports in selected representative daily newspapers of three 10-year periods (1865-1874, 1905-1914, and

[64] Stephen Banning, "The Professionalization of Journalism: A Nineteenth-Century Beginning," *Journalism History*, Vol. 24, Issue 4 (Winter 1998-1999), p. 157.
[65] Hackett and Zhao, 1998, p. 31.
[66] Richard Kaplan, "The Origins of Objectivity in American Journalism" in *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism* (ed. by Stuart Allan; Abingdon, Oxon: 2010), p. 25.
[67] Calcutt and Hammond, p. 106.
[68] Ibid., p. 106.

1925-1934) to determine how and to what extent the general news reports of these periods differed over time in terms of objective reporting. Stensaas found that by the late 1800s, one third of the news stories adhered to the tenets of objectivity; after World War I, that number doubled, and by the late 1920s and early 1930s, 80% of the news stories reflected objectivity.[69]

With scholarship about the emergence of objectivity – and professionalism – being so vast, with much disagreement between authors and disciplines, it is useful to take note of Calcutt and Hammond's differentiation between a first view, which "tends to mark out a discrete moment when objectivity appears," and the second, larger view, which emphasizes continuity.[70] The work in this chapter considers the emergence of objectivity – and the scholarship dealing with it – as a complex continuum, singling out key different views and approaches for the purposes of outlining the difficulties in discussing journalistic professionalization, as so many terms and concepts are nebulous and unclear. Steven Knowlton offers a very useful distinction between two major works centering on two major periods, which many authors – especially historians of journalism – have followed in discussing the emergence of a professional class of reporters in the context of the development of professional objectivity: "the 1830s and the development of the penny press, and the Progressive Era of the 1920s."[71] According to Knowlton, this division is based on two seminal, foundational texts on the topic. The first, "the case for the penny press as the true origin of objectivity was made by Dan Schiller in *Objectivity and the News*" and the second, for the latter period, was made by Michael Schudson,

[69] Harlan S. Stensaas, "Development of the objectivity ethic in US. daily newspapers," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 2, no. 1 (1986-1987), pp. 50-60.
[70] Calcutt and Hammond, p. 106.
[71] Steven Knowlton, Intro, Fair and Balanced, p. 3.

"whose *Discovering the News* argues that it was not until the 1920s that the term objectivity became widely used, and that it was not until then that it became a moral goal of journalism, as opposed to a loose synonym for neutrality or evenhandedness."[72] Knowlton concludes that both Schudson and Schiller cannot be right, obviously, "for the[ir] answers are clear, certain and nearly a century apart," but there is an acknowledgement of the debt journalism historians owe to both of these writers, even as they expand their fields of inquiry. At the end of the day, "both are partly right, and yet so are a dozen other answers, depending upon the definition being used."[73]

Like Schudson, Schiller discusses the emergence of the penny press in the 1830s – the Jackson era – except that it is in this instance that he places the emergence of objectivity. For Schudson, the popular cheap papers expressed and built what he termed "the culture of a democratic market society, a culture which had no place for social or intellectual deference" which would later provide "the groundwork on which a belief in facts and a distrust of the reality, or objectivity, of 'values' could thrive."[74] While Schudson's approach to history is driven by sociology, Schiller draws on scholarship in labor history and political economy and, in turn, "views American cities in the 1830s not as a market society of fluidity and entrepreneurship but as a stratified society in which a workforce of independent artisans was fighting a losing battle for economic and civil rights as manufacturing moved from the workshop to the factory"[75] as a result.

---

[72] Steven Knowlton, *Intro, Fair and Balanced*, p. 3. The author is referring to Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News: The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981) and Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers* (New York: Basic Books, 1978).
[73] Ibid., p. 3.
[74] Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News*, p. 60.
[75] James Boylan, "Infancy of Objectivity" in *Columbia Journalism Review* 20, no. 3 (September/October 1981), pp. 62-63.

According to Schiller, the new penny press – especially such papers as Benjamin Day's the New York *Sun* and James Gordon Bennett's the New York *Herald* – took up the ideals voiced by a once vigorous labor press, which had "flagged and failed" due to the economic setbacks of the late 1830s.[76] Papers of the penny press proclaimed themselves free of the narrow party and commercial interests that had controlled the older, elite press, according to Schiller. "The main goal of the new penny papers was to give their readers the news, not to support any party or class," and objectivity contributed to helping them fulfill their new role as social reformers.[77] Curiously, he best represents this strategy with the *National Police Gazette,* which epitomizes a policy of objectivity, according to the author.[78] "Some may object," writes Schiller, "that the *Police Gazette* is not a fair index of tendencies in mainstream commercial journalism, but his, I think, is not the case: the *Police Gazette* merely raised the tactics of exposure of civil and criminal corruption of prominence."[79] But "like the commercial press, the *Police Gazette* tried to protect the public's natural rights" as "its stories stressed objective facts rather than opinion, tried to substantiate those facts and quoted trusted sources."[80]

Although the writing seemed as 'florid and opinionated' as in most other newspapers at the time, the *Police Gazette* is objective, according to Schiller, "as a matter of position – that is, in the modern terminology, of credibility."[81] James Boylan offers a

---

[76] Ibid., p. 63.
[77] Fred Fedler, Book Review, *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 58, Issue 3 (Autumn 1981), p. 482.
[78] James Boylan, p. 63. The author proceeds to write that "a few readers may still remember in its [the *National Police Gazette*] later incarnation as a trashy barbershop magazine. When it was founded, in 1845, the *National Police Gazette* was designed as an unofficial imitator of an official British journal used by police to publicize criminals and aid in their capture. The American *Police Gazette*, however, was never an official mouthpiece; although it concentrated on publishing information about felons and felonies, it also exposed official corruption."
[79] Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, p. 125.
[80] Fedler, p. 482.
[81] Boylan, p. 63.

good synthesis of the arguments presented in Schiller's book. First, he explains, "there was an implicit claim that the facts in the *Gazette* reflected the real world out there," and Schiller "ingeniously" related this claim "both to the developing scientific method of the time and to the new art of photography."[82] Second, "the *Gazette* displayed specialized knowledge, both through reportorial expertise and through the use of what Schiller calls 'situated language' – use of the criminal argot to enhance the impression that the newspaper knew the inside of its field."[83] Third, "the paper authenticated its material by citing believable sources" and, very much in the style of twentieth-century newspapers, "it paradoxically combined attacks on official corruption with heavy reliance on official sources. And finally, "the *Gazette* established its independent position with exposures of, for example, bribery of police, miscarriages of justice, and unequal application of the laws of property."[84] Most importantly for our purposes here, "with its insistence on the universal recognizability of the facts, the *Police Gazette* laid repeated claim to its professional right of access to the pertinent facts about crime and criminality."[85] In other words, according to Schiller, "once accuracy became merely a matter of access to a seemingly uniform world rather than a matter of adherence to a defining point of view, the way was open for professional specialization itself to become a feasible defense of validity and reliability."[86]

---

[82] Ibid., p. 63. "In effect, the *Gazette* tried to be a camera," the author notes.
[83] Ibid., p. 63.
[84] Ibid., p. 63. The writer proceeds to note that "textbooks generally date the journalism of exposure from the New York Times crusade against the Tweed Ring in 1871. Schiller makes it clear that the *Police Gazette* has an earlier claim. More important, he shows how exposé journalism, tendentious and "unobjective" though it may be, may still enhance a newspaper's claim to objectivity – that is, its claim to stand apart from other interests."
[85] Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, p. 107.
[86] Ibid., p. 107.

Irving Fang notes that "then [in the early decades of the nineteenth century] as now, reports had more value when the reporter was at the scene of events, sending back dispatches based on personal observation and answers to questions posed to the important players of each drama, even generals at a battlefield or diplomats at a foreign court." The author notes that "the practice of active investigation soon followed and so did a rise in circulation of newspapers willing to pursue news actively." Interestingly enough, Fang writes that "in response – or in self-defense – organizations from police to government to private business learned a myriad of ways to cope with the reporter's questions, ways that ranged from creating a public relations industry to these organizations actually improving what they were doing."[87]

Along with the popularization of photographic realism and the belief that science and scientific methods could be used to help reveal the truth, "Schiller convincingly argues that the penny papers emphasized crime because they wanted to reform the legal system and to defend the rights of workingmen – not simply because they expected to profit from the sensationalism."[88] For instance, "Schiller clearly shows that the New York *Herald* published by James Gordon Bennett exploited the murder of prostitute Helen Jewett and the arrest of her lover, a playboy named Richard Robinson, because the legal system seemed to be protecting the rich."[89] Not only did Bennett think Robinson was innocent, but according to Schiller he also believed that a more thorough and

[87] Irving E. Fang, *A History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions* (Focal Press, 1997), p. 53.
[88] Fedler, p. 482.
[89] Ibid., p. 482.

impartial investigation of the murder might "unfrock some of the most respectable men in New York" who had been at the brothel at the time.[90]

That said, in an article offering a historical approach to objectivity and professionalism in American news reporting, Schiller takes a political economy stance and claims that from the moment of their initiation in the mid-1830s, penny newspapers took business success as their most fundamental goal.[91] As a result, "circulation growth was attended and encouraged by the assimilation of many new classes of news," with "every aspect of the newspaper re-examined to 'discover whether it might not be an uneconomic use of space-meaning, by uneconomic, inferior in its power to interest the reader.'"[92] Schiller explains that both high society and the criminal underworld found themselves "selectively observed by the roving eye of the press" and that in order "to select, collect, write, refine, and collate this multiplying series of accounts, newspapers staffed themselves with an increasingly complex bureaucracy, comprised of reporters, copy editors, editors, and circulation and advertising sales personnel." The division of labor within the newsroom, according to Schiller, accounts for "an emergent profession of journalism whose members were intent on enhancing journalists' status and pay."[93] This "emerging profession of journalism sought to consolidate the higher status it merited as the newspaper grew to be a successful business enterprise attending to a vital political function."[94] The emergence of journalism as a profession shall be discussed in the following chapter, which examines the process of professionalization as a whole. For the

[90] Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, p. 64. / Quoted in Fred Fedler, p. 482.
[91] Dan Schiller, "An Historical Approach to Objectivity and Professionalism in American News Reporting," *Journal of Communication*, Vol. 29, Issue 4 (December 1979), p. 46.
[92] Ibid., p. 46. / The author cites Helen MacGill Hugues, *News And The Human Interest Story* (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago, 1940), p. 26.
[93] Ibid., p. 46.
[94] Ibid., p. 50.

purposes of the discussion offered here, it is important to note Schiller's argument that the profession and "objectivity developed in tandem with the commercial newspapers' appropriation of a crucial political function – the surveillance of the public good."[95] According to the author, "by means of periodic exposures of violations and infringements of public good – most notably in crime news, a blossoming genre – the newspaper at this juncture presumed to speak as the public voice.'"[96]

Among the many 'forces' that publishers counted on to help legitimize their newspapers' 'surveillance of public good'[97] came news objectivity, which "purported to ground the commercial newspaper's defense of public good in a positively verifiable and theoretically pristine world of fact."[98] Schiller observes that news objectivity

> was nurtured by the climate of 'Baconianism' pervading contemporary American science and, through its scientific deference to fact, the commercial newspaper stood aloof from the progressive relativization which eventually affected other modes of thought. If science served an ultimate public good, the commercial newspaper served both. Objective news accounts thus supported the major intention of the commercial press: to become a chief social agency for the organization of public enlightenment.[99]

Equally importantly, "objectivity likewise drew explicitly from the general belief that the new technology of photography afforded an exactly accurate and universally recognizable copy of reality."[100] Schiller also discusses the introduction of daguerreotypes in the United States in 1939, soon after their final invention in France that same year, which Edgar Allan Poe described, in 1840, as "infinitely more accurate than

---

[95] Ibid., p. 47.
[96] Ibid., p. 47. / The author cites Isaac Clark Pray, *Memoirs Of James* Gordon *Bennett And His Times* (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1855), p. 252 and p. 36.
[97] For example, grounding their enterprise in a reputed guarantee offered by the Constitution, a forceful penetration of political life by reference to the constituting rights of the American people as a polity, the commercial newspaper's massive presence as a new social institution, etc.
[98] Ibid., p. 48.
[99] Ibid., p. 49.
[100] Ibid., p. 49.

any painting by human hands" and "discloses only a more absolute truth, more perfect identity of aspect with the thing represented."[101] Schiller also mentions that daguerreotypes were called "sun-paintings," for, "said Samuel Morse in 1840, 'they cannot be called copies of nature, but portions of nature herself.'"[102]

The technological advances and inventions of the nineteenth century with which "humanity creatively addressed the problem of how to eliminate information scarcity, how to overcome the limitations of space, time, and form," in the words of Neil Postman, were numerous. The author cites but a few: "telegraphy, photography, the rotary press, the transatlantic cable, the electric light, radio waves, movies, the computer, the x-ray, the penny press, the modern magazine and the advertising agency."[103] Of course, we immediately notice that along with the penny press and the daguerreotypes discussed above come the rotary press – and the telegraph. The technological approach the emergence of objectivity comes, perhaps unsurprisingly, from scholarship in communication studies. According to Daniel J. Czitrom, "insofar as the invention and spread of the telegraph provided the crucial catalyst and means for regular, cooperative news gathering, it supplied the technological underpinning of the modern press; that is, it transformed the newspaper from a personal journal and party organ into primarily a disseminator of news." Czitrom also credits other technological developments in helping shape the nineteenth-century press. The author notes that "steam presses in the 1830s and later rotary presses of the 1890s allowed faster and larger press runs; linotypes developed

---

[101] Edgar Allan Poe, "The Daguerreotype" in *Alexander's Weekly Messenger* (Philadelphia, 15 January 1840), p. 2. / Quoted in Dan Schiller, An Historical Approach, p. 49.
[102] Samuel Morse. "Probable effects… The discovery of Daguerre," extracted from M. A. Root, *The Camera and The Pencil: or the Heliographic Art* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co., 1864) pp. 390-392. Quoted in Dan Schiller, An Historical Approach, p. 49.
[103] Neil Postman, "The Information Age: A Blessing or a Curse?" in *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 9, no. 2 (2004), p. 3-4.

in the 1880s introduced automatic typesetting; photoengraving, beginning with halftones in 1877, played an important part in the pictorial journalism and sensationalism of the 1880s and 1890s." Donald L. Shaw notes that "by the 1880s and 1890s, the nation was trembling between two worlds, one rural and agricultural, the other urban and industrial" and that this period is particularly important to an understanding of the modern press. According to Shaw, "the technological changes evident in the nation also had an impact upon American journalism," as "in many ways, developments of the period shaped the modern American daily newspaper." Shaw writes that "from inventive minds came ideas which resulted in huge perfecting presses, the linotype, the autoplate, color printing, and the half-tone and rotogravure processes."[104] The author notes further that "also of great value to the modern daily were such technological developments as the telephone, typewriter, automobile, and the continued improvement of the telegraph procedures."[105] Shaw writes that "technological developments also sent the price of newsprint down during the period," concluding that "more than ever before, the newspaper became a machine-made product."[106] According to Ted Curtis Smythe, "five changes in technology had a profound influence" between 1886-1895. These were, according to Smythe, "the web-fed rotary press, electrically run machinery, wood-based white paper, typesetting machines, and halftone engraving." The author adds that "competent business managers were up-to-date on the new technologies that saved money or produced copies faster."[107] That said, Czitrom still notes that "the telegraph led the way not only to large-scale news gathering and modern news concepts, but also to standardization, perhaps the

[104] Donald L. Shaw, "News Bias and the Telegraph: A Study of Historical Change," *Journalism Quarterly* (Spring 1967), p. 3.
[105] Ibid., pp. 3-4.
[106] Ibid., p. 4.
[107] Ted Curtis Smythe, *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003), p. 123.

most remarkable characteristic of modern journalism."[108] The author cites an 1884 census report on the history and current state of the American press by Simon N. D. North, worth reproducing here:

> The influence of the telegraph upon the journalism of the United States has been one of equalization. It has placed the provincial newspaper on a par with the metropolitan journal, so far as the prompt transmission of news – the first and always to be the chiefest function of journalism – is concerned.[109]

Silvio Waisbord remarks that "histories of U.S. newspapers have suggested that the introduction of the telegraph in the 1830s and photography in the 1890s facilitated and supported claims to objectivity." According to Waisbord, "telegraph transmission standardized news language and conveyed the same wire information to newspapers." Photography, in turn, "was later incorporated in reporting and strengthened claims to objectivity on the basis that it was a technology that provided an undistorted view free of human bias." In this way, writes Waisbord, "news photography further cemented journalism's intention to wrap itself in the flag of scientific realism." [110] In ideological terms, it is pertinent to note Hanno Hardt's point about a predominant "bourgeois version of media history as a structural representation of communication and power (influence) in society" which "relied on a particular reception of science and scientific truths."[111]

---

[108] Daniel J. Czittrom, *Media and the American Mind: From Morse to McLuhan* (The University of North Carolina Press, 1982), p. 18.
[109] Simon N. D. North, *History and Present Condition of the Newspaper and Periodical Press of the United States* (Washington, DC: Census Office, 1884), p. 110. / cited in Daniel J. Czittrom, *Media and the American Mind,* p. 18.
[110] Silvio Ricardo Waisbord, *Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability and Democracy* (Columbia University Press, 2000), p. 124. The author proceeds to note that "in South America, however, even after newspapers incorporated wire services and photography in newsgathering, journalism still remained crossed by contradictory ideals. Nor was objectivity adopted as the ruling ideal even after news organizations gradually shifted economic gears in the first decades of the twentieth century as their finances increasingly became more dependent on the market. The model of commercial journalism gained presence in South America around the 1920s and 1930s simultaneously with the development of a consumer market and the rise of a middle class with growing economic and political influence."
[111] Hanno Hardt, "Without the Rank and File" in *Newsworkers: Towards a History of Rank and File* (University of Minnesota Press, 1995), p. 9.

According to Hardt, "its ideological framework rested on accepting the beneficial relationship between science, technology, and democracy that had marked the era of urbanization and industrialization and that were inspired by the positivism of the last century also guided the search for validity and stability in the American media system in the latter part of this century."[112] Hardt explains that "since notions of media, freedom and democracy became synonymous features in an ensuing historical narrative, observations and descriptions of media institutions and practices have always been supportive."[113]

In this sense, "the roots of objective reporting are thought to be lodged in 19th-century technology and its concomitants, industrialization and urbanization."[114] In particular, according to William B. Blankenburg and Ruth Walden, "the wire services are credited with developing objectivity and teaching it to newspapers." In their view, "objectivity befitted concise, interesting, nonpartisan news accounts that expediently reduced transmission costs and attracted readers."[115]

A substantivist view in its theorization of technology and society characterizes a seminal text in communication studies by James Carey, *Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph*, where the author claims that "the telegraph brought about changes in the nature of language, of ordinary language, of the very structures of awareness."[116] Formulated in the Western tradition by philosophers such as Max Weber, Martin Heidegger, Jacques Ellul, George Grant and Albert Borgman, the substantivist view

---

[112] Ibid., p. 9.
[113] Ibid., p. 9.
[114] William B. Blankenburg and Ruth Walden, "Objectivity, Interpretation and Economy in Reporting," *Journalism Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (September 1977), p. 591.
[115] Ibid., p. 592.
[116] James W. Carey, "Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph" in *Communication as Culture: Essays on Media and Society* (Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman,1989), p. 202.

maintains that, according to Darin Barney, "beneath the superficial variety of technological instruments and their applications, technology *as such* has a substantive essence that implicates it in the deepest meaning of human souls, and in the prevailing character of societies where its logic holds sway."[117] (italics original) So before the Anglo-American media could use the telegraph to reshape the world's journalistic landscape, they would themselves be reshaped by it, for "the most important fact about the telegraph is at once the most obvious and innocent: it permitted for the first time the effective separation of communication from transportation."[118]

Carey argues that until the invention of the telegraph, communication implied transportation, with all of its time and cost constraints. A newspaper which wanted to report on an event outside of its immediate area would need to spend money to physically send a correspondent to the event, at which they would most likely arrive long after the fact. They would then wait for the reporter to either return with the story, or send the physical copy of the story back to the paper. This process was both costly and time-consuming, and these factors, combined with the loss of immediacy and relevance of the delayed story itself, were major disincentives for any paper to invest serious resources in this sort of news coverage. Carey writes that "the telegraph freed communication from the constraints of geography.

> The telegraph, then, not only altered the relation between communication and transportation; it also changed the fundamental ways in which communication was thought about. It provided a model for thinking about communication – a model I have called a transmission model.[119]

[117] Darin David Barney, *The Network Society* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2004), p. 38.
[118] James W. Carey, "Technology and Ideology," p. 203.
[119] Ibid., p. 204.

Theodor L. Glasser and Lise Marken note that "it is not difficult to see how this view of language sustains what James Carey (1989) describes as a 'transmission' or 'transportation' model of communication, where meaning is to communication what freight is to a train: one simply transports the other." The authors add that "popularized by journalists and others with aphorisms like 'don't blame the messenger for the message,' this view of language and communication reduces news and journalism to mere devices of conveyance." In sum, "objective reporting works precisely this way as it manifests itself as a set of routines and rituals that effectively shift the journalist's authority—and responsibility—away from the content of news and toward its form."[120]

According to Carey, this "transmission model" allowed for the bigger and more prestigious newspapers to engage in serious forays into national and international coverage, and it also enabled the creation of news agencies, which functioned as clearinghouses for news from around the world. The immediacy of the coverage raised its value to the reader, which generated enormous interest in the new "discursive practices" which shall be discussed next. Indeed, the inherent value of facts, interviews, quotes, and the other elements that made up this new genre are their immediacy. It is the timeliness and objectivity of this 'mere reporting' that gives it currency. In sum, "by-the-word telegraph rates helped wring excessive, opinionated verbiage from journalistic prose, and the simultaneous creation of the wire service further mandated a fact-laden, neutral, one-story-fits-all-papers writing style."[121] In fact, Irving E. Fang goes as far as saying that "cooperative news agency existed to service client newspapers and thrived by acquiring still more clients," thus "it followed that the agency would try to please all its

[120] Theodor L. Glasser and Lise Marken. "Can we make journalists better?" in *Making Journalists*, ed. Hugh de Burgh (Abingdon, Oxon: 2005), p. 267.
[121] Steven Knowlton, p. 3.

customers, or at least as many as possible, which covered a multitude of political leanings on every conceivable issue." The author notes that "pleasing as many customers as possible translated itself into transmitting facts that were colored as little as humanly possible, by the agency reporter's point of view." So in Fang's view, it was at that moment that "*objective reporting*, something rather new, was born."[122] (italics original)

It is fascinating to note that the authors of *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do*, another seminal communications text, also credit the wire service with developing "the theory of objective reporting" to "fulfill its function as an information medium" in a substantivist manner. According to Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm,

> its origin in America may be traced to the growth of cooperative news-gathering associations which furnished the local newspaper with information from state, national, and international sources. Most newspapers were then violently partisan, and they resented attempts to induce them to publish materials favorable to, or slanted in the direction of the opposite party. The alternative is to eliminate as far as possible all political bias in the news. The news agencies instructed reporters and writers to remember that their writings were being distributed to both Democratic and Republican clients and had to be acceptable to both. Writers became adept at constructing non-partisan accounts, and from this practice grew the concept of objective reporting which has permeated American journalism to the present.[123]

Carey writes that by creating the wire services, the telegraph "led to a fundamental change in news." According to the author, the telegraph "snapped the tradition of partisan journalism by forcing the wire services to generate 'objective' news, news that could be used by papers of any political stripe (…) the origins of objectivity may be

---

[122] Irving E. Fang, *A History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions* (Focal Press, 1997), p. 53.

[123] Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm, *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do* (Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1963), p. 60.

sought, therefore, in the necessity of stretching language in space over the long lines of Western Union."[124] Ben H. Bagdikian notes that the telegraph freed provincial printers from the role of passive consumer of weeks-old information from established sources," so that original information could then be received direct. According to the author, telegraphy brought all papers, "large and small, big-city and provincial," closer to an equal access to sources of information." In Bagdikian's view, the telegraph "marked the beginning of the transformation of the local purveyor of news from printer, a mechanical conduit of remotely processed material, to an editor, an individualistic interpreter with access to his own information."[125]

Menachem Blondheim notes that the Associated Press monopolized telegraphic news gathering and news distribution in America in the second half of the nineteenth century.[126] Formed in 1848 as the New York Associated Press, Donald L. Shaw points to its domination of the field for most of the 1852-1916 years.[127] According to Blondheim, "its structure as a national institution – impersonal, non-local, unselfconscious, and hidden – have wire service news, however partisan, the appearance of objectivity." The Associated Press, in Blondheim's view, "helped Americans accommodate to a common information environment." Thus, "by giving news that impressed the minds of Americans a national orientation, it fostered the integration of American society."[128]

Irving Fang notes that "cooperative news gathering began before the advent of the telegraph, but these ventures were brief agreements; for example, to share the cost of a

---

[124] James W. Carey, "Technology and Ideology," p. 210.
[125] Ben H. Bagdikian, *The Information Machines: Their Impact on Men and the Media* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971), pp. 9-10.
[126] Menahem Blondheim, *News Over The Wires: The Telegraph and the Flow of Public Information in America, 1844-1897* (Harvard University Press, 1994), p. 195.
[127] Donald L. Shaw, "News Bias and the Telegraph," p. 9.
[128] Blondheim, *News Over The Wires*, p.195.

boat." Like Carey, Fang argues that "by removing the barrier of time for the transportation of news, the telegraph extended each newspaper's reach to wherever the telegraph poles ran," but adds that "rates were steep, which made cooperation the only sensible means of collecting news."[129] As a result, the independent *telegraph reporter* would try to establish a foothold in the decades following the diffusion of the telegraph, only to be weighed down by the news agency, particularly the Associated Press in the United States, Reuters in England, and Havas in France.[130] (italics original) Noting that the increased attractiveness and availability of wire copy occurred at a time when newspapers were growing in size, Donald L. Shaw adds that "hard-pressed news editors undoubtedly welcomed the steadily-incoming wire news as they tried to fill up issues which gradually increased from four to six to eight and, finally, to ten or more pages."[131] In his study of increased reliance upon news by telegraph bringing a sharp decline in biased stories about presidential campaigns in the 1880s, as seen in Wisconsin dailies from 1852-1916, Shaw notes that "Wisconsin editors eagerly demanded telegraph news."[132] According to the author, "one editor pointed out, in 1873, that telegraph dispatches must be published with little regard to their news value," as "people read such dispatches without regard to their importance because readers associated telegraph messages with messages sent only in vital emergencies."[133] He notes that "this reader

[129] Fang, p. 53.
[130] Ibid., p. 53.
[131] Donald L. Shaw, "News Bias and the Telegraph," *Journalism Quarterly* (Spring 1967), p. 10. The author also cites "such factors as decreased newsprint costs, development of the linotype and improved presses, larger audiences and more advertising support resulting from urbanization, and better distribution facilities by means of railroads resulted in more and more pages being added to newspaper issues."
[132] Ibid., p. 10.
[133] Ibid., p. 10.

appetite 'grows on what it feeds on, like novel-reading in the young, or a whisky or an opium appetite in the old'."[134]

The use of the newswires by Anglo-American newspapers grew exponentially throughout the 1800s. According to Shaw, "this increase in wire usage appears to be related to at least five factors: the expansion of telegraph facilities; the decreasing relative cost of telegraph news to newspapers; declining costs of newsprint; and expansion of press association services."[135] Noting that press associations had exclusive control over the amount of news sent over leased lines, Shaw explains that "Western Union records do not give any estimate of the amount of news sent in this way."[136] However, the author cites "sketchy estimates of the amount of press association news and 'specials' sent to newspapers over regular nonleased telegraph lines" which have existed for several years. According to Shaw, in 1869 these two types of news amounted to a total of approximately 2,167,000 messages; in 1880, the total was 2,484,000; and "by 1887, however, the total number of press messages of these two types had jumped to 24,667,000!"[137] As another example, Jean K. Chalaby writes that "even *The Times*, which in 1857 refused the Reuter services, from the early 1860s onwards published the agency telegrams on a daily basis" and, "by the late 1870s, *The Times* published between 10 and 20 Reuter telegrams every

---

[134] Wisconsin Press Association, *Proceedings*, 1872, p 40. / Cited in Donald L. Shaw, p. 10.
[135] Donald L. Shaw, "News Bias and the Telegraph," p. 6.
[136] Ibid., p. 7.
[137] Ibid., pp. 7-8. The author cites "at least two reasons to account for the increase in the number of press messages carried by Western Union in the 1880s. First, the increase in miles of wire from 1880 (233,534) to 1884 (430,571) was relatively larger than any other increase during a four-year interval from 1868 through 1900. (…) Second, Western Union was also able to control an important technological development of the 1870s. In 1873 Western Union put into use a device known as a Duplex which permitted two messages to be transmitted in opposite directions upon one wire at the same time. Soon after came the Quadruplex which allowed four messages to be sent simultaneously, two messages in each direction, upon a single wire. The effect of all these development was to make more wire news available to newspapers about the time of the 1880s."

day to complement the numerous dispatches sent by its own correspondents."[138] It is clear that the telegraph and the correspondents of the papers and news agencies were fundamentally changing the types of stories appearing in newspapers. But perhaps more fundamentally, they were changing the way journalism itself was approached, and how it was constructed. A new form was emerging, one constructed around the needs of the machine itself. The telegraphic mode of transmission was still fragile and spotty enough that a connection could be broken during transmission, leaving the story incomplete. This necessitated a new structure, one which placed the most important and newsworthy details right at the top, with less crucial information following in a descending order of priority. "Speed, the one advantage of the telegraph," according to Richard B. Kielbowicz, "was achieved only at some sacrifice: stories had to be summarized – even skeletonized and sent in code – to save on the expense of the transmission."[139]

Notably because they place the most newsworthy facts first, news reports, according to Mitchell Stephens, are constructed "around facts" and not around "ideas and chronologies."[140] Kielbowicz notes that "one by-product of both the telegraph and the concomitant rise of cooperative news agencies was the modern news form – the concise, supposedly impartial, inverted-pyramid story."[141] The telegraph thus gave birth to the

---

[138] Jean K. Chalaby, "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention: A Comparison of the Development of French and Anglo-American Journalism, 1830s-1920s" in *European Journal of Communication*, Volume 11, Issue 3 (1996), p. 310. The author adds that "for instance, on 30 October 1878, the foreign news page of *The Times* contained 32 news items from almost as many different countries."

[139] Richard B. Kielbowicz, "News Gathering by Mail in the Age of the Telegraph: Adapting to a New Technology" in *Technology and Culture* 28, no. 1 (January 1987), p. 33.

[140] Mitchell Stephens, *A History of News* (New York, NY: Viking, 1988), p. 253.

[141] Kielbowicz, *News in the Mail: The Press, Post Office, and Public Information, 1700-1860s* (New York: Greenwood Press, 1989), p. 154. The author notes further that "to the mails, therefore, was left the task of supplying features and political commentary. This was facilitated by extending the exchange privilege to magazines in 1851, which publishers had sought since 1840. Magazines could now exchange with each other as well as newspapers. (…) Literary reputations were built in part on exchanges; such writers as Mark Twain and Bret Harte came to national attention because their contributions to small, western papers

'inverted pyramid,' an objectivity-based revolutionary discursive practice which defines the genre to this day. According to David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, "telegraph news also appeared to influence journalistic writing techniques and the scope of news coverage." The authors note that thanks to the telegraph, "reporters learned to imitate the more 'objective' news style of the wire services and to write news stories in the 'inverted pyramid' style, with the 'who, what, where, when, why, and how' crammed into the first few paragraphs for quicker and less costly telegraph transmission."[142] According to Tim P. Vos, "it took a conscious embrace of objectivity for the inverted pyramid to become a dogma of journalism and a common tool of the journalist."[143] In his quantitative study which examined the news reports in selected representative daily newspapers of three 10-year periods (1865-1874, 1905-1914, and 1925-1934) to determine how and to what extent the general news reports of these periods differed over time in terms of objective reporting, Harlan S. Stensaas established that "there appears to be a strong interrelationship among the qualities of (a) objective news reporting, (b) inverted pyramid format, and (c) citing of authoritative sources." According to Stensaas, "these three qualities appear to rise together across the time periods to form the modern news report."[144]

Journalism scholar Hazel Dicken-Garcia also writes of the nascent form of 'packaging' news which emerged as news came to be treated as a product. According to the author, "news items became increasingly standardized as they took on the form that is

---

were picked up and widely reprinted. The mails, in short, functioned much as modern feature syndicates that supplement the hard, timely news now sent electronically."

[142] David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986), p. 147.

[143] Tim P. Vos "News Writing Structure and Style" in *American Journalism: History, Principles, Practices* (Ed. William David Sloan, Lisa Mullikin Parcell), p. 296.

[144] Harlan S. Stensaas, "Development of the objectivity ethic in US. daily newspapers," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Vol. 2, No. 1. (1986-1987), p. 58.

today called the inverted pyramid, emphasizing the lead, featuring bylines, and depending on Associated Press reporting – a structure that guides readers in finding the most important elements."[145] Additionally, Dicken-Garcia remarks on the role of the telegraph in establishing new reporting techniques which changed news story form, explaining that "because telegraph lines were often cut during the [American Civil] war, reporters began to transmit the most important information first: who won what battle, how many soldiers were killed, the maneuvers used, and so on." She notes that "if they lost telegraph access while transmitting further details, [then] their newspapers would at least have the gist of the story" and, as a result, multi-deck headlines "became a part of the packaging, paralleling major points of the story as they arrived over the wire."[146] Most significantly, she credits the Civil War with "drastically" affecting reforming forms:

> The press had never before systematically organized coverage of a war – or much of any kind of event – away from its home offices, but the Civil War allowed no other choice as it stretched across time and vast distances. The speed of events made reporters ingenious in finding ways, at virtually any personal cost, to get their stories – and procedures expanded, with consequences for journalistic standards. Reporters made news more accessible than ever. Riding with the troops gave access to news of battles, generals' performances, military strategies, camp life, and troop behavior. Use of eyewitness accounts and interviews as sources, which had developed before the war, and reliance on multiple sources became an established practice. Reporters also cultivated high-ranking officials to maintain good relations and keep access to sources open.[147]

David T. Z. Mindich agrees with Dicken-Garcia, noting that there were no professional societies, college programs, or textbooks for journalists before before the Civil War, claiming that the 'objective' ethic that emerged in the last part of the nineteenth century paralleled a rising sense of journalism as a profession. According to

[145] Hazel Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America* (The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989), p. 53.
[146] Ibid., p. 53.
[147] Ibid., p. 55.

Mindich, "this [the lack of professional societies, college programs, textbooks] began to change after the Civil War, so much so that journalism quickly began to consider itself a profession."[148] Donald L. Shaw also notes "changes in the content of the press, and among the American press trends which historians have noted for the years between the Civil War and the first World War were an increasing emphasis upon impartial gathering and reporting of news and a growing independence from party control."[149] Shaw writes that "at the same time, historians have pointed out that newspapers during this period used increasing amounts of wire news – news which presumably was relatively unbiased politically because it was sold to newspapers of different political faiths."[150]

Dicken-Garcia notes equally that the press incorporated previously ignored techniques and technologies, such as illustration and the telegraph, into news gathering.[151] The author notes that the telegraph was used little by the press before the war and then became largely responsible for improved access to news. According to Dicken-Garcia, "newspapers that before had only two or three columns of telegraph news contained two or three pages during the war and often kept offices open to receive late night telegraph news."[152] As well, the author notes that the war's complexity forced reporters to use many sources, including individuals whose views differed; thus, "not only did news items

[148] David T. Z. Mindich, *Just The Facts*, p. 115.
[149] Donald L. Shaw, "News Bias and the Telegraph," p. 4. / The author cites the work of Edwin Emery, The Press and America: An Interpretative History of Journalism, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1962), p. 317.
[150] Ibid., p. 4. / The author cites the work of Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm, Four Theories of the Press (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 60.
[151] Hazel Dicken-Garcia, p. 55.
[152] Ibid., p. 55. The author notes further that "before the war, morning papers regularly closed their offices at 10:00 P.M."

increasingly include multiple sources, but presenting a diversity of news in the same article – a new journalistic procedure – gained strength."[153]

Finally, James Carey writes that "the wire services demanded a form of language stripped of the local, the regional, and colloquial," as well as something closer to a 'scientific' language, "a language of strict denotation in which the connotative features of utterance were under rigid control." Language had to be flattened out and standardized "if the same story were to be understood in the same way from Maine to California." On a discursive level, the telegraph, according to the author, "led to the disappearance of forms of speech and styles of journalism and storytelling – the tall story, the hoax, much humor, irony, and satire – that depended on a more traditional use of the symbolic, a use I earlier called the fiduciary."[154]

But whereas Carey and others (e.g., Siebert, Peterson and Schramm) see the roots of objectivity in the structural demands of the telegraph and the news agencies, and clearly there is a strong case to be made for this position, Michael Schudson believes that journalistic objectivity is rooted in specific organizational and cultural conditions which contributed to the establishment of institutional norms within journalism. Schudson explains that "this instrumentality – the practical utility of having some norm – does not explain why this norm, the objectivity norm, came to dominate" and, most significantly, "the latter problem requires understanding the cultural environment the group can draw on, the set of ideas, concepts, and values that they have access to, find attractive, and can

[153] Hazel Dicken-Garcia, p. 55. The author notes further that "in addition, Northern correspondents' practice of traveling in disguise to avoid detection in the South provided a model for the undercover investigative reporting that developed in the 1880s. Participating in the action as 'specials' armed as soldiers reinforced the undercover model."
[154] James W. Carey, "Technology and Ideology," p. 210.

convey convincingly to themselves and others."[155] The author disagrees with Carey on the inevitability of the emergence of objectivity, on the grounds that it was being promoted as a moral ideal as well, and poses the question at the centre of his argument: "If technology made objectivity an inevitable practice or if economic self-interest of newspapers made objectivity the obvious best choice, what purpose was served by moralizing a practice that would have survived regardless?"[156]

Dan Schiller also does not place the emergence of objectivity in the structural demands of the telegraph and the news agencies. He argues that "objectivity was not synonymous with news-agency routine but instead retained an autonomous character, to which, in some degree, the news agency itself was made to conform."[157] The author claims instead that "objectivity is a cultural form with its own set of conventions," an argument which "clearly challenges the more common assumption that objectivity equals the absence or reduction of political bias." In Schiller's view, "the latter presumes that bias can be entirely avoided by newspapers, at least in principle," but "within this view, however, there is disagreement over the correct dating and institutional source of the decline in what is now a reified entity, 'bias'."[158]

Like Dan Schiller, Michael Schudson defines objectivity less as a technologically-determined consequence of the telegraph, and more in terms of an established 'norm' which elevates it to the status of value system or ideology within journalism.

> The objectivity norm guides journalists to separate facts from values and to report only the facts. Objective reporting is supposed to be cool, rather than emotional, in tone. Objective reporting takes pains to represent fairly

[155] Michael Schudson, "The objectivity norm in American journalism" in *Journalism: Theory, Practice & Criticism*, Volume 2, Issue 2 (2001), p. 165-6.
[156] Ibid., "The objectivity norm in American journalism," p. 150.
[157] Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, p. 4.
[158] Ibid., p. 5.

> each leading side in a political controversy. According to the objectivity norm, the journalist's job consists of reporting something called 'news' without commenting on it, slanting it, or shaping its formulation in any way. The value of objectivity is upheld specifically against partisan journalism in which newspapers are the declared allies or agents of political parties and their reporting of news is an element of partisan struggle. Partisan journalists, like objective journalists, typically reject inaccuracy, lying and misinformation, but partisan journalists do not hesitate to present information from the perspective of a particular party or faction.[159]

The author disputes the claim that objectivity became the preeminent moral and ideological norm in journalism as a result of the telegraph. In fact, Schudson actually scrutinizes the work of Carey, which he characterizes as "apparently entirely impressionistic."[160] While he does concede that the telegraph necessitated the introduction of the inverted pyramid structure, and while he doesn't dispute that there was some standardization and 'flattening out' of language, as Carey would put it, he cautions against "economic and technological reductionisms" and claims that, at most, they help explain "new social practices (in this case, a new literary style), not new moral norms and, in that sense, it does not explain enough."[161]

Jean K. Chalaby also writes that beginning in the 1850s, "Anglo-American journalists began to make the typically journalistic claim to be neutral and objective," and that the news report format afforded them fewer opportunities to insert their opinions and biases.[162] Chalaby goes as far as saying that "the profession of the journalist and the journalistic discourse is the product of the emergence, during this period [the 19th century], of a specialized and increasingly autonomous *field of discursive production*, the

[159] Schudson, "The objectivity norm in American journalism," p. 150.
[160] Ibid., p. 159
[161] Ibid., p. 158.
[162] Jean K. Chalaby, p. 311.

journalistic field."[163] (italics original) "Progressively," writes Chalaby, "the journalistic discourse became a distinctive class of texts: agents in the journalistic field developed their own discursive norms and values, such as objectivity and neutrality."[164]

Michael Schudson instead takes the position that the emergence of objectivity as the dominant ideology of Anglo-American journalism occurred in the 1920s, and resulted more from a period of anti-partisan independence within the politics of the time, and by extension within journalism, combined with the emergence of four specific conditions within the journalistic establishment. The author's historical analysis of objectivity incorporates a Durkheimian perspective on its adoption as an occupational norm, and a Weberian perspective on its instrumental use by employers as a mechanism to exercise control over employees, both an essential component of the gradual 'professionalization' of American journalism.[165]

Schudson also points to another important background condition, a new liberal and independent political orientation, which he believes contributed to the emergence of the objectivity norm, in "the very concept of politics changed from l880 to l920 under the impact of Mugwump and Progressive reforms." As Liberal reformers began to criticize party loyalty, "newspapers at the same time became more willing to take an independent stance" and, "by l890, a quarter of daily newspapers in Northern states, where the reform movement was most advanced, claimed independence of party."[166] He finds that this political environment, combined with what he terms "the growing corporate coherence of

---

[163] Jean K. Chalaby, p. 304.
[164] Ibid., p. 304. The author notes that, furthermore, "the journalistic mode of writing became characterized by particular *discursive strategies and practices,* neither literary nor political in character. Journalistic texts began to possess distinctive philological characteristics, and the same *discursive phenomena* could be identified in the texts which formed the journalistic discourse." (italics original)
[165] Schudson, "The objectivity norm in American journalism," p. 151-153.
[166] Ibid., "The objectivity norm in American journalism," p. 160.

that occupational group, generating a demand both for social cohesion and occupational pride, on the one hand, and internal social control, on the other, would by the l920s eventuate in a self-conscious ethic of objectivity."[167] In reference to the critical election of 1896 and the subsequent Progressive reform era, this political explanation for the rise of objectivity is echoed by Richard Kaplan, who argues that political parties needed to lose their hold over the loyalties of voters and the institutions of government before the press could feel free to offer a nonpartisan, "impartial" account of news events.[168]

Stephen Ward, whose work offers a historical analysis of the evolution of ethics and objectivity in journalism leading to an innovative theory of pragmatic objectivity, agrees with the essential arguments and timeline of Schudson's thesis. According to Ward, "the nineteenth-century newspaper set the stage for the arrival of objectivity early in the twentieth" with the doctrine of objectivity emerging from two notions of newspaper function: educator of public opinion and informer of the masses."[169] News was, therefore, "the product of an independent paper for all the people, not just for one class or political party" and, despite constituting "two traditions [which] do not fit together smoothly, both forms of liberal newspaper saw servile party partisanship as a relic of the past,"[170] according to Ward.

---

[167] Schudson, "The objectivity norm in American journalism," (objectivity norm in American journalism), p. 158.
[168] Richard L. Kaplan, *Politics and the American Press: The Rise of Objectivity*, 1865-1920 (Cambridge University Press: 2002).
[169] Stephen J. A. Ward, *The invention of journalism ethics: the path to objectivity and beyond,* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.), p. 174. The author explains that in turn, "these ideas emerged from two forms of liberal paper in the nineteenth century – the elitist, middle-class, liberal newspaper of England and the egalitarian, popular press first developed in the United States in the 1830s. From the English paper, objectivity took the idea of the informed public educator and opinion creator. The English paper anticipated objectivity insofar as it aspired to be an independent educator of the public, resisting the distortions of partiality. From the U.S.-style popular press, objectivity took the idea of the newspaper as the impartial provider of news for the masses."
[170] Ibid., p. 174.

Schudson writes that this "analytical and procedural fairness" could only take hold in the journalistic community when journalists felt themselves more accountable to their own and their readers' values than to the political allegiances of their bosses. According to the author, it was only in the 1920s that journalists began "to articulate rules of the journalistic road more often and more consistently."[171] Schudson ties these moral directives related to objectivity to Carey's earlier points regarding the volume of newswire copy changing the fundamental power structure within the industry itself, and necessitating new methods of control. "This newly articulate fairness doctrine was related to the sheer growth in newsgathering; rules of objectivity enabled editors to keep lowly reporters in check."[172]

But whereas Schudson takes a sociological approach considering journalists as a group as the driving force behind the push for professionalism, a political economy strand of scholarship considers the marketplace as the primary arena, treating the owners of the means of production as its main actors. For instance, scholars as Gerald A. Baldasty analyze "news and other aspects of newspaper operations (such as distribution, staffing and production) as an outgrowth of market conditions and competition in the newspaper industry in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries."[173] Bartholomew H. Sparrow writes that "it was more than the emergence of the telegraph and AP that boosted objective reporting to pre-eminence." According to the author, "the commercialization of the newspapers in the nineteenth century made impartial reporting viable."[174] On that

[171] Schudson, "The objectivity norm in American journalism," p. 161.
[172] Ibid., p. 162.
[173] Gerald J. Baldasty, "The Economics of Working-Class Journalism: the E. W. Scripps Newspaper Chain 1878-1908," *Journalism History* 25, no. 1 (1999), pp. 3-12.
[174] Bartholomew H. Sparrow, *Uncertain Guardians: The New Media as a Political Institution* (JHU Press, 1999), p. 122.

note, Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen discuss the need to recover an alternative media history that addresses the historical place of newsworkers and the role of labor in the rise of media capitalism. They refer to primarily "the period between 1890 and 1940, perhaps the most eventful and dramatic period in the rise of the American press, as it relates to the commodification of news and follows commercial interests." Hardt and Brennen note that it was also a time in which the relationship between technology and democracy was defined by 'mass' communication and used to explain progress and freedom in American society.[175] And although it is quite common to talk about objective news coverage as an ethical or professional norm, James Hamilton argues that objective news coverage is a commercial product that emerges from market forces.[176] According to the author, a number of factors affect a newspaper's decision to offer a partisan versus an independent interpretation of events: the political preferences of potential readers in a city; the size of potential audiences for news coverage; the technology and costs of information generation and transmission; the varieties of products offered by competitors; the demand by advertisers for readers as potential consumers; and the size of partisan subsidies or favors.[177] James Carey refers to objective reporting as 'the fetish of American journalism in the period of rapid industrialization.'[178] According to Carey, this form of journalism was originally grounded in "a purely commercial motive: the need of the mass newspaper to serve politically heterogeneous audiences without alienating any significant segment of the audience." As he also noticed in his aforementioned essay *Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph*, "the practice apparently began with the wire services," which

[175] Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, "Introduction" in *Newswokers*, p. vii.
[176] James Hamilton, *All the news that's fit to sell: how the market transforms information into news* (Princeton University Press, 2004), p. 37.
[177] Ibid., p. 37.
[178] James Carey, "The Communications Revolution and the Professional Communicator," p. 137.

instructed their writers and reporters that any distributed copy had to be acceptable to both Democratic and Republican subscribers, and as a result writers became skilled at constructing nonpartisan – that is, 'objective – accounts of events."[179]

As discussed previously, a neutral wire copy was in virtually every newspaper every day by the second half of the nineteenth century. Jean Chalaby writes that Anglo-American newspapers were extensively publishing the information received by news agencies, and "by the 1880s, the main source of foreign news for many newspapers were the cables of the news agencies, such as the Associated Press in America and Reuters in England."[180] This would seem to indicate that what journalists wrote, and how they wrote it, was not decided by the individual journalist, but by the company for which the journalist worked. The owners of the newswires decided, long before Schudson's "democratic despair" set in,[181] that non-partisan, factual, objective news was in their economic interest because it would allow them to sell their copy to more newspapers, and they imposed this occupational norm on all of their employees.

By treating the journalists themselves as the key actors, Schudson looks for evidence of why they would choose to adopt objectivity as a norm, and he finds it in the civic, philosophical and spiritual disenchantment which followed WWI. His timeline for the emergence of objectivity as a professional norm parallels that of political economists as Robert McChesney, who states that "the concept of journalism as politically neutral,

[179] Ibid., p. 137.
[180] Jean K. Chalaby, "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention," p. 306.
[181] Schudson, *Discovering the News*, the author notes that: "Not until after World War I, when the worth of the democratic market society was itself radically questioned and its internal logic laid bare, did leaders in journalism and other fields, like the social sciences, fully experience the doubting scepticism democracy and the market encouraged. Only then did the ideal of objectivity as consensually validated statements about the world, predicated on a radical separation of facts and values, arise." (p. 122)

nonpartisan, professional, even 'objective,' did not emerge until the twentieth century."

But unlike Schudson, McChesney argues that

> During the first two or three generations of the republic such notions for the press would have been nonsensical, even unthinkable. Journalism's purpose was to persuade as well as to inform and the press tended to be highly partisan. A partisan press system has much to offer a democratic society – as long as there are numerous well-subsidized media providing a broad range of perspectives. During the nineteenth century, newspapers became primarily commercial. The press system remained explicitly partisan, but it increasingly became an engine of great profits as costs plummeted, population increased, and advertising – which emerged as a key source of revenues – mushroomed.[182]

Schudson's analysis of the intellectual, political and philosophical climate of post-WWI America is well-documented, but whereas the 'leaders' of sociology and the other social sciences were free to reflect on their society and follow their consciences, the only journalistic 'leaders' whose opinion mattered were the owners themselves. Under the political economy lens, according to W. Lance Bennett, "the objectivity norm did not emerge until the turn of the century when established news organizations began to legitimize their product and their status with claims about professionalism."[183] In other words, the emergence of the objectivity norm after WWI was intimately connected to the professionalization which occurred at the same time, but neither was a product of journalists as a group seeking a new approach to their craft. Rather, objectivity and professionalization were both part of a commercial strategy undertaken by ownership to protect and consolidate their monopolies on the one hand while undermining organized labour on the other. Edward S. Herman notes that "professionalism and objectivity rules are fuzzy, flexible, and superficial manifestations of deeper power and control

[182] Robert McChesney, *The Problem of the Media: U.S. communication politics in the twenty-first century,* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004), p. 58. "It was only a matter of time before the commercial economics of the press would conflict with its explicitly partisan politics," writes McChesney.
[183] W. Lance Bennett, *News: The Politics of Illusion* (London: Longman, 1988), p. 121.

relationships." In the author's view, "professionalism arose in journalism in the years when the newspaper business was becoming less competitive and more dependent on advertising." For Herman, "professionalism was not an antagonistic movement by the workers against the press owners, but was actively encouraged by many of the latter." Most significantly, "it gave a badge of legitimacy to journalism, ostensibly assuring readers that the news would not be influenced by the biases of owners, advertisers, or the journalists themselves."[184] Additionally, Arthur J. Kaul writes that "professionalization represents the ideological reorganization of work that ran parallel to marketplace reconfiguration," with professional 'objectivity' emerging "as an ideological corollary to commercial noncompetition—the withdrawal of news from competing claims in the service of a transcendent 'public interest.'"[185] According to Graham Knight, "taken alone, the political and economic effects of consolidation provided the structural context for the ideology of objectivity to arise," while "the motivation for this opportunity to be realized came from the increasing division of labor in the press and the subsequent professionalization of journalism as an occupation." In the writer's view, "economic consolidation led to a re-shaping of the class structure by hastening the demise of the 'old' middle class of independent, self-employed commodity producers, including many small newspaper proprietors" and, "at the same time, it brought about the growth of a 'new' middle class of salaried, intellectual labor."[186]

Bonnie Brennen writes that "during the 1920s and 1930s, newsworkers were repeatedly reminded that newspapers were business properties dedicated to making a

---

[184] Edward S. Herman, *The Myth of the Liberal Media: An Edward Herman Reader* (New York: Peter Lang, 1999), p. 264.
[185] Arthur J. Kaul, "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1, no. 2 (1986), p. 52.
[186] Graham Knight, "News and Ideology" in *Canadian Journal of Communication* 8, no. 4 (1982), p. 23.

profit."[187] The author notes that "although journalists might have dreamed of newspapers as 'guardians of the public welfare or organs of political enlightenment,' given the private ownership of the American press, they were forced to realize that it was without justification to expect newspapers to 'adhere to a different ethic or a more detached consideration of the public good than bankers, business magnates, or manufacturers of patent medicines' (Rosten 1937: 297)."[188] Arthur J. Kaul notes that "professionalization represents the ideological reorganization of work that ran parallel to marketplace reconfiguration." In the author's view, "professional 'objectivity' emerged as an ideological corollary to commercial noncompetition – the withdrawal of news from competing claims in the service of a transcendent 'public interest'."[189]

The relationship between newsworkers and owners was evident in all aspects of professionalization. In his study of early reporting textbooks and the formation of professional identity, Randall S. Sumpter explains that "textbooks warned students that editors and owners would sometimes want changes in stories that had nothing to do with good reporting practices, and the prudent beginner would follow their instructions."[190] Sumpter cites Willard Grosvenor Bleyer's *Newspaper Writing and Editing* (1913), in which Bleyer writes that many newspaper style sheets included an 'index expurgatorius' of 'the pet aversions of the editor-in-chief, the managing editor, or the city editor, that are matters of preference rather than good usage.'[191] Sumpter recommends "beginners should cater to these preferences," and adds that, according to M. Lyle Spencer's *News*

[187] Bonnie Brennen, "Cultural Discourse of Journalists" in *Newsworkers*, p. 101.
[188] Bonnie Brennen, "Cultural Discourse of Journalists" in *Newsworkers*, p. 101. The author cites the work of Leo C. Rosten, *The Washington Correspondents* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937), p. 297.
[189] Arthur J. Kaul, "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism" in *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* (Volume 1, Number 2), p. 52.
[190] Randall S. Sumpter, "Core Knowledge: Early Reporting Textbooks and the Formation of Professional Identity," *Journalism History* 35, no. 1 (2009), p. 47.
[191] Ibid., p. 47.

Writing (1917), "producing unbiased news was an ideal that American journalism had not reached." According to the Spencer journalism textbook, dating back to 1917, newspapers were businesses

> 'run for the profit or power of the owners, with the additional motive in the background of possible social uplift – social uplift as the owners see it. They determine a paper's policies, and a reporter must learn and observe those policies if he expects to succeed.'[192]

Journalistic professionalism had been successfully codified during this period, and the journalistic values enshrined in the codes written in this era, and taught at the schools founded in this era, became the norms of the new profession, as shall be discussed later. By 1947, when the Hutchins Commission issued recommendations to improve the conduct and quality of the press, it was clear that journalists had internalized the corporate ideology of their owners. Lisa H. Newton, Louis Hodges and Susan Keith write of "a confusion of responsibility with accountability that led to the press's negative, knee-jerk reaction to the so-called Social Responsibility theory of the press promoted by the Hutchins Commission in 1947," with the Commission addressing press responsibility, but the working press reading accountability. According to the authors, "journalists and news organizations did not want to be accountable to *a bunch of intellectuals on the Commission* who would judge their performance"[193] (italics mine).

The Commission made it clear, however, that the goal was a journalistic fraternity which was accountable to one another and to the public, not to the government. According to Newton, Hodges and Keith, the Hutchins Commission declared that "if the press is to be accountable—and it must if it is to remain free—its members must

[192] M. Lyle Spencer, *News Writing* (1917) / cited in Randall S. Sumpter, p. 47-48.
[193] Lisa H. Newton, Louis Hodges and Susan Keith, "Accountability in the Professions: Accountability in Journalism," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 19, no. 3 & 4 (2004), p.174.

discipline one another by the only means they have available, namely, public criticism."[194] But journalists' relationship with the public and with one another had been codified by and for their bosses, and the Commission's recommendations were not open to discussion. The professionalization period of 1900-1925 resulted in journalists being accountable to news organizations exclusively, and the purpose of that professionalization, they argue, was to ensure that owners of news organizations wouldn't be accountable to the government, the public, or anybody else. As John Soloski writes, "professionalism is an efficient and economical method by which news organizations control the behavior of reporters and editors."[195] This view is also shared by Arthur J. Kaul, who notes that "proletarian journalists' assertions of professionalism obscured their economic exploitation." According to Kaul, "in its substitution for 'morality' for 'mere pecuniary gains,' professionalism legitimated marketplace practices." In the author's view, 'independence,' 'objectivity,' and 'social responsibility' were merely ideological corollaries of commercial strategies deployed to stabilize marketplace crises and class conflicts within journalism."[196] Gaye Tuchman notes further that news organizations maintain flexibility by "encouraging professionalism among reporters" and that, "among reporters, professionalism is knowing how to get a story that meets organizational needs and standards."[197]

Stuart Allan reviews "the often subtle, seemingly 'commonsensical' ways in which corporate interests influence news content" today. According to Allan, it "can be

---

[194] Ibid., p.177.
[195] John Soloski, "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News" in *Social Meanings of News: A text-reader*, ed. by Dan Berkowitz, (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), p. 139.
[196] Kaul, "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism," p. 53.
[197] Tuchman, *Making News*, pp. 65-66.

rendered discernible for analysis with careful scrutiny," and "important insights have been provided in thoughtful appraisals by self-reflexive journalists (for recent examples, see Adie 2002; Alterman 2003; Bell 2003; Brinkley 2003; Greenslade 2003; Hargreaves 2003; Kovach and Rosenstiel 2001; Lloyd 2004; Lule 2001; Newkirk 2000) and academic researchers alike."[198] In the author's view, the commodification of news by owners keen on maximizing their profits is a major issue which is consistently underscored by these accounts. Thanks to this process of commodification, according to Allan, the values of media owners as if on par with those of professionalism are still – very problematically – adopted by journalists today.

[198] Stuart Allan, ed., *Journalism: Critical Issues* (Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2005), p. 9. Please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.

Chapter III

Professionalism and Professionalization in Journalism: Art, Craft, Trade or Profession?

Introduction

America is a country of inventors, and the greatest of inventors are the newspaper men.
– Alexander Graham Bell

The study of journalistic professionalization is a very difficult undertaking, because although professionalism has been an important concept to Anglo-American journalists for over a century, there is no agreement – and in fact, much confusion – around concepts like profession, professionalism, and professionalization, and their relationship and significance in journalism.[1] This is not only a problem exclusive to the domain of sociology for, as Matthew F. Jacobs reminds us, the relationship between journalism and professionalism has also been "a salient feature" of mass media history.[2] That said, as Patricia L. Dooley contends, a "plethora of promising sociological perspectives on occupation and profession has had little impact on American scholarship in journalism and mass communication." Dooley observes that most writing on the journalistic occupation, mirroring earlier sociological trends and approaches of the authors of American journalism textbooks, portrays it as a progressively developing entity striving for professional status through an ongoing attainment of the bits and pieces of professionalism such as codes of ethics and university training.[3] As noted previously, Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis agree that classifying the occupation of journalism "is never an easy task," and point to the complicated fact that from the nineteenth century, when the processes of professionalization began for journalism, until

[1] Randal A. Beam, "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept," *Journalism Monographs* 121 (June 1990), p. 1.
[2] Matthew F. Jacobs, "Professionalism in Journalism: Ongoing debate among journalists about benefits of 'profession' versus trade'" in *History of the Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), p. 537.
[3] Patricia L. Dooley, *Taking Their Place: Journalists in the Making of an Occupation* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press: 1977), p. 8.

the present, a debate has raged as to whether journalism is a craft, a trade or a profession.[4] This point was once made by Walter Lippmann himself, who wrote that journalism "has never yet been a profession," and that "it has been at times a dignified calling, at others a romantic adventure, and then again a servile trade."[5] The point is also echoed by other mass communication scholars, who deliberate on the journalistic occupation by posing rhetorical questions such as the one which serves as the title of Penn Kimball's well-known essay, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?"[6] In this vein, John Hartley notes that "training itself is viewed with suspicion by editors, owners and even many senior journalists, for whom it is not a profession but a trade to be learnt on the job" and "as a result it is still possible to work as a journalist without any professional training."[7] While Kimball argues that reporters must indeed learn to master "two opposite psychological states,"[8] But journalists "do not enjoy anything like a doctor-patient or lawyer-client relationship with members of the public" and it is very different from such standard professions as medicine or law – "for example, journalists do not need to acquire a systematic body of knowledge in order to practice."[9] This a central argument made by Robert Khowy, who writes about preconceived notions in the study of professionalism, arguing that its characteristics are defined in ways that privilege traditional occupations

---

[4] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "Journalism and the Making of a Profession" in Hugh de Burgh, ed., *Making Journalists* (London: Routledge, 2005), p. 58.
[5] Walter Lippmann, "The American Press," *The Yale Review*, Vol. 30 (1930-31), pp. 432-441.
[6] Penn Kimball, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?" in Kenneth C. Lynn, ed., *The Professions in America* (Boston: Beacon, 1963).
[7] John Hartley, "Journalism as a Human Right: The Cultural Approach to Journalism" in Martin Löffelholz and David Weaver, eds., *Global Journalism Research: Theories, Methods, Findings, Future* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008), pp. 39-51. The authors note further that "at the same time, the majority of journalism graduates do not go on to work in newsrooms. The laudable desire to have competent practitioners and an explicit understanding of the practice is directly at odds with both industry and democratic imperatives."
[8] Penn Kimball, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?" p. 253. The author refers to the full immersion in the stories journalists are sent to cover, and detachment from "these same intense involvements, to stand outside the experience and place it in perspective for the reader."
[9] Ian Richards, "Trust me, I'm a journalist: Ethics and Journalism Education," *Asia Pacific Media Educator* 14 (2003), p. 142.

such as medicine and law.[10] Barbie Zelizer points out that "journalism simply does not require all the *trappings of professionalism*."[11] (italics original) She writes that "unlike classically defined professions like medicine or law where professionals legitimate their actions via socially recognized paths of training, education, and licensing, these trappings have had only limited relevance for [journalism] practitioners."[12]

John C. Merrill, moreover, discusses the split between journalists in the United States who see the trend toward professionalization "as a good move, one that will assure a certain degree of journalistic freedom while increasing responsibility," and "its foes [who] see the move to further professionalization as dangerous to press pluralism."[13] But regardless of their deep divisions on many questions of their practice, David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit argue that "the modern journalist, then, is *of* a profession, but not *in* one."[14] (italics original) According to the authors, the institutional forms of professionalism likely will always elude the journalist.[15]

As mentioned previously, John Soloski notes that while "much ink has been spilled over arguments about whether journalism is a bona fide profession," even "more ink has been used by scholars who have attempted to identify the criteria that make an

---

[10] Robert Khowy, "Demythologizing the Professions," *International Review of History and Political Science* 17 (1970), pp. 57-70.
[11] Barbie Zelizer, "Journalists as Interpretive Communities," *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader*, ed., Daniel Allen Berkowitz (London: Sage, 1997), p. 404.
[12] Barbie Zelizer, "Journalists as Interpretive Communities," p. 404.
[13] John C. Merrill, *The Dialectic in Journalism: Toward a Responsible Use of Press Freedom* (LSU Press, 1993), pp. 31-32. Of the aforementioned foes to professionalization, the write notes that they see it [professionalization] "as excluding many 'eccentric' journalists from practicing journalism; they see it as a trend toward conformity in journalism; they see it as a tendency toward a journalism of 'self-interest' rather than public interest; they see it as essentially bringing about licensing of journalists with all that would entail; and they see it as basically contrary to the whole idea of open journalism in an open society."
[14] David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of Newspeople and Their Work* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1986), p. 145.
[15] David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist,* p. 145.

occupation a profession."[16] This argument resonates with Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson, who also highlight the lack of dialogue between the disciplines operating in this area – notably sociology and journalism studies, which coexist "in a state of mutual indifference."[17] In other words, different disciplines hold disparate views about what the journalistic occupation consists of, and what constitutes a profession in the first place – and there is virtually no dialogue between them. To complicate things further, the occupational scholarship within journalism studies uses a methodology that is out of date. According to Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts "the episodic debate about modes of occupational control in journalism has persisted with an implicit model of professionalism as a set of professional 'traits' that was abandoned by sociology thirty years ago."[18]

The work in this chapter also refers to Thomas Hanitzsch's crucial distinction between *professionalism* and processes of *professionalization*. The author notes that both terms were often used interchangeably, although they clearly have conceptually different meanings. "Professionalism," writes Hanitzsch, "is something that journalists embrace or pursue, while professionalization refers to a process of an occupation gradually becoming a true profession."[19] Like Chapter II, which takes this distinction as a point of departure and posits objectivity, along with the emergence of a mass press, at the centre of journalism's professional/occupational ideology, the third chapter of this dissertation also draws from the dissimilarity between *professionalism* and *professionalization*, and it is

[16] John Soloski. "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News" in *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader* (ed. by Dan Berkowitz), (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997), p. 138-9.
[17] Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson, "Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism" in *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, p. 88.
[18] Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts. "Rethinking the concept of professionalism: the case of journalism." *British Journal of Sociology*, Vol. 54, Issue 4 (December 2003), p. 548.
[19] Thomas Hanitzsch, "Comparative Journalism Studies" in *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, p. 416.

divided into two main sections. The first section discusses the emergence of reporters and it situates both the modern principle of objectivity in Anglo-American journalism and the rise of professionalism as "an aspect of a wider movement known as *modernism*, a response to the major shifts in technology, economics and beliefs that had accompanied the Industrial Revolution."[20] The second section, in turn, aims to offer a brief review of the literature on *professionalization*, in the sense of the term offered by Hanitzsch. It considers the journalistic occupation within the system of professions by drawing on approaches from sociology, political economy, communications and, of course, journalism studies. Finally, it lays the groundwork which will enable us to see the emergence and purpose of journalism education as an integral part of the so-called "professional project," which is discussed extensively in the fourth chapter of this dissertation.

[20] Barbara Kelly, p. 147. The author proceeds to explain that modernism is marked by the spread of reforms and social change, and that "although scholars of modernism debate the exact moment of its birth, all agree that it was in its primacy during the years following World War I, particularly in America."

Objectivity/Professionalism, Modernism, and the Emergence of the Reporter

One problem I have with reporters is that to a reporter following me around, my untimely death wouldn't be a tragedy, but a professional opportunity.

– Garrison Keillor

Despite the multiplicity of views about the nature and emergence of objectivity, the core tenet of Anglo-American journalism's occupational ideology, as discussed in this dissertation's previous chapter, one thing is certain: by the 1920s, the objectivity norm "became a fully formulated occupational ideal, part of a professional project or mission."[21] At the time, Walter Lippmann wrote that journalism had been many things, "but a *profession* it could not begin to be until *modern objective journalism was successfully created*, and with it the need of men who consider themselves devoted, as all the professions ideally are, to the service of truth alone."[22] (italics mine) At any rate, as Daniel Hallin and Paolo Mancini put it, "the early and strong development of this form of professionalization, centered around the principle of objectivity and connected with a sharp decline in party-press parallelism, is clearly one of the distinctive characteristics of North American media history."[23]

Most significantly, Michael Schudson notes that far more than a set of craft rules to fend off libel suits or a set of constraints to help editors keep tabs on their underlings, objectivity was finally a 'moral code,' one which was asserted in the textbooks used in journalism schools, and in the codes of ethics of professional associations.[24] Barbara Kelly agrees that as these first codes of conduct were adopted, objectivity became the

[21] Schudson, "Objectivity Norm," p. 163.
[22] Lippmann "The American Press," pp. 440-441.
[23] Hallin and Mancini, *Three Media Systems*, p. 219.
[24] Schudson, "Objectivity Norm," p. 163.

'cornerstone' of the established press in the period between World Wars I and II.[25] For journalists, according to the author, objectivity represented both a reform in the nature of news coverage and evidence of their rise to professional status.[26] Stephen Ward notes that professionalism and objectivity were "the only bulwarks against the invading evil forces of sensationalism and commercial degradation of the once widely admired liberal press."[27] Harrison Miller Trice echoes these ideas, stating that there was a long-term compatibility between objectivity and the actual tasks of journalists that tipped the occupation toward the selection and revival of objectivity as the prevailing ideology.[28] Trice explains that the distortion of news is simply not a basic feature of gathering and reporting; thus, "to distort it was an unrealistic, discomforting and onerous task." In other words, reporting news as accurately as possible was consistent with the task itself and, in addition, a new morality was emerging within the ranks of editors and reporters that was guiding the institutionalization phase of the development of the ideology.[29]

That said, the emergence of the parallel between objectivity and newsgathering can be traced back much further. As discussed in the previous chapter, Dan Schiller writes about the materialization of the machinelike role of the reporter in mid-nineteenth century America by the evident tie to daguerreotypy and photography; news objectivity was thus compared metaphorically to instruments whose capacity for photographic accuracy was "widely known and uncontested."[30] Schiller notes that the widespread typification of the newspaper as a daguerreotype was sustained also by the guiding credo

---

[25] Kelly, p. 149. The author cites J. Douglas Tarpley, "The Canons of American Journalism: The ASNE and SPJ Codes and Statement."
[26] Ibid., p. 149. The author views objectivity as "both a literary style and an ethical ideal."
[27] Ward, *The Invention of Journalism Ethics*, p. 212.
[28] Harrison Miller Trice, *Occupational subcultures in the workplace* (New York: ILR Press, 1993), p. 60.
[29] Ibid., p. 60.
[30] Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News: The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981), p. 88.

of the new professional journalist, and quotes mid-nineteenth-century journalist Isaac Pray describing this phenomenon:

> A reporter should be as a mere machine to repeat, in spite of editorial suggestion or dictation. He should know no master but his duty, and that is to give the exact truth. His profession is a superior one, and no love of place or popularity should swerve him from giving the truth in its integrity. If he depart from this course, he inflicts an injury on himself, on his profession, and on the journal which employs him.[31]

Géraldine Muhlmann also points to the number of technological advances in the Western democracies which transformed journalism towards the middle of the nineteenth century. Among them, she cites the growth of railway transport, which facilitated the circulation of newspapers and assured them a far wider readership; the extension of the telegraphic communication network which mean that news could be gathered with greater frequency and from further afield. According to Muhlmann, "the newspaper ceased to be simply a forum for the expression of diverse opinions and became a source of news, ever more news, gathered by people who became to call themselves 'reporters'."[32] Andie Tucher notes that historians interested in the development of journalism as a profession generally agree that the reporter was born in the 1830s, "as a necessary agent of the new urban penny press, which was redefining the idea of 'news' to mean not the customary commercial or partisan intelligence but rather gathered information about everyday life that was timely, accurate, independent, enterprising, and commercially valuable."[33] Finally, the nascent press agencies increasingly established 'reporting' as the core

---

[31] Isaac Clark Pray, *Memories of James Gordon Bennett and His Times* (New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1855), p. 472. / Cited in Dan Schiller, *Objectivity and the News*, p. 89.
[32] Géraldine Muhlmann, *A Political History of Journalism* (Polity, 2008), p. 1.
[33] Andie Tucher, "Reporting for Duty: The Bohemian Brigade, the Civil War, and the Social Construction of the Reporter," *Book History* 9 (2006), p. 131.

journalistic activity and, broadly speaking, journalism embarked on the path to its professionalization.[34]

Daniel Hallin places the professionalization of journalism as part of a general trend, beginning in the Progressive Era, away from Partisan politics as a basis for public life, and towards conceptions of administrative rationality and neutral expertise.[35] Andie Tucher claims that "the reporter began to take on many of the generally accepted sociological characteristics of a professional in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when journalists joined the members of other emerging vocations such as law, medicine, and teaching in the widespread effort to identify, organize, and control the distinctive bodies of knowledge, codes of behavior, and modes of inquiry that set them apart from ordinary people."[36]

According to the Hallin, "the journalist was supposed to serve the public as a whole, and not particular interests, whether the partisan causes journalists had championed in the nineteenth century, or the narrow commercial interests of advertisers and owners."[37] Géraldine Muhlmann notes that this is also the period when there emerged those concerns about journalism that have dogged it ever since. The author argues that "the criticism have varied in content, but they all, then as now, start from the same somber diagnosis: journalism is responsible for a powerful trend to homogenize the public sphere of opinions and gazes, which is prejudicial to democratic life, itself dependent on the exchange of a variety of points of view."[38] Hugh de Burgh notes that

---

[34] Muhlmann, p. 1.
[35] Daniel Hallin, "Commercialism and professionalism in the American News Media" in *Mass Media and Society* (ed. by J. Curran and M. Gurevitch, London: Arnold, 2000), p. 220.
[36] Tucher, "Reporting for Duty," p. 131.
[37] Hallin, "Commercialism and professionalism in the American News Media," p. 220.
[38] Muhlmann. p. 2.

"this 'public sphere' consisted of competing groups debating the issues of the day, and these groups wished to be supplied with the same information on which to base their often differing analyses of their interests and the interests of their polities."[39] As Jürgen Habermas put it, "the public sphere served only to integrate subjective opinions into the objectivity assumed by the spirit in the form of the state."[40]

The inter-war years brought "the climax of the transition of the newsman from the printer to journalist and reflects and number of contextual changes that were taking place" in America.[41] According to William S. Solomon, this transition commenced after the American Civil War, when the commercial press began to emphasize news gathering and staffs increased.[42] Andrew Abbott observes that although news in the modern sense was created by the penny press of the 1830s, the Civil War intensified demand for news coverage and helped push newspapers towards exclusive work in news rather than entertainment.[43] Solomon notes that this fundamental change required some way to control the labor force that was being created," and argues that "the solution was a hierarchy of power in the newsroom.[44] In the author's view, the establishment of the position of reporter was an initial step in this development, "enabled by 'evolution of the social organizations that produced news'."[45] Abbott notes that "the late nineteenth century saw an invasion of college-trained reporters and consequent improvement in the

---

[39] Hugh de Burgh, *Investigative Journalism: Context and Practice* (Routledge, 2000), p. 36.
[40] Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (Boston, MA: MIT Press, 1991), p. 120.
[41] Barbara Kelly, p. 149.
[42] William S. Solomon, "The Site of Newsroom Labor: The Division of Editorial Practices" in *Newsworkers: Toward a History of the Rank and File*, Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, ed. (University of Minnesota Press, 1995), p. 119.
[43] Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions*, p. 225.
[44] Solomon, p. 119.
[45] Ibid., p. 119. / The author cites John C. Nerone, "The Mythology of the Penny Press," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4 (1987), p. 396.

status, style, and content of reportage." According to the author, "the editorial conception of 'facts' in the modern sense had already taken shape by this period, and although Hearst papers made 'reporting the facts' a form of entertainment (as opposed to the Ochs conception of facts as information), the news jurisdiction has been founded on providing current 'factual' information to the public since the turn of the century."[46]

Kelly discusses the reshaping of the definition of the term journalist at the turn of the century "with the creation of a new class of middle managers and the professionalization of what had formerly been artisans and tradesmen."[47] John C. Nerone notes the evolution of a commercial model of journalism as the newspaper began to shift "from a craft to an industry."[48] According to Marianne Salcetti, "increased speed in newspaper production produced both a division of labor and specialization of labor in newspapers."[49] Sandra L. Borden writes that "promising developments included the emergence of reporting as a new occupation with its own practices of interviewing and, later, verification."[50] That said, Salcetti specifies that "reporters were but one widget in this mechanized process, and in spite of the stereotypes of spirited individualism and work freedom, their work life, as characterized by Francis Leupp in 1910, was not so different from that of a railroad worker or iron puddler – workers in other industries whose work was also increasingly driven by machines and speed."[51] William S. Solomon notes the irony that "in terms of pay, working conditions, and job security, newswork

---

[46] Abbott, p. 225.
[47] Kelly, p. 154.
[48] John C. Nerone, "The Mythology of the Penny Press," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 4 (1987), p. 113.
[49] Marianne Salcetti, "The Emergence of the Reporter," in Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, eds., *Newsworkers: Toward a History of the Rank and File* (University of Minnesota Press, 1995), p. 59.
[50] Sandra L. Borden, *Journalism As Practice: MacIntyre, Virtue Ethics and the Press* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007), p. 109.
[51] Salcetti, pp. 59-60.

appears to have been more blue-collar than was typographical work." According to the author, this white-collar identity on the part of newsworkers may be due to "the fact that the work did not involve manual labor and dirtying one's hands." Solomon argues that "in this vein, the determinants of newsroom work's ideology and social status were rooted in a long-standing distinction between editor and printer." In his view, "with the separation of these two tasks earlier in the [twentieth] century, the position of editor – and that of all newsroom work – came to carry a more intellectual aura than did typographical work." That said, Solomon notes that "newspapers' capitalist development brought such growth in newsroom staffs that most newswork positions became in many respects proletarian in nature" and, "in effect, the work retained its intellectual nature as the main determinant of its identity, even as its material circumstances deteriorated."[52]

Additionally, Barbara Kelly notes that "the traditional professions expanded into a variety of specialists, and among them could be found the new breed of journalists, who were professionals with academic standing, a published set of standards, professional associations, and middle-class status.[53] Marianne Salcetti adds that as labor became more specialized, the reporter's work, and the training for this work, also emerged as specialized needs and activities,[54] as shall be discussed in the next chapter of this dissertation. Kelly argues that these professionals would also drive the rise of objectivity.[55] According to Stephen Ward, the formulation of journalism objectivity in the early twentieth century differed in three ways from its predecessor, the nineteenth-century ideal of factual reporting. More specifically, "the three differences were matters

[52] Solomon, pp. 128-129.
[53] Kelly, p. 154.
[54] Salcetti, p. 60.
[55] Kelly, p. 154.

of degree – objectivity was stricter, more methodical, and *more professional*."[56] (italics mine) Barbara Kelly notes that by 1920, journalists had established professional associations to set standards for the education and ethics that would support their field.[57] Andie Tucher notes that "by the first decades of the twentieth century the reporter was widely recognized as a professional, and journalism was establishing its own schools, associations, and ethical standards, which, while never as central to vocational standing and identity as those of law or medicine, nonetheless participated in the characteristic social effort of the era to identify, organize, and control the distinctive bodies of knowledge, codes of behavior, 'expert' practices, and special modes of inquiry that set professionals apart from ordinary people."[58] Stuart Allan goes back much further, dating this phenomenon to the mid-19th century, when "various social clubs and press societies were being created as informal, shared spaces for journalists to meet to discuss their concerns about what was rapidly becoming – in the eyes of many of them – a 'profession' (this when the drinking of toasts from skulls was not an unknown practice at some of these clubs)."[59] According to Allan, "these spaces were formally inaugurated after the Civil War with the opening of the New York Press Club in 1873." The author notes that "it was in this period, just as the newspaper was being redefined as a big business requiring financial investment on a large scale, that journalists' formal claims to a professional status deserving of public esteem were becoming widespread."[60]

As Allan reminds us, appeals to professionalism "have always been hotly contested among journalists in the USA," noting that some historians maintain that

---

[56] Stephen Ward, *The Invention of Journalism Ethics*, p. 216.
[57] Kelly, p. 154.
[58] Andie Tucher, "Notes on a Cultural History of Reporting," *Cultural Studies* 23, no. 2 (2009), p. 291.
[59] Stuart Allan, *News Culture*, 2nd ed. (Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2004), pp. 20-21.
[60] Ibid., p. 21.

journalists began referring to their craft as a profession as early as the Civil War, while others eschew the idea of professional status altogether. At any rate, according to Allan, "there seems little doubt that it was the penny press in the 1830s which firmly established the institution of paid reporters, although it would still take several more decades for salaried positions to become the norm."[61] Andie Tucher notes that while the tactics and techniques used by reporters for gathering the news did not materially change during the Civil War era, he contends that the journalists' sense of themselves and their work did. According to Tucher, "for the first time, people engaged in everyday newsgathering were making an effort to craft their public image, to present to the world their own picture of who reporters were, what reporters did, and why the public should care." The author adds that "for the first time, some journalists—a small group of them, to be sure, though among them were some of the most influential practitioners on some of the largest-circulation papers of the day—were not just doing their job of reporting but were also writing about their job of reporting, making explicit claims about their rights and responsibilities as narrators of the nation's stories." In other words, in Tucher's view, "journalists were beginning to think of and present themselves as a class apart—as professionals."[62]

Since then, and in this process, "the news gatherer changed from a freelance correspondent to a salaried journalist, from an on-site diarist to a professional chronicler of events, and, in the case of the war correspondents, from an adventurer to an educated professional."[63] Magali Sarfatti-Larson claims that "modern professions are a typical product of the great transformation, and emerging, "thus, as the age-old foundations of

[61] Ibid., p. 20.
[62] Tucher, "Reporting for Duty," p. 132.
[63] Kelly, p. 154.

status are being destroyed by the twin processes of urbanization and industrialization."[64] In addition to the rise of class, status and education among its practitioners, Kelly points out that "the journalism of the 1920s was a product of a number of other influences from the late 19th century." She lists among these the "new ideas about labor management: the centralized use of space, the value of a specialized work force and the study of time and motion," aspects which had "invaded all aspects of urban life by the by the end of WWI."[65] Marianne Salcetti writes of another modernization influence on the newspaper industry in the late 1880s. The author notes that in order to participate in the mechanized business of newspapers, capital on a large order was a prerequisite. According to Salcetti, "in order to run a newspaper, more than a set of type in a wagon or a desire to influence people was needed," and she moves on to discuss "the shift from editor-publisher to publisher-financier."[66] Moreover, Hanno Hardt notes that "the conditions of journalism in modernity and the contemporary task of the media are shaped by the rising importance of information, the impact of technology, and the commodification of knowledge,"[67] as argued previously in the discussion of professionalism and objectivity. In Hardt's view, "the inevitable shift to an information society has made different demands on journalists and their relations to each other and to their institutions and affects the notion of work itself when information and knowledge, rather than property, constitute social and

---

[64] Magali Sarfatti-Larson, *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1977), p. 76.
[65] Kelly, p. 155. The author notes that "From the centralization of activities into districts within the city – Printers Row, Ladies' Mile, the theatre district – as well as the creation of residential suburbs, the forces of centralization marked the physical layout of the modern city. Within the factory, the specialization of tasks was reflected in the rise of specialized spaces and a rationalized flow of work from one dedicated area to another."
[66] Salcetti, "The Emergence of the Reporter," p. 51.
[67] Hanno Hardt, "The End of Journalism," in *Interactions: Critical Studies in Communication, Media and Journalism* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1998), p. 200.

political power (and divide society into classes)."[68] The author cites an argument by Alain Touraine, who writes that work, in this sense, "comes to be less and less defined as a personal contribution and more as a role within a system of communications and social relations," adding that "the one who controls exerts influence on the systems of social relations in the name of their needs; the one who is controlled constantly affirms his existence, not as a member of any organization, element of the production profess, or subject of a State, but as an autonomous unit whose personality does not coincide with any of his roles."[69] By the 1920s, "media professionals had themselves adopted the notion that professionals are more qualified than their audience to determine the audience's own interests and needs."[70]

According to Graeme Burton, the invocation of the term 'professionalism' conjures up a discourse in which ideas about expertise, codified behaviour, status and reliability are also invoked. The author notes that "there are reasons why people like to call themselves professionals." As Burton points out, "news produced by 'professionals' is therefore truthful and reliable" and journalists thus "share a culture in which they operate out of standard practices."[71] Barbie Zelizer adds that "since the 1900s, when a scattered and disorganized group of writers was able to consolidate via agreed-upon standards of action, the profession has given reporters a sense of control over work conditions, wages and tasks." In Zelizer's view, journalists' ability to decide what is

---

[68] Ibid., p. 200.
[69] Alain Touraine, "Post-Industrial Classes," in James D. Faubion, ed. *Rethinking the Subject: An Anthology of Contemporary European Social Thought* (Boulder: Westview, 1995), p. 188 / cited in Hanno Hardt, "The End of Journalism," p. 200.
[70] Gaye Tuchman, *Making News: A Study in the Social Construction of Reality* (New York: Free Press, 1978), p 108.
[71] Graeme Burton, *Media and Society: Critical Perspectives* (Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2005) p. 283.

news is the constituting factor distinguishing journalists from non-reporters.[72] David T. Z. Mindich echoes this view, writing that "being a professional, of course, implies that others are 'unprofessional'."[73] According to the author, "a number of journalists saw professionalization as an efficacious means to uplift journalists and keep out 'unprofessionals'." Mindich cites Whitelaw Reid, a leading journalist-turned-politician, who declared, in 1931, 'we may hope for some of the sanctions of a profession. The age of Bohemia is gone.'[74] Mindich notes that "Joseph Pulitzer waxed Darwinian in his plans to create his journalism school at Columbia: 'I sincerely hope it will create a class distinction between the fit and the unfit,' he wrote."[75]

While the following chapter of this dissertation will consider this discussion of a professional rise of class by focusing on the emergence of journalism education as an means of legitimization, the next section of this chapter offers a brief review of scholarly literature on the process of professionalization. For these purposes, the discussion is divided into six subsections: 'trait' theories, linked to structuralist-functionalist sociological theories, like those of Émile Durkheim and Talcott Parsons; the interactionist or phenomenological approach associated with Everett C. Hughes; the power perspective advanced by Magali Sarfatti-Larson through a sociological shift from 'professional traits' to 'professional struggle;' journalistic discourse and discursive communities, including discursive analyses of how journalists construct their identity, expertise, authority, and power, exemplified in the work of Barbie Zelizer; the systemic

---

[72] Barbie Zelizer, "Journalists as Interpretive Communities," *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader*, ed., Daniel Allen Berkowitz (London: Sage, 1997), p. 402.
[73] David T. Z. Mindich, *Just The Facts*, p. 115.
[74] Whitelaw Reid, *American and English Studies*, Vol. 2, *Biography, History and Journalism* (1913), p. 219. / Cited in David T. Z. Mindich, p. 115.
[75] Joseph Pulitzer, *The College of Journalism*, p. 649. / Cited in David T. Z. Mindich, p. 115.

division of labor and a struggle of *jurisdiction*, as proposed by Andrew Abbott; and Pierre Bourdieu's concept of *field*. It should be specified that the three basic sociological traditions to the study of the professions outlined by Randal Beam are the phenomenological, power-oriented and open-system approaches.[76] To this, practically all the scholars cited in this literature review add Andrew Abbott's (1988) systemic division of labor. Zelizer's concept of journalists as discursive communities, and the Bourdieusian concept of field, are used to illustrate the difficulties of classifying the journalistic profession, and as alternatives, albeit limited and incomplete with which to address these difficulties.

Following the exploration of these different approaches, their intersections, differences, points of convergence, and points of dispute, my purpose is to lay the groundwork for the emergence and role of journalism education as an integral part of the so-called Weberian "professional project,"[77] a discussion of which follows in the next section of this work.

[76] Randal A. Beam, "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept," p. 3. The author adds a disclaimer that "other approaches can be identified when the conceptual hair-splitting begin."
[77] Advanced by Magali Sarfatti Larson (1977) as shall be discussed later, the 'professional project' approach "is concerned with the ways in which the possessors of specialist knowledge set about building up a monopoly of their knowledge and, and this basis, establish a monopoly of the services derived from it. This draws on a mainly Weberian tradition, especially the concepts of 'exclusion' and 'social closure' as mechanisms whereby the social standing of a group is achieved and maintained." [Extracted from Keith M. Macdonald, *The Sociology of the Professions* (London: Sage, 1995), p. xii.]

Professionalization and Journalism: Art, Craft, Trade or Profession?

To publish a good News-Paper is not so easy an Undertaking as many People imagine it to be. The Author of a Gazette (in the Opinion of the Learned) ought to be qualified with an extensive Acquaintance of Languages, a great Easiness and Command of Writing and Relating Things clearly and intelligibly, and in a few words; he should be able to speak of War both by Land and Sea; be well acquainted with Geography, with the History of the time, with the several Interests of Princes and States, the Secrets of Courts, and the Manners and Customs of all nations. Men thus accomplish'd are very rare in this remote Part of the World; and it would be well if the writers of these Papers could make up among his Friends what is wanting in himself.

– Benjamin Franklin,
THE PENNSYLVANIA GAZETTE *(SEPT. 25, 1729*

As mentioned previously, there is a great deal of discussion in the occupational sociological literature about what occupations qualify as professions, and what occupations are doing or might to do obtain professional status.[78] This has been the case since the days of the founding fathers of sociology, Karl Marx, Max Weber and Émile Durkheim, who "remained relatively vague about the role of the professions, subsuming them under what they deemed the more important categories of their respective theories."[79] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis write that "Marx's central theme of class struggle left little room for a more detailed account of the professions."[80] According to the authors, Marx's "division of society across class lines did not attribute any special role to the professions," aligning them at times with the bourgeoisie, "in others with the proletariat, and in a third way, treated as bystanders that could align with either side."[81] Andrew Abbott shares the same concern, writing that "the professions, and in particular

[78] Marianne Allison, "A Literature Review of Approaches to the Professionalism of Journalists," in *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1, no. 2 (Spring/Summer 1986), p. 5.
[79] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 58.
[80] Ibid., p. 58.
[81] Ibid., p. 58.

the Anglo-American variety, were a great puzzle for social theorists."[82] According to Abbott, "Weber spent many embarrassed pages confronting the wanton irrationality of the English bar," while "Durkheim simply ignored the Anglo-American professions altogether and looked to more familiar French occupations for his neocorporatist future."[83] Moreover, Simon Cottle argues that "if the ideas of Marx still register in the traditions of political economy and cultural studies, so the ideas of Émile Durkheim with respect to processes of professional socialization and the establishment of group norms, and Max Weber with respect to the nature of modern bureaucracies and views of social action, have informed the sociological study of news production."[84]

Randal Beam attempts to define three basic sociological traditions to the study of professions (phenomenological, power-oriented and open-system, as shall be discussed later), "though other approaches can be identified when the conceptual hair-splitting begins."[85] As noted previously, Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson speak of a "state of mutual indifference" between this subfield of sociology that examines professionalization and professional systems – the sociology of professions – and the field of journalism studies.[86] Henrik Örnebring argues that "journalism scholarship has so far not been very successful in placing the changes in journalism within the wider context of changes in work, employment and occupations" simply because journalism research has not kept up to date with the sociology of work and occupations.[87] Finally, Howard

[82] Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions*, p. 4.
[83] Ibid., p. 4.
[84] Simon Cottle, ed., *Media Organisation and Production* (London: Sage, 2003), p. 13.
[85] Randal A. Beam, "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept," p. 3.
[86] Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson, "Objectivity, Professionalism and Truth-Seeking in Journalism," p. 88.
[87] Henrik Örnebringm, "The Two Professionalisms of Journalism: Journalism and the changing context of work," working paper (University of Oxford, Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism: February 2009), p. 2-3.

Tumber and Marina Prentoulis show that unlike the classical professions, the depth of abstract knowledge on which the practice of journalism is based is both limited and less clearly defined, while the emphasis on practical skills brings journalism closer to a craft than a profession.[88] So "although journalism has had to face a set of very specific problems inherent in its practice, the sociology of professions and occupations has juggled with providing some stable guidelines on how to characterize professions in general."[89] Despite these challenges, one can still argue that professionalization is a process through which journalists sought to elevate their standing in society by joining the ranks of other educated professionals. Whether or not this process ever succeeded in creating a profession of journalism, this social 'elevation' did succeed in changing the identity of journalists, as the following brief literature review of the process of professionalization, and the next chapter of this dissertation, aims to demonstrate.

[88] Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "Journalism and the Making of a Profession," p. 58.
[89] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 58.

The structuralist-functionalist approach

Randal A. Beam, David H. Weaver, and Bonnie J. Brownlee claim that "discussions about journalism as a profession date to at least the start of the twentieth century, when legendary publisher Joseph Pulitzer proposed that journalists receive education and training to improve their social standing."[90] They add that "others, such as columnist Walter Lippmann, echoed Pulitzer, advocating that journalists embrace work practices that some now associate with professionalism, such as objectivity."[91] However, the authors claim that "it was not until the 1960s that a body of scholarship on the professionalization of journalism began to emerge"[92] though this statement is not entirely correct. Scholarship in this area dates back to 1933 and the pioneering work of Sir Alexander Morris Carr-Saunders and Paul Alexander Wilson, *The Professions*.[93] Although there are major weaknesses in their methodology – including but not limited to their refusal to define 'professionalism' – their work is very significant in terms of opening scholarship in the field.[94] Carr-Saunders and Wilson had noted that much attention had been given to the study of trade unions and social and economic problems, while professional associations, in turn, had been "almost entirely neglected."[95] As a result, the central purpose of their study was to provide an historical background for all groups that could be considered "professions."

---

[90] Randal A. Beam, David H. Weaver, and Bonnie J. Brownlee, "Changes in Professionalism of U.S. Journalists in the Turbulent Twenty-First Century," *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, (Volume 86, Number 2, Summer 2009), p. 278.
[91] Ibid., p. 278.
[92] Ibid., p. 278.
[93] Sir Alexander Morris Carr-Saunders and Paul Alexander Wilson, *The Professions* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933).
[94] Ibid.,. The authors literally write: "We shall not offer, now or later, a definition of professionalism."
[95] Ibid., p. iii.

It wouldn't be until the early 1970s that scholarly attention to occupations and professions turned away from focusing on identifying 'traits,' "such as development of codes of ethics, that supposedly differentiated professionals from nonprofessionals," according to Patricia L. Dooley.[96] Tumber and Prentoulis write that the main problem with the 'trait theories,' as they are referred to, "was how to define a core set of traits, attributes or crucial characteristics that played a decisive role in the distinction between occupations and 'professions.'"[97] In his discussion of the relationship between journalists and the traits generally accepted as distinguishing a profession from a vocation, Andie Tucher lists: autonomy, special training, a high level of skill, social authority, codes of ethics or standards of conduct, peer accountability, and a culture or sense of community.[98] Anthony Smith, in turn lists the following key criteria of professionalization: collective control over entry to the group; a code of altruistic service, supported by scrupulous self-policing; a special set of skills based on the absorption of a definable body of knowledge and a set of 'client-type' relationships with the public.[99]

Tumber and Prentoulis cite a 1964 review of the trait approach by Geoffrey Millerson,[100] who "identified twenty-three elements that might constitute the various definitions of a profession" and notes that, "as he tried to extract the core elements from the sociological literature, he provided an insight into the problem by pointing out that no single element on his list was accepted by all authors as essential."[101] Unsurprisingly,

---

[96] Patricia L. Dooley, *Taking Their Place: Journalists in the Making of an Occupation*, p. 4.
[97] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 59.
[98] Andie Tucher, "Reporting for Duty: The Bohemian Brigade, the Civil War, and the Social Construction of the Reporter," *Book History* (Volume 9, 2006), pp. 152-153 (n1).
[99] Anthony Smith, *The Geopolitics of Information: How Western Culture Dominates the World* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), p. 153.
[100] Geoffrey Millerson, *The Qualifying Associations: A Study of Professionalization* (London: Routledge and Paul: 1964) / cited by Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 59.
[101] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 59.

Millerson begins his first chapter by stating that "of all sociological ideas, one of the most difficult to analyze satisfactorily is the concept of a profession."[102]

According to Tumber and Prentoulis, "a further problem with trait theory is that it is based on the implicit assumption that there is an 'ideal type', a 'true profession' that can be abstracted from existing occupations."[103] Indeed, the methodological model used by Carr-Saunders and Wilson is basically a collection of empirical case studies. The authors requested information from a variety of occupational associations which were "usually granted professional rank" and suggested that "with this material before us we shall be in a position to examine and evaluate all that is characteristic of professionalism."[104] According to Andrew Abbott, "the Carr-Saunders volume epitomized two methodologies characteristic of writing on the professions, combining naturalism and typology."[105] Abbott notes that "early articles on the professions would summarize the life history of their particular case, review the then-current essential traits of a true profession, and decide whether social work or nursing or whatever really was a profession."[106] Edward Gieskes notes that "consensus on what those 'essential traits' of a profession might be was elusive and the body of work produced was an undifferentiated mass of empirical studies that reflected the author's prejudices rather than theoretical rigor."[107] Tumber and Prentoulis agree, noting that "until well after World War II most British historians focused on the elite professions, often in studies commissioned by the professions themselves," in large part due to the "collective perception of profession as a

[102] Millerson, p. 1.
[103] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 59.
[104] Carr-Saunders and Wilson, p. 3.
[105] Abbott, *The System of Professions*, p. 4.
[106] Ibid., p. 4.
[107] Edward Gieskes, *Representing the Professions: Administration, Law, and Theater in Early Modern England* (University of Delaware Press, 2006), p. 47.

distinct set of occupations put forth by Carr-Saunders and Wilson.[108] Furthermore, looking back to Millerson's analysis of "twenty-three items culled from the work of no less than twenty-one authors who have attempted various to define or abstract the 'essential elements' of the 'true' profession,"[109] Terence Johnson notes that "an 'ideal type,' as it is sometimes referred to, is abstracted from the known characteristics of these existing occupations – medicine and law are taken as the 'classical' cases." This poses a huge problem, because "on many occasions one is left with the overriding impression that the 'ideal' is in terms of what ought to be."[110]

If I am focusing so intensely on a theoretical approach to the study of professional occupations that is both obsolete and ridden with problems – the 'trait' theories which emerged in the 1930s – it is because this approach is still present in scholarship coming from journalism studies. Pointing to the absence of work that explicitly links the sociology of professions to journalism, Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson single out two strands of analysis which have emerged within journalism studies: the first emerging from journalism itself; the second drawing on approaches from the sociology of news organizations and media studies. The problem with the first strand is its emphasis on measuring the degree to which journalism has achieved professional status, often through occupational or educational surveys, "without actually worrying about whether journalism produces authoritative knowledge or possesses professional traits."[111] In this first strand of scholarship, the importance of journalism "is self-evident and not dependent on its status in a hierarchy of occupations," and in this sense suffers "from its

[108] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 61.
[109] Terence James Johnson, *Professions and Power (Study in Sociology)* (London: Macmillan Press, 1972), p. 23.
[110] Terence James Johnson, *Professions and Power*, p. 24.
[111] Schudson and Anderson, p. 88.

(probably unconscious) adoption of the 'trait perspective' on the professions.[112] Schudson and Anderson cite the work of David H. Weaver, Randal A. Beam, Bonnie J. Brownlee, Paul S. Voakes & G. Cleveland Wilhoit – and more specifically, their book *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millenium* – as an example of this type of scholarship.[113] Commonly termed 'institutional research,' and "most often initiated by the news industry itself, or by academics with close ties to professional journalism," these types of analyses "usually seek quantitative data on journalists' employment, education levels, adherence to ethical codes, etc."[114]

Marianne Allison explains that this ideal-typical approach – which her literature review calls a *structural-functional* approach – is predominant in the literature about professionalism, and that "it has served as a guide against which would-be occupations measure themselves," sort of a 'how-to' for occupations 'on the make.'"[115] Allison also notes that "it is easily quantifiable: most of the research about journalism as a profession, for example, has used some form of indexing of the concept."[116] She cites as an example a group of communicator analysis studies which utilizes a method for indexing the professional orientation of journalists developed by Jack McLeod and Searle E. Hawley.[117] According to Allison, McLeod and Hawley developed two groups of twelve occupational criteria, one corresponding with professional orientation, and the other to a

---

[112] Schudson and Anderson, p. 88.
[113] David H. Weaver, Randal A. Beam, Bonnie J. Brownlee, Paul S. Voakes & G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 21st Century: U.S. News People at the Dawn of a New Millenium* (Mawhwah, NU: Erlbaum, 2007); this study has been carried out in 1982-1983, then again in 1992, and once more in 2002. It is, in turn, modeled on the 1971 study by John Johnstone, *The News People*. / Referred to in Schudson and Anderson, p. 88.
[114] Schudson and Anderson, p. 91.
[115] Marianne Allison, "A Literature Review of Approaches to the Professionalism of Journalists" in *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1 no. 2 (Spring/Summer 1986), p. 6.
[116] Ibid., p. 6.
[117] Jack McLeod & Searle E. Hawley, "Professionalization among newsmen," *Journalism Quarterly 41,* (1964), p. 529-588. / cited in Marianne Allison, p. 6.

non-professional orientation. Items were "grouped on the basis of structural-functional studies of professionalism" and used quantitative research-based questionnaires. Their index "proved a popular tool for other researchers," according to Allison. Slightly modified forms have been used in studies conducted by Donald K. Wright, Sven Windhal and Karl Erik Rosengren; Oguz Nayman, Blaine McKee, and Dan Lattimore; and Dan Lattimore and Oguz Nayman.[118] Donald Weithal and Garrett O'Keefe measured the professional orientation of broadcast journalists using the index, and Oguz Nayman et al. used it to compare print journalists to public relations workers.[119]

Marianne Allison writes that this type of easily quantifiable research permits the conceptualization of an established profession, of the professional orientation of an individual, and of the professionalizing occupation.[120] But it is also this implicit model of professionalism as a set of professional 'traits' that was abandoned by sociology thirty years ago, according to Meryl Aldridge and Julia Evetts, which accounts for "the episodic debate about modes of occupation control in journalism."[121] According to Wilson Lowrey and Jenn Burleson Mackay, most scholars have shifted from a focus on static professional traits to the role of conflict among professions and occupations in pursuit of control over work, in the ways occupations define themselves publicly, and in the social antecedents and consequences of occupational control and public legitimacy (e.g. Andrew

---

[118] Donald K. Wright, "An analysis of the level of professionalism among Canadian journalists, *Gazette,* Vol. 20 (1974), p. 133-134. / Sven Windhal & Karl Erik Rosengren, "Newsmen's professionalization: Some methodological problems," *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 55 (1978), p. 466-473. / Oguz Nayman, Blaine McKee, and Dan Lattimore, "PR Personnel and Print Journalists: A Comparison of Professionalism," *Journalism Quarterly*, Vol. 54, No. 3 (Autumn 1977), pp. 492- 497. / Dan Lattimore & Oguz B. Nayman, "Professionalism of Colorado's daily newsmen: A communicator analysis," *Gazette,* Vol. 20 (1974), p. 1-10. / cited in Marianne Allison, p. 6.

[119] Donald Weinthal & Garrett J. O'Keefe, "Professionalization among broadcast newsmen in an urban area," *Journal of Broadcasting* (Vol. 18, 1974) p. 193-209. / cited in Marianne Allison, p. 6.

[120] Ibid., p. 6.

[121] Aldridge and Evetts, p. 548.

Abbott, 1988; Eliot Freidson, 1994; Magali Sarfatti-Larson, 1977).[122] Finally, as noted by Schudson and Anderson, this "basic institutional research echoes the older body of 'trait theory' and stops the investigation before it truly begins." As a result, it becomes tempting for journalism "to turn to a talk of 'quasi," 'pseudo,' or 'failed' profession and to echo Weaver and Wilhoit's contention that journalism 'is *of* a profession but not *in* one.'"[123] (italics original) In other words, this first strand of journalism studies, "in short, largely avoids the deeper questions surrounding journalism's unsettled occupational status."[124] According to the Schudson and Anderson, "rather than placing journalism somewhere on the professional spectrum between plumbers and neurosurgeons, it would be far more productive to inquire why and how the occupations of reporting and news editing achieved the professional status they did and how journalism may be attempting (or not, as the case may be) to raise that status."[125] The authors explain that these questions have been dealt with most explicitly by authors working within the second strand of journalism studies, a strand that which they propose to label 'cultural histories of professional objectivity.'[126] This second strand comes from the sociology of news organizations[127] and media studies[128] and "focuses on the character of journalistic

[122] Wilson Lowrey and Jenn Burleson Mackay, "Journalism and Blogging," *Journalism Practice* 2, No. 1 (2008), p. 66. Please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.
[123] Schudson and Anderson, p. 91. The authors refer to Daniel Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of Newspeople and Their Work* (Bloomington: University of Indiana Press, 1986), p. 145.
[124] Ibid., p. 91.
[125] Ibid., p. 91.
[126] Ibid., p. 91.
[127] The authors cite as examples the work of Mark Fishman, *Manufacturing the news* (Austin: University of Texas Press,1980); Herbert Gans, *Deciding what's news: A study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time (*New York: Pantheon Books, 2004); Michael Schudson, *Discovering the News* (New York: Basic Books, 1978); and Gaye Tuchman, *Making news: A study in the construction of social reality* (New York: Free Press, 1978).
[128] The authors cite the work of Barbie Zelizer, *Covering the body: The Kennedy assassination, the media, and the shaping of collective memory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992).

knowledge or claims to knowledge and thus on the standing of journalism's 'cultural authority' in Paul Starr's terms."[129]

[129] Schudson and Anderson, p. 91. The authors cite the work of Paul Starr, *The social transformation of American medicine* (New York: Basic Books, 1984).

The interactionist or phenomenological approach

This second strand of journalism studies scholarship draws on the interactionist or phenomenological theoretical perspectives associated with the sociology of professions. Schudson and Anderson situate the emergence of this perspective in the 1960s and 1970s, departing from the work by Everett C. Hughes and inspired by Max Weber's writings on status and authority.[130] According to the authors, sociologists abandoned the trait approach, passing "from the false question 'Is this occupation a profession' to the more fundamental one 'What are the circumstances in which people in an occupation attempt to turn it into a profession and themselves into professional people'."[131] They also point out that the study of the profession as an idealized structural-functionalist category, in the forty years since Hughes' challenge, has been replaced in much of sociology by the more Weberian study of professionalization and the 'professional project.'[132] Engaging with the problems of trait theory, Tumber and Prentoulis also note the emphatic shift from the 'static' structure of a profession to a specific account of the historically and culturally dynamic processes by which occupations gain professional status. The authors write that "furthermore, increased attention was paid to the attempts by practitioners to impose their own definitions of social needs and how these should be fulfilled," and that, "finally, instead of a search for traits, professions were differentiated according to their claims to abstract knowledge that underpinned the practical technique."[133] Finally, Barbie Zelizer notes this 'sociologically motivated' methodological change in research on news organizations in the 1960s when "an emphasis on organizational constraints began to

[130] Schudson and Anderson, p. 89.
[131] Everett C. Hughes, *Men and Their Work* (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1958), p. 655. / Cited in Schudson and Anderson, p. 89.
[132] Schudson and Anderson, p. 89.
[133] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 60-61.

displace a focus on the values, norms and ethics, roles and norms of individuals. At the same time, the inevitability of social constructions and their organizational function were accepted as part of most research conceptualizations."[134]

Randal Beam begins his discussion of the concept of professionalism by looking at this interactionist approach, which he refers to as the phenomenological approach. According to Beam, it is the "least-formalized tradition," rejecting a strict, formal definition of profession as artificial and advocating, instead, the study of the way members of an occupation invoke the term in everyday usage.[135] The author notes that "the strength to such an approach is that the research focuses on what the term actually means when members of an occupational group use it; it is not an objectified, idealized description of a social phenomenon."[136] Beam also states that "many analyses of professionalism in journalism are essentially phenomenological" and names Morris Janowitz, John Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski & William W. Bowman, E. Barbara Philips and Gaye Tuchman as scholars whose work equate professionalism with objectivity as a work practice, and George A. Hough, whose work equates it with exceptional journalistic skills or savvy.[137]

In turn, Christopher Anderson offers a division of three strands within the field of journalism studies concerned with expertise, authority and power: those concerned with professions (organizational analysis, objectivity and the professions); discourse (culture,

---

[134] Barbie Zelizer, *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004), pp. 62-63.
[135] Randal Beam, "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept," p. 3.
[136] Ibid., p. 3.
[137] Ibid., p. 3. All these works are also cited in the bibliography of this dissertation.

narrative, and discursive communities); and fields (the journalistic field).[138] It is within this first thread of journalism studies, which analyses journalism "as a process by which knowledge about the world is produced," that Anderson situates scholarship in this sense. Like the work of most of the scholars listed above, this work "crested in the late 1970s, part of broader critical (and largely non-Marxist) tendencies within journalism scholarship."[139] According to Anderson, "research in this vein began with Epstein's analysis of television news (1973), continued on through Carey's overview of journalism's 'whiggish history' (1974), and culminated with Tuchman's description of journalistic objectivity as a strategic ritual (1978), Gans's detailed analysis of the daily processes by which news decisions were made (2004), Schudson's social history of nineteenth-century newspapers (1978), and Gitlin's critique of the process by which the national media shaped the image and social behavior of the 'new left' (1980)."[140] The author claims that "the major development in journalism scholarship in the 1970s can be seen as the deconstruction of the idealized image of the journalist that saw him or her as the transparent relay of external events," and argues against "the usual tendency of scholars to locate this clutch of analysis in different communications 'sub-disciplines' (…) they would be better analyzed together, united as they are in their skeptical attitude toward the epistemologies of journalism and their desire to link these knowledge-producing practices to broader professional systems."[141]

---

[138] Christopher Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power in Democratic Life" in *The Media and Social Theory* (ed. by David Hesmondhalgh and Jason Toynbee; London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2008), pp. 248-264.
[139] Ibid., p. 250.
[140] Ibid., p. 250. All of these major works are referred to elsewhere in this dissertation, and cited in its bibliography.
[141] Ibid., p. 250-251. The author explains that in this context, "I follow Ekström's definition of epistemology, looking at it 'not as a philosophical inquiry into the nature of true knowledge but to the study

According to Anderson, "the critical studies of the late 1970s sought to do more than simply dissect the journalist's construction of reality, however; they were also part of what Thomas Haskell has called the 'relentless critique of professionals and professionalism.'"[142] Anderson argues that "if the critique of journalism's construction of reality paralleled, perhaps unwittingly, other critiques of science and scientific knowledge, journalism studies' turn towards the 'professionalization frame' found resonance with developments in sociology more generally."[143] As mentioned previously, "by the late 1970s the sociology of the professions was enjoying something of a renaissance as scholars began to turn away from the prevailing neo-structuralist, Parsonian understandings of the professions, adopting a more Weberian or Marxist critique of professional power."[144]

According to Eliot Freidson, "if 'profession' may be defined as a folk concept then the research strategy appropriate to it is phenomenological in character."[145] The author states that "one does not attempt to determine what a profession is in an absolute sense so much as to how people in society determine who is professional and who is not, how they 'make' or accomplish professions by their activities."[146] Pierre Bourdieu shares this view, agreeing that 'profession' is a "folk concept," one "which has been uncritically smuggled into scientific language and which imports into it a whole social unconscious."

---

of knowledge producing practices and the communication of knowledge claims' (citing Mats Ekström, "Epistemologies of TV journalism: a theoretical framework," *Journalism*, Vol. 3, 2002, p. 259)."

[142] Thomas Haskell, *Objectivity is not Neutrality* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998) / cited by Chris Anderson, p. 251.

[143] Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power in Democratic Life," p. 252. The author had previously referred to a similar critique of science and the scientific establishment as seen in the works of Paul Feyerabend, *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Science* (London: New Left Books, 1975) and Harry Collins, "The seven sexes: a study in the sociology of a phenomenon, or the replication of experiments in physics," in *Sociology*, Vol. 9 (1975), p. 205–24.

[144] Ibid., p. 252.

[145] Eliot Freidson, *Profession of medicine; a study of the sociology of applied knowledge* (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1970), p. 27.

[146] Eliot Freidson, p. 27.

For Bourdieu, the concept of 'profession' is "the *social product* of a historical work of construction of a group and of a *representation* of groups that has surreptitiously slipped into the science of this very group" – which is why, in the author's view, the concept "works" so well.[147] (italics original)

Freidson drew largely on the school of symbolic interactionism in America, which always maintained an alternative view and tacitly contradicted the functionalism that dominated mid-century sociology and social anthropology.[148] According to Macdonald, studies like Becker et al.'s *Boys in White* (1961) and Eliot Friedson's *The Profession of Medicine* (1970) were the outcome of a tradition which took as its subject matter the actions and interactions of individuals and groups, how they constituted their social worlds as participants and how they constructed their careers.[149] In this instance, "the professional principles of altruism, service and high ethical standards were therefore seen as aspects of the day-to-day world within which members lived, worked and strove and which therefore appeared as less than perfect human social constructs rather than as abstract standards which characterized a formal collectivity."[150] According to Macdonald, "trainee physicians were portrayed as developing cynicism rather than altruism (Becker et al., 1961) doctors appeared as wielders of power, not servants of the social good (Freidson, 1970) and most of the professional 'traits' were shown to have an ideological tinge (Daniels, 1973) or even to be characterized as 'mythology' (McKinlay, 1973)."[151]

---

[147] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)," in *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, ed. Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant (The University of Chicago Press, 1992), pp. 242-243.
[148] Keith M. Macdonald, *The Sociology of the Professions*, p. 4.
[149] Ibid., p. 4.
[150] Ibid., p. 4.
[151] Ibid., p. 4.

The power approach

Macdonald writes that "it was this [aforementioned] tradition which gave rise to one version of the 'power' approach that a decade later came to dominate sociological writing on the professions."[152] It also helped Magali Sarfatti-Larson advance her theory of the 'professional project,' with *The Rise of Professionalism* (1977), which took as its starting point the work of Eliot Freidson "and was wholeheartedly endorsed by him (on the cover of the paperback edition) as being 'the most important book on professions to be published in years.'"[153] Anderson views the concept as "a fusion of Friedson's early, groundbreaking work on the medical field (Freidson 1970) with Weber's classic analysis of the attempts of occupational groups to link economic class and social status." For Sarfatti-Larson, according to Anderson, "professions are neither naturally existing occupational categories nor the bearers of socially functional 'traits'; rather, they are collective social actors who 'attempt to translate one order of scarce resources—special knowledge and skills—into another—social and economic rewards.'"[154] According to Patricia L. Dooley, Sarfatti-Larson "adopts a critical Marxist approach," and defines professional power as the ability of certain occupational groups to create markets for services and accumulate monopolies over the dispensing of such services. "Of central importance," writes Dooley, "is a group's ability to meet the needs of various groups as it sells its services."[155]

Marianne Allison writes that "the power advocates prefer to look at the stakes occupations have in acquiring professional status." In this instance, "the struggle for

---

[152] Ibid., p. 4.
[153] Ibid., p. 2.
[154] Anderson, "The Deprofessionalization of Journalism?" p. 6.
[155] Patricia L. Dooley, *Taking Their Political Place: Journalists and the Making of an Occupation* (Greenwood Publishing Group, 1997), p. 7.

professionalism is seen as a complex process of securing privilege and prestige," having implications at the interpersonal, organizational and societal level.[156] Randal Beam adds that "an emphasis on the exercise of power is at the heart of the power-relations approach to the study of professions." According to Beam, "this model addresses such issues as professionalization as a political process, the relationship of professionals to other important actors in their environment, and the relationship of the professions to the labor markets."[157] Allison states that "the power advocates do not deny that the professions may be characterized by their perceived attributes, but they point out that structural-functionalists seem to accept the appearance of an attribute at face value, rather than looking at it as having been derived from the power of the profession."[158] In Randal Beam's view, "the trait and power approaches to the professions are not wholly incompatible." For Beam, many professions certainly share common attributes or traits, "but what often underlies these common characteristics is their usefulness in helping the occupational group gain authority to control the terms of its work."[159]

The structure of the professionalization process, as defined by Sarfatti-Larson, "binds together two elements which can, and usually did, evolve independently of each other: a body of relatively abstract knowledge, susceptible of practical application, and a market – the structure of which is determined by economic and social development and also by the dominant ideological climate at a given time."[160] The fusion of these elements is clearly visible in the organizational imperatives of the news industry (i.e. efficiency, stability, profit, credibility) and the political imperatives of government and social

[156] Allison, p. 7.
[157] Beam, p. 4.
[158] Allison, p. 7.
[159] Beam, p. 5.
[160] Sarfatti Larson, p. 40.

institutions (i.e. access to the public, message salience, and legitimacy), which, in turn, "converge to create a mass communication logic called news."[161] According to W. Lance Bennett, Lynne A. Gressett, and William Halton, journalism can be understood as a 'paradigm-based field,' defined as one characterized by "broadly shared assumptions about how to gather and interpret information relevant to a particular sphere of activity," where "there is a high degree of professional control over the training process through which journalists acquire a code of ethics and a standardized reporting methodology."[162] In their view, there is a strong correlation between journalism as an institution and profession, made evident, as is also argued by Gaye Tuchman, in journalistic routines of production.[163] Bennett, Gressett and Halton write that "the combination of professional training and routinized practice corresponds to a high degree of consensus on story selection, reporting angles, and trends in the profession."[164]

Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini note that much of the media research of Liberal[165] societies has been devoted to showing how professional routines can lead to subservience of the news media not to the particular political commitments of individual owners, but to a broader dominant view among political elites. The authors underscore the notion of professional routines, claiming that "because of the relatively strong professionalization of journalism in Liberal systems, media scholarship in these countries has developed a distinctive focus on this notion, and the politics of news is normally explained primarily by the cultural assumptions and structural limits built into these

[161] W. Lance Bennett, Lynne A. Gressett, and William Halton, "Repairing the News: A Case Study of the News Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 35, no. 2 (June 1985), p. 52.
[162] W. Lance Bennett et al., "Repairing the News," pp. 54-55.
[163] Gaye Tuchman, "Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected," *The American Journal of Sociology* 79, no. 1 (July 1973), pp. 110-131.
[164] Bennett et al., "Repairing the News," p. 55
[165] The authors explain that "Liberal" and "Anglo-American" can be used interchangeably, in reference to the United States, Britain, Canada and Ireland. Hallin and Mancini, p. 198.

routines, rather than in terms of the personal views or political connections of journalists, instrumental control by owners, or political pressures from outside of news organizations (Sigal 1973; Tuchman 1978; Gans 1979; Gitlin 1980; Hallin 1986; Ericson, Baranek, and Chan 1987; Schlesinger 1987)."[166]

Michael Schudson and Chris Anderson note that a later thread on the rise of journalistic objectivity in the United States, drawing not only on Schudson's *Discovering the News* (1978) but also his later work (2001), "moved away from seeing the emergence of objectivity as an 'inevitable outcome' of wide-scale social processes and changes—whether social, economic or technological—and linked the emergence of journalistic professionalism to questions of group cohesion, professional power, social conflict, and the cultural resonance of claims to occupational authority."[167] The authors state that "Schudson's original move in *Discovering the News* was to seek the origins of professional objectivity in the nexus of developments that built a 'democratic market society' rather than in technological developments or in a "natural" evolutionary progress."[168] As a result, "Schudson distinguishes journalistic beliefs of the 1890s—naïve empiricism, or a faith in 'the facts'—from the more modern, early 20th century view of objectivity, which takes norms of objective reporting to be a set of defensive strategies rooted in the 'disappointment of the modern gaze'—the understanding that true objectivity is impossible."[169] According to Schudson and Anderson, "many authors—primarily historians of journalism—have followed Schudson in discussing the emergence of a professional class of reporters in the context of the development of professional

[166] Hallin and Mancini, *Three Media Systems*, p. 226. Please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.
[167] Schudson and Anderson, p. 92.
[168] Ibid., p. 92.
[169] Ibid., p. 93.

objectivity (most notably Stephen Banning, 1999; Hazel Dicken-Garcia, 1989; Mark Wahlgren Summers, 1994; Andie Tucher, 2004)."[170] Schudson and Anderson claim that "for these authors, and many others, objectivity continues to be the *sine qua non* of journalistic professionalization: explain the reasons behind the emergence of objectivity as an occupational practice, fix a date at which it first emerged, and you have gone a long way towards uncovering the "secret" of professional journalism."[171]

Simon Cottle reviews this trend by citing the vast number of 'substantive' ethnographies that developed this interest in the organizational, bureaucratic and professional nature of news production and news manufacture processes throughout the 1970s and 1980s: Epstein 1973; Altheide 1976; Murphy 1976; Schlesinger 1978; Tuchman 1978; Gans 1979; Golding and Elliott 1979; Bantz et al. 1980; Fishman 1980; Gitlin 1980; Fishman, 1980; Ericson et al. 1987; Soloski, 1989.[172] Cottle notes that these researches became "fully conversant with news-making processes" after basing their work on extensive and intensive periods of newsroom observations and interviews, often conducted across many years and different news outlets. Central to their line of inquiry was "how news was subject to temporal routines, how newsroom layouts were organized spatially, and how news processing was organized in relation to a newsroom division of labor, corporate hierarchy and professional cultural milieu," and how these questions "became basic building blocs to understanding."[173]

In Cottle's view, the ideological consequences of the organizational character of news production were often stressed. He notes that "researchers also observed the

[170] Ibid., p. 93. Please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.
[171] Ibid., p. 93.
[172] Cottle, *Media Organization and Production*, p. 14. Please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.
[173] Ibid., p. 14.

professional pursuit of deep-seated news values and the operation of a journalistic culture and milieu sustaining of colleague relationships, journalist professionalism and news policies."[174] That said, "it was the bureaucratic necessity of 'routine' that became the explanatory key for many of these theorists."[175] He contrasts these to earlier studies of news gatekeepers, with their tendency towards individualist and subjectivist explanations of news selection (White 1950).[176] According to Cottle, the 'substantive' ethnographies "collectively emphasized how news was an organizational accomplishment guaranteeing that sufficient amounts of news were produced on time and to a predetermined form."[177] In summary, writes Cottle, "these studies argued that the organizational requirements of news combine with the professional ideology of objectivity to routinely privilege the voices of the powerful, and this further reinforces the tendency towards the standardized and ideological nature of news." In his view, "these studies in the sociology of news production represent a substantive literature, rich in empirical detail and theorization of the mechanics of news production."[178]

Nevertheless, Chris Anderson writes that except for Schudson, his first thread in journalism studies is far more successful in documenting the organizational processes by which journalists construct reality than it is at analyzing and explaining the social and political authority which accrues to journalists through the knowledge claim which they make.[179] Hanno Hardt shares this concern, writing that "similarly, the study of newsworkers and their activities continues to occupy the literature of communication in

[174] Ibid., p. 14.
[175] Ibid., pp. 14-15.
[176] David Manning White, "The Gatekeeper: A Case Study in the Selection of News," *Journalism Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1950), p. 383. / Cited by Simon Cottle, p. 15.
[177] Simon Cottle, p. 15.
[178] Ibid., p. 15.
[179] Anderson, p. 253.

ways that reinforce the ahistorical nature of social-scientific research."[180] According to Hardt, "the historical role of newsworkers vis-à-vis media management and the creation of conditions of permanent change with the introduction of media technologies under ownership control, the issue of professionalization and the curtailment of freedom of expression, as well as the anti-labor attitudes of media owners, may offer alternative explanations for the contemporary status and working habits of newsworkers, the production of content matter, and may help provide a rational for understanding audiences as consumers."[181] Instead, the author notes that "since the development of communication and media research in the United States, analyses of communication have typically grown out of studies of individual and group behavior or group processes, ranging from an interest in an individual's creation of knowledge, conduct and self-control to the role of media in the process of constructing and sharing social realities." In these contexts, for Hardt, communication as an essential way of understanding the other as well as the self becomes an ordering mechanism and constitutes a process of control.[182] And for Anderson, what seems to be the fundamental problem – how journalists translate one order of scarce resources (their expertise in constructing the news) into another (social and political power) – goes unanswered, despite the first thread's provocative allusions to professional systems, political culture, and hegemony.[183] Like many scholars working in journalism studies, John Soloski shares this concern. According to Soloski, although journalists do not set out to report the news so that the existing politico-economic system is maintained, their professional norms end up producing stories that

[180] Hanno Hardt, *Critical Communication Studies: Communication, History and Theory in America* (London and New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 221.
[181] Ibid., pp. 221-222.
[182] Ibid., p. 222.
[183] Anderson, p. 253.

implicitly support the existing order. In addition, writes Soloski, "the professional norms legitimize the existing order by making it appear to be a naturally occurring state of affairs."[184] Barbie Zelizer, moreover, cautions against viewing journalists solely as "strategic actors who move in response to their environment" for this can distract

> scholarly attention from the nonpurposive, nonstrategic sides of journalistic practice. Sociological explanations of news, moreover, offered a lopsided picture of the process of news making. News begins before journalists negotiate all the contexts –cultural, historical, political, economic– in which journalism exists. *In other words, sociological inquiry reduced journalists to one kind of actor in one kind of environment*. It was up to other disciplinary frames to complicate that picture. (italics mine)[185]

Finally, Robert Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao draw attention to the fact that "these kinds of arguments seem to throw a double-whammy at the epistemology of objectivity." According to Hackett and Zhao, "they suggest that news is a manufactured product subject to organizational biases, rather than the mirror-like reflection proclaimed by strong versions of objectivity; and because the process of creating news is also one of creating social reality itself, the media cannot be regarded as a separate observer." In the authors' view, "the media actively help to constitute reality, even if it is only by helping to make 'real' the ways that dominant social institutions structure social and political processes."[186]

---

[184] John Soloski, "News Reporting and Professionalism" in *The Social Meaning of News*, p. 152.
[185] Barbie Zelizer, *Taking Journalism Seriously*, p, 80.
[186] Robert Hackett and Yuezhi Zhao, Sustaining Democracy, p. 321. They ask: "For example, could an election campaign today have any meaningful existence apart from the media that amplify it?"

Journalistic discourse and discursive communities

Recent scholarship in journalism studies – not sociology – has attempted to address the fact that news is a manufactured product which creates reality, rather than reflects it, and thus attempted to deconstruct the strong linkage between objectivity and professionalism. Chris Anderson's second thread of journalism scholarship, which emerged in the early 1990s, includes culture, narrative, and discursive communities, making the analysis of the sources and foundations of journalistic authority much more explicit.[187] As discussed in the previous chapter, Jean K. Chalaby, for instance, argues that "the profession of the journalist and the journalistic discourse is the product of the emergence, during this period [the 19th century], of a specialized and increasingly autonomous *field of discursive production*, the journalistic field."[188] (italics original) In Chalaby's view, "the emergence of journalism is not only historically but culturally marked."[189] Departing from the idea that different texts share common philological properties because they are produced by a specific field of discursive production, Chalaby argues that "the relationship between a class of texts and a field of discursive production may be illustrated using an analysis of journalism: the journalistic discourse is the class of texts produced by the agents of the journalistic field."[190] Additionally, Barbie Zelizer notes that "the relevance of journalistic discourse in determining what reporters do, informal contacts among them, and the centrality of narrative and storytelling are all dimensions of journalistic practice that are not addressed in general discussions of

[187] Chris Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power in Democratic Life," p. 253.
[188] Jean K. Chalaby, "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention," p. 304.
[189] Ibid., p. 304.
[190] Jean K. Chalaby, "Beyond the Prison-House of Language: Discourse as a Sociological Concept," *The British Journal of Sociology* 47, no. 4 (Dec. 1996), p. 690.

professions yet help unite reporters."[191] Zelizer claims that the academy has looked upon reporters as members of a profession or professional collective since American journalists were first identified as an upwardly mobile group. In the author's view, "seeing journalism as a profession, however, may have restricted our understanding of journalistic practice, causing us to examine only those dimensions of journalism emphasized by the frame through which we have chosen to view them."[192] As a result, Zelizer calls for alternative ways to conceptualize community other than through the 'profession,' "one that accounts for alternative dimensions of journalists' practice."[193] The author suggests that journalism be considered not only as a profession "but as an interpretive community, united through the shared discourse and collective interpretations of key public events."[194]

Schudson and Anderson note that "the claim that journalistic professionalism is established as much by the *representation* of knowledge as by the actual *possession* of knowledge would not, in and of itself, be a controversial theoretical claim; indeed, arguments about the constructed nature of professional expertise predate the post-structuralist critique and can be found in sociological scholarship as far back as Elliot Freidson." (italics original) According to the authors, what is important and original is the emphasis on the rhetorical dimension of constituting the cultural authority of journalists.[195]

Additionally, Chris Anderson offers a critique of Zelizer's perspective by noting two problems with the aforementioned approach as articulated in another of her texts –

---

[191] Barbie Zelizer, "Journalists as Interpretive Communities," in *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader*, ed. Daniel Allen Berkowitz (Sage, 1997), p. 401.
[192] Ibid., p. 401.
[193] Ibid., p. 401.
[194] Ibid., pp. 401-402.
[195] Schudson and Anderson, p. 97.

Covering the Body[196] – and in her subsequent work. In Anderson's view, Zelizer "fails to link the discursive construction of journalistic *expertise* with the more politically and economically based positioning of the journalist as occupational *expert*."[197] (italics original) Basically, according to Anderson, Zelizer ignores forms of power not grounded in narrative. Additionally, Anderson writes that "Zelizer unconvincingly (and, in my opinion, unnecessarily) distances herself from the 'professional project' perspective advanced by Larson and others, and especially Andrew Abbott."[198] These shortcomings can also be addressed via Bourdieu's concept of field, as the last section of this chapter will demonstrate.

[196] Barbie Zelizer, *Covering the Body: the Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992).
[197] Chris Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power," p. 255.
[198] Ibid., p. 255.

Jurisdiction/Systemic Division of Labor

According to Schudson and Anderson, sociologist Andrew Abbott's (1988) work in *The System of the Professions* shares much with Magali Sarfatti-Larson's, "but is a substantial refinement." In the authors' view, "in addition to criticizing Larson for her overemphasis on economic power as the ultimate basis of journalistic authority (rather than seeing professional power as emerging from mixture of economic control, political power, social status, and cultural authority), Abbott's most important advance over the 1970s' work is to argue that study of the professions must begin with a focus on professional *work* rather than the *occupational group* and the structural markers of professionalism as a distinct object of analysis." (italics original) Schudson and Anderson note that the key aspect of professional struggle, according to Abbott, "is the struggle over jurisdiction, or the struggle over the link between knowledge and work." In other words, "Abbott views the professional field as a terrain of competition, though in this instance as a competition over jurisdiction rather than the structural emblems of professionalism."[199]

Ronen Shamir notes that "the fundamental strength of Abbott's model is that it establishes a strong theoretical link between a given profession's 'knowledge' and its ability to control the market for its services." Abbott's model posits that the study of a profession cannot be undertaken independently of the activities of other professions because all occupational groups are situated within a system in which there is an ongoing interprofessional competition over turf.[200] In other words, Abbott emphasizes jurisdictional disputes concerning the relationship between abstract knowledge and work,

[199] Schudson and Anderson, p. 95.
[200] Ronen Shamir, *Managing Legal Uncertainty: Elite Lawyers in the New Deal* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995), p. 117.

and thus allows us to expand our discussion of knowledge-based occupations outside the 'traditional' professions, as well as helps us to conceive of a new way in which occupational groups struggle over social and cultural status.[201] As it claims jurisdiction, according to Schudson and Anderson, "a profession asks society to recognize its cognitive structure (and thus the authority conferred by that recognition) through exclusive rights."[202] The authors note that, according to Abbott, "jurisdiction has not only a culture, but also a social structure."[203] In Abbott's view, however, having a culture is not enough for an organized structure to claim jurisdiction. A profession must ask "society to recognize its cognitive structure through exclusive rights" in order to claim jurisdiction.[204] Defining occupational boundaries as social or cultural divisions that help signify a group's work and societal roles, Patricia L. Dooley and Paul Grosswiler argue that "to establish and maintain occupational boundaries and power, groups must define, claim, and seek to control certain work tasks; devise strategies to ward off the members of other occupations seeking to encroach on their work terrain; control the process of admitting new workers to the occupational fold; and strive to become solely responsible for penalizing those who violate the group's standards."[205] The authors note that "studies of these processes are important because they are central to an occupational group's amassment of legitimacy and power, and they help explain the complex interrelationships of groups whose work is closely related."[206]

---

[201] Schudson and Anderson, p. 95.
[202] Ibid., p. 95.
[203] Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions,* p. 59. / Cited by Schudson and Anderson, p. 95.
[204] Ibid., p. 59.
[205] Patricia L. Dooley and Paul Grosswiler, "Turf Wars: Journalists, New Media and the Struggle for Control of Political News," *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, Vol. 2, No. 31 (1997), p. 32.
[206] Patricia L. Dooley and Paul Grosswiler, "Turf Wars," p. 32. The authors cite the following as examples of such studies: Andrew Abbott (*The System of Professions*, 1998), Thomas Gieryn, George M. Bevins and

Abbott notes that a profession can claim jurisdiction in several possible arenas, among them the legal system (which can confer formal control of work), public opinion (where professions build images that pressure the legal system), and the equally important, but less studied, arena of the workplace.[207] Schudson and Anderson explain that "doctors and lawyers, for instance, not only claim jurisdiction over specific areas of work but gain enforceable legal and political rights through state intervention." According to the authors, "even journalists, who lack many of the structural advantages granted to other professional groups, have achieved some level of juridical recognition via shield laws, for example, and privileged access to political leaders."[208]

Additionally, Abbott notes that a profession's social organization has three major aspects – groups (lobbying, informational, practitioner), controls (the schools that train practitioners, the examinations that test them, the licenses that identify them, and the ethics codes they are presumed to obey), and worksites (e.g., hospitals; law, accounting and architectural firms, etc.).[209] These three distinct internal structures work in unison to create a more bonded and organized professional structure, and help a profession to claim jurisdiction. Abbott writes specifically about current information – in particular about general events (news) and consumer products (advertising) – as a major qualitative information jurisdiction. The author observes that "these jurisdictions have never been completely separated, since American society generally lets the one pay for the other."

Stephen C. Zehr ("Professionalization of American Scientists: Public Science in the Creation/Evolution Trials," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 50 (June 1985), pp. 392-409), Carol L. Kronus ("The Evolution of Occupational Power: An Historical Study of Task Boundaries between Physicians and Pharmacists," *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, Vol. 1 (Feb. 1976), pp. 3-37); and John F. Runcie, "Occupational Communication as Boundary Mechanism," *Sociology of Work and Occupations*, Vol. 1 (Nov. 1974), pp. 419-44.

[207] Abbott, *The System of Professions*, pp. 59-60.

[208] Schudson and Anderson, p. 95.

[209] Abbott, *The System of Professions*, p. 79-80.

He highlights its significance in stating that "the news jurisdiction has steadily grown in size and importance through this century [the 20th century], and the incumbent profession of journalism has come to extraordinary power."[210]

Journalism remains "a very permeable occupation" according to Abbott; for instance, in the sense that "mobility between journalism and public relations is quite common, as is mobility between journalism and other forms of writing."[211] The author notes that "while there are schools, associations, degrees, and ethics codes, there is not exclusion of those who lack them." But according to Abbott, "whether journalism's inability to monopolize makes it 'not a profession' is not particularly interesting" – of greater importance is the external competition that "shaped it decisively."[212] In the author's view, "the clearest force driving reporters towards a formal conception of their jurisdiction was in fact competition with hired publicity agents." Abbott writes about the amazement of 1920s reporters at discovering that about 50 percent of the stories in the *New York Times* originated in the work of publicity agents. As a result, "reporters saw such stories (correctly) as little better than advertising, and their reaction led on the one hand to a renewed drive for formal professional structures, and on the other to a frank recognition of subjectivity in reporting."[213]

Abbott's 'system' perspective posits that professions exist within a network of other occupations and institutions, seeking to encroach into the jurisdictional areas of other occupations, often making an occupation extremely permeable. The author makes a fascinating point about the boundaries – or lack thereof – between journalism and

[210] Abbott, *The System of Professions,* p. 225.
[211] Ibid., p. 225.
[212] Ibid., p. 225.
[213] Ibid., pp. 225-226.

advertising in this sense. As advertising specialists and their Associated Clubs embarked on serious structural professionalization at the turn of the twentieth century, there was much talk of the "science" of advertising. Abbott writes that "proposals for schools of advertising were sent to universities, and when these proved hostile, the Associated Clubs set up its own curriculum."[214] He notes that J. E. Kennedy proposed a central advertising research institute to evaluate actual agency work, and advertising research and teaching eventually took root in universities. In private universities, according to Abbott, advertising was "located in the new business schools, which offered a home that arts and sciences departments refused;" by contrast, in public universities, "advertising usually ended up in schools of journalism."[215] This therefore means that one version of advertising allied with marketing in general, while the other was tied to a particular medium; neither version, in fact, achieved a serious monopoly of jurisdiction for its graduates.[216] According to Abbott, "most agencies continued to train advertisers in-house, making the occupation extremely permeable."[217] The author notes further that "the journalists not only provided an academic home for advertising, they also created the original institutional structures for the quantitative study and active manipulation of consumers' desires – a specialized area now known as market research."[218]

In Abbott's account, write Schudson and Anderson, "journalism, at least in the United States, has claimed jurisdiction over the collection and distribution of qualitative, current information about general events." The authors note that "journalism in general, and US journalism in particular, also displays an internal differentiation in which

[214] Andrew Abbott, *The System of Professions,* p. 234.
[215] Ibid., p. 234.
[216] Ibid., p. 234.
[217] Ibid., p. 234.
[218] Ibid., p. 235.

journalists who cover politics or other topics that bear on political democracy have the highest professional standing and an especially marked cultural authority." They explain that "this close link to democratic politics gives journalism its closest relationship to recognition by the state, but a paradoxical recognition in that the First Amendment prohibits state regulation rather than requiring it (as in the case of state-regulated licensing of lawyers and doctors and a number of other professional occupations)." Therefore, "US journalism's claim to objectivity—i.e., the particular method by which this information is collected, processed, and presented—gives it its unique jurisdictional focus by claiming to possess a certain form of expertise or intellectual discipline." In other words, "establishing jurisdiction over the ability to objectively parse reality is a claim to a special kind of authority." In sum, note the authors, "journalistic objectivity operates as *both* an occupational norm and as object of struggle within the larger struggle over professional jurisdiction. In their view, 'expert' professionals—in this case, journalists—seek, via occupational struggle, "to monopolize a form of journalistic expertise, which itself is discursively constructed out of various journalistic practices and narratives, including the claim to professional objectivity."[219]

[219] Schudson and Anderson, p. 96.

Field

The mere conception of journalists as 'expert' professionals seeking to monopolize a form of journalistic expertise via occupational struggle is itself extremely problematic. Schudson and Anderson argue that "this very notion of journalistic expertise makes journalism an unusually fascinating case within the sociological analysis of the professions." The authors point to two major problems made evident thanks to Abbott's framework, given its focus on knowledge and jurisdiction, which "helps us see immediately what makes journalism a sociologically anomalous profession."[220] First, Abbott argues that professions are "somewhat exclusive groups of individuals applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases,"[221] but Schudson and Anderson state that "most segments of the journalism profession are not exclusive (and with the arrival of on-line journalism becoming progressively less so); nor is journalistic knowledge abstract." Second, the authors note that "journalism seems to simultaneously make a grandiose knowledge claim (that it possesses the ability to isolate, transmit, and interpret the most publicly relevant aspects of social reality) and an incredibly modest one (that really, most journalists are not experts at all but are simply question-asking generalists)."[222] In other words, the journalistic professional struggle for a definition of and jurisdiction over particular forms of expertise is almost a paradox, a contradiction in terms.

Schudson and Anderson proceed to contemplate alternative ways of framing the struggle over journalistic expertise, in a way that more productively incorporates the profession's social structure, as well as the 'external' structures that impact upon the

[220] Schudson and Anderson, p. 96.
[221] Abbott, *The System of Professions*, p. 8.
[222] Schudson and Anderson, p. 96.

profession itself. They offer a possibility gaining a following in recent years: to rethink journalism as a journalistic 'field' in the terms of Pierre Bourdieu.[223] The authors describe Bourdieu's envisioning of modern society as "highly differentiated, composed of different spheres or 'fields,' each relatively autonomous and operating to some degree by a logic of its own."[224] More specifically, and according to Rodney Benson, Bourdieu draws on and modifies Weber's sociology of religion, and sees society "as differentiated into a number of semi-autonomous fields (e.g., fields of politics, economics, religion, cultural production, etc.) governed by their own 'rules of the game' and offering their own particular economy of exchange and reward, yet whose basic oppositions and general structures parallel each other."[225] Including the domains of art, politics, academia, and journalism, these 'fields' have been conceptualized to explore the relationship between professional and non-professional media, as seen in the work of Rodney Benson and Eric Neveu, Eric Klinenberg, Chris Atton, and Nick Couldry & James Curran, among others.[226]

In addition to field, several tools of analysis attributed to Pierre Bourdieu – habitus, doxa, reflexivity– are undeniably useful to the study of journalism and news. According to Rodney Benson, examining journalism by focusing "on the mezzo-level of the 'field' offers both a theoretical and empirical bridge between the traditionally

---

[223] Schudson and Anderson, p. 97.
[224] Ibid., p. 97.
[225] Rodney Benson, "Review: Field Theory in Comparative Context: A New Paradigm for Media Studies," *Theory and Society* 28, no. 3 (June 1999), p. 464.
[226] Schudson and Anderson, pp. 97-98. The authors cite the work of Rodney Benson & Eric Neveu [*Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (Cambridge, MA: Polity, 2005)], Eric Klinenberg ["Convergence: New production in a digital age," *Annals of the American Political Science Association*, Vol. 59, No. 7 (2005), pp. 48–68], Chris Atton [*Alternative media*, (London: Sage, 2002)], and Nick Couldry & James Curran [*Contesting Media Power: Alternative Media in a Networked World* (New York: Rowan & Littlefield, 2003)] as scholars who have utilized Bourdieu's concept of 'field' to explore the relationship between professional and non-professional media.

separated macro-"societal" level models of the news media, such as political economy, hegemony, cultural and technological theories, and micro-"organizational" approaches and micro-'organizational' approaches."[227] In speaking of the political, the social science, and journalistic fields, Bourdieu offers

> a simple definition of the notion of field, a convenient one, but like all definitions, a very inadequate one: a field is a field of forces within which the agents occupy positions that statistically determine the positions they take with respect to the field, these position-takings being aimed either at conserving or transforming the structure of relations of forces that is constitutive to the field.[228]

Bourdieu also extends his notion of field to a discussion of the classifications of occupations and the concepts used to designate classes of jobs, cautioning against the very notion of profession as "all the more dangerous because it has, as always in such cases, all appearance of neutrality in its favor and because its use has been an improvement over the theoretical jumble (*bouillie*) of Parsons."[229]

Bourdieu writes that "everything becomes different, and much more difficult if, instead of taking the notion of 'profession' at face value, I take seriously the work of *aggregation* and symbolic imposition that was necessary to produce it, and if I treat it as a field, that is, as a structured space of social forces and struggles."[230] According to Christopher Anderson, "occupations engaged in the professional project struggle to gain and maintain a legitimate jurisdiction over certain discursively, culturally, and epistemologically constructed forms of expertise." In Anderson's view, by analyzing the position of various social actors within the journalistic field (in the Bourdieu sense), the

---

[227] Rodney Benson, "Review: Field Theory in Comparative Context," p. 463.
[228] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field" in Rodney Benson and Eric Neveu (editors), *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), p. 30.
[229] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)," p. 242.
[230] Ibid., "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)," p. 242.

professional struggles between them, and the construction of various forms of journalistic expertise, we can gain a deeper insight into the maintenance of, and challenges to, journalistic authority.[231]

Bourdieu highlights the difficulties of questioning the boundaries of the field, arguing that the question of the definition is at stake within the object itself.[232] And "there is a struggle within the object over who is part of the game, who in fact deserves the title of writer."[233] According to Bourdieu, "the very notion of writer, but also the notion of lawyer, doctor, or sociologist, despite all efforts at codification and homogenization through certification, is at stake in the field of writers (or lawyers, etc.): the struggle over the legitimate definition, whose stake – the word definition says it – is the boundary, the frontiers, the *right of admission*, sometimes the *numerus clausus*, is a universal property of fields."[234]

Anderson's conception of the Bourdieusian field is one serving as an analytical model of social space in which action and social struggle are structured. He draws on the following excerpt by Bourdieu and Wacquant to illustrate this definition:

> In analytic terms, a field may be defined as a network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose on their occupants, agents, or institutions, by their present and potential situation in the structure and distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to

[231] Christopher Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power in Democratic Life" in *The Media and Social Theory* (ed. by David Hesmondhalgh and Jason Toynbee; London and New York: Routledge, Taylor & Francis Group, 2008), p. 250.
[232] Pierre Bourdieu, "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)," p. 244. Bourdieu notes that "The most daring of positivists solve that question – when they do not purely and simply neglect to pose it by using preexisiting lists – by what they call an "operational definition" ("In this study, I shall call 'writer'…"; "I will consider as a 'semiprofession'…"), without seeing that the question of the definition ("So and so is not a *true* writer!") is at stake within the object itself. (italics original)
[233] Ibid., pp. 244-245.
[234] Ibid., p. 245.

> specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their relation to other positions.[235]

Anderson emphasizes that his goal is not to judge the applicability of Bourdieu's field concept to the entirety of social life (though Bourdieu certainly feels that such an application is possible), let alone "to convert the human world into an 'obdurate social structure' (Gitlin 2004) whose unthinking 'field of forces' resolves, once and for all, pressing sociological questions of structure and agency.[236] What he does maintain, and I am in full agreement, is that the Bourdieusian field is useful for placing professional struggle over various forms of occupational expertise within a specific social space, including the social space of journalism.[237] These are the questions untreated by the classical organizational studies of journalism and Zelizer's model of discursive communities. Andersons questions where, after all, the 'struggle over jurisdiction' described by Abbott occurs? Anderson argues that for Abbot, the key spatial metaphor is that of the system, or 'occupational ecology' (Abbott 1988), and contends that a more useful model might be that of the field.[238] This is so because the journalistic field includes all those individuals and organizations engaged in the 'work of journalism' and not simply those formally certified as doing so. Anderson thus proposes a fusion of the Bourdieuian field perspective and the professionalisation perspective advanced by Larson and Abbott, for this resolves a number of difficulties with regard to the positioning of journalistic experts in social space.[239]

---

[235] Bourdieu and Wacquant, 96. / Cited in Anderson, "Journalism: Expertise, Authority, and Power in Democratic Life" p. 256.
[236] Ibid., pp. 256-57.
[237] Ibid., p. 257.
[238] Ibid., p. 257.
[239] Ibid., p. 257. Anderson notes that "Bourdieu structuralises Larson, while Abbott directs our attention to Bourdieu's oft-neglected theories of agency."

Chapter IV

A History of the Emergence of Journalism Education in the United States and Canada

Introduction: Legitimization and the Emergence of Journalism Education

> *While it is a great pleasure to feel that a large number of young men will be helped to a better start in life by means of this college, this is not my primary object. Neither is the elevation of the profession which I love so much and regard so highly. In all my planning the chief end I had in view was the welfare of the Republic. It will be the object of the college to make better journalists, who will make better newspapers, which will better serve the public.*
>
> – Joseph Pulitzer, PLANNING A SCHOOL OF JOURNALISM: THE BASIC CONCEPT IN 1904

> *Professional education, and the ideology of professionalism that backed it, always has been driven by more than the quest for knowledge and professional standards. It has also been driven by the desire to have a workforce that is moral, orderly, habitual, and conservative.*
>
> – James Carey, *Some Personal Notes on US Journalism Education*

The previous discussions of journalism as the articulation of many genres and traditions of writing and communication, of professionalism as an occupational norm, and of the processes of professionalization in journalism, provide the foundation for an analysis of the emergence of journalism education, which has been historically linked to the notion of journalism as a profession. Considering journalism education as an agent of professional legitimization, this chapter aims to historicize the establishment of journalism departments in a university setting in the United States and Canada by tracing the origins of models of journalism schools in order to provide a context for the study of journalism education and training. A more specific analysis of the historically uncomfortable position that journalism training has occupied within the university builds on the work presented here, and follows in the next chapter of this dissertation.

The relationship between journalism education and the process of professionalization dates back to the full establishment of objectivity as a professional norm. "I suspect," writes Walter Lippmann, "that schools of journalism in the

professional sense will not exist generally until journalism has been practiced for some time as a profession. It has never yet been a profession." Lippmann refers to journalism as "a dignified calling, at others a romantic adventure, and then again a servile trade. But a profession it could not begin to be until modern objective journalism was successfully created, and with it the need of men who consider themselves devoted, as all the professions ideally are, to the service of truth alone."[1]

Dan Schiller shares this view, arguing that before education could definitively separate and uplift the profession, codification of newsgathering ethics and etiquette-formalization of professional procedure had to be acknowledged as a possibility.[2] By the early twentieth century, the objectivity norm "became a fully formulated occupational ideal, part of a professional project or mission" in journalism in the United States.[3] This ideal was inculcated in the swelling numbers of its practitioners, in an attempt to establish the reporter as a professional while maintaining a certain standardized approach to reasoning and writing. At the same time, the professionalization of journalism was underway, with editors and publishers looking to instill in the craft some measure of dignity and honour in the eyes of the public and of the other disciplines and professions. The establishment of a formalized curriculum of journalism education was seen as an effective means to this end. "Journalism education," writes Betty Medsger, "was first created to accomplish two interrelated goals: to improve the minds of journalists and to improve the image of journalism."[4]

---

[1] Walter Lippmann, "The American Press," *The Yale Review*, Vol. 30 (1930-31), pp. 440-441.
[2] Dan Schiller, "An Historical Approach to Objectivity and Professionalism in American News Reporting," *Journal of Communication* 29, no 4 (December 1979), p. 52.
[3] Michael Schudson, Objectivity Norm, p. 163.
[4] Betty Medsger, "The Evolution of Journalism Education in the Unites States" in *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues* (edited by Hugh de Burgh / Routledge, 2005), p. 206.

And this image was in dire need of improvement. After a visit to the United States in 1831-32, Alexis de Tocqueville found American journalists to be "generally in a very humble position, with a scanty education and a vulgar turn of mind."[5] For James Carey, the greatest obstacle to the legitimization of journalism were the reporters themselves:

> [R]eporters were not educated individuals and most assuredly they were not literary people. They were an unlikely collection of itinerant scribblers, aspiring or more often failed novelists, ne'erdo-well children of established families and, most importantly, the upwardly mobile children of immigrants with an inherited rather than an educated gift of language, without much education and certainly without much refinement. They were often radical in their politics and unpredictable in their conduct. In fact, their behavior forms much of the folklore of the craft. They lived in and romanced the low life of the city and had no aversion to socialism or trade unions and little illusion about the motives of those for whom they worked.[6]

According to Arthur Kaul, professionalization, proletarianization, and political economy are linked in the transformation of American labor, a process framed by three historic episodes: (1) the shift from commercial to cultural capital as an occupational strategy; (2) class conflict within journalism; and (3) the maneuver to co-opt militantly disruptive labor radicalism with professional ideology.[7] In terms of the first historic episode, the occupational strategy for commercial capital was the apprenticeship system; an apprentice could work his way through journeyman to master status, become an entrepreneur, and acquire wealth and social standing.[8] The strategy for cultural capital, in Kaul's view, was formal education. The author notes that "although a college education as a route into journalism was ridiculed during much of the nineteenth century, erosion of the

---

[5] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (Vol. 1) (New York: Knopf, 1945), p. 194.
[6] James Carey, "Some personal notes on US journalism education," *Journalism* (Volume 1 No. 1 April 2000), p. 16.
[7] Kaul, "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism," p. 50.
[8] Ibid., p. 51.

apprenticeship system shifted the strategy from commercial to cultural capital."[9] Paul H. Weaver goes as far as stating that "the idea that journalism is a profession, in other words, was a public relations flourish meant to conceal the true nature of the enterprise, deflect criticism and attack, legitimate the industry, and increase the new journalism managers' control over their employees and subordinates."[10]

Matthew F. Jacobs views the movement to professionalize journalism as originating in three broad developments in U.S. history: (1) as a consequence of the division of labor caused by the massive industrialization that occurred throughout U.S. society in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, with editors and publishers becoming less important in the physical production of news and assuming greater significance as managers of businesses; (2) the emergence of a new scientific positivism and the ideal of objectivity; and (3) the reforming impulse of the Progressive Era, characterized by an emphasis on serving the public interest and an attempt to distance oneself from big business.[11] According to Jacobs, one way in which the combination of these three trends influenced journalism directly was through the creation of journalism schools. The author notes that "the reliance on scientific positivism encouraged journalists to develop an educational program in an attempt to tie the occupation more closely to the social sciences."[12] He writes that "Joseph Pulitzer, founder of the Columbia University School of Journalism, believed that journalism schools provided students with an education that at once distinguished them from the laboring classes, offered guidance

[9] Ibid., p. 51.
[10] Paul H. Weaver, *News and the Culture of Lying* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), p. 58.
[11] Matthew F. Jacobs, "Professionalism in Journalism: Ongoing debate among journalists about benefits of 'profession' versus trade'" in *History of the Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia* (Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998), pp. 537-8.
[12] Ibid., p. 538.

on how to use journalism to the benefit of the public interest, and conferred a degree of detachment and objectivity that could be acquired only through higher education."[13] Furthermore, Paul Weaver notes that Pulitzer was "the prime mover" in this instance. In Weaver's view, Pulitzer had been "utterly sincere and engaged to the limit of his awesome powers" as far as the creation of news itself was concerned. But when it came to "promoting the idea of a professional journalism he tended to be cynical and hypocritical." Weaver specifies that for Pulitzer. "the news was the product, journalism schools and the accoutrements of professionalism just an exercise in public relations and media hype."[14]

The goal of this new formal education was not only to teach the craft of reporting, which had been done quite effectively in the newsroom from the beginning. The goal was also to pull reporters off of the docks, out of the saloons and away from the criminals and bon-vivants, give them a shave and a haircut, and send them off to college in the hopes of ending up with a better class of journalist, and by extension, a more respectable profession. Joseph Mirando writes that "higher education offered journalists the possibility to earn a sense of respect and, along the way, raise up the field of journalism to the status of a profession." The author claims that this line of reasoning is still used to justify the existence of schools of journalism and mass communication today.[15]

As argued by Betty Medsger, the motives for the enthusiasm shown by editors for journalists to study in college are evident in this 1869 letter to Professor Johnston at

---

[13] Ibid., p. 538.
[14] Paul H. Weaver, *News and the Culture of Lying*, p. 58.
[15] Joseph Mirando, "Training and Education of Journalists" in *American Journalism: Histories, Principles, Practices* (edited by W. David Sloan and Lisa Mullikin Parcell / McFarland, 2002), p. 77.

Washington College from John Plaxton of the Nashville Typographical Union, following the implementation of the first journalism courses to be taught in the United States:

> We look upon this action of Washington College as a very important step toward raising American journalism from the slough of venality, corruption, and party subservience into which it has too notoriously fallen to the high position it should occupy.[16]

By coming from, mingling with, and identifying with the lower classes, journalists were also aligning themselves with their politics. According to Carey, Joseph Pulitzer and the other journalistic elites hoped "that a university education might domesticate this unruly class, turn them into disciplined workers and end their flirtation with socialism and trade unions" and that "this was not the first or last time that education was seen as a means of social control, a means, in a phrase of this day, of coopting an undisciplined and contentious group and aligning them more closely with the aims of business enterprise."[17] Interestingly enough, Harrison Miller Trice claims that "the coup de grace in news reform" at that time actually came from journalists themselves. According to Trice, journalists were "always reluctant to unionize because they saw themselves as professionals and reporting as a way into management, believing that they would find financial relief through individual initiative." As a result, "the many attempts between 1886 and 1935 to create a craft union were doomed to failure."[18]

While the motive of publishers, senior editors and other elites in pressuring reporters to get a higher education was clear, "that motive could not answer the question of how journalism was to be fitted into the university, however, and, in truth, this rough-

---

[16] Medsger, p. 206.
[17] James Carey, "Some personal notes on US journalism education," *Journalism Studies* (Volume 1 No. 1 April 2000), p. 16.
[18] Harrison Miller Trice, *Occupational subcultures in the workplace* (New York: ILR Press, 1993), p. 61. The author notes further: "As the Depression deepened, however, news reporters found they were the most readily dispensable part of any news operation. Their numbers and salaries were drastically cut, while those of unionized printers were left largely intact."

hewn craft has never been very comfortable in the overstuffed chairs of the faculty commons upholstered for professors of the liberal arts and the traditional professions of theology, law and medicine."[19]

U. S. universities began offering courses in journalism at the turn of the century, in the humanities departments at the Universities of Kansas, Iowa, and Wisconsin.[20] Carey explains that the curriculum was later expanded to include ethics, history, and the law in order to justify the teaching of a vernacular craft in an academic setting.[21]

> [T]hey turned to the humanities as they understood them to ground the new educational enterprise. If journalism was a profession, then it must have a history. The task of journalism professors was to write that history in a way that would demonstrate why journalism deserved a place in the university. Similarly, if journalism was a profession, then it must have a code of ethics or at least an enlightened sense of the First Amendment. Journalism faculties attempted to manufacture such codes and gave to the First Amendment a meaning that justified the professional standing of the journalist. *Journalism educators fashioned themselves not only into teachers of students but tutors and shapers of the craft, dedicated to elevating journalism to an exalted station deserving a place in the university*. The fit has always been a little uneasy.[22] (italics mine)

Once again, it is clear that the desire for professionalization and academization, with the status and social attitudes they bring, was the motivating force if not for journalism education itself, then at least for it to take place in college, because the money and effort to bring journalists into the university setting preceded the formulation of a coherent curriculum for them to study once they got there. Isabel Macdonald writes that

> University journalism education has historically been linked to the notion of journalism as a profession, defined as 'a group organized to perform a public service' (Commission on Freedom of the Press, 1947, p. 27). The establishment of the first university-based journalism schools in North America was motivated, at least in theory, by this *lofty rationale*. As William Bleyer, who was the dean of the first American journalism school, at the University of Wisconsin, stated, ''no

[19] Carey, "Some personal notes on US journalism education," p. 16.
[20] Zelizer, p. 16.
[21] Ibid., p. 16.
[22] Carey, "Some personal notes on US journalism education," p. 17.

> other profession has a more vital relation to the welfare of society or to the success of democratic government'' than journalism (Bronstein and Vaughn, 1998, pp. 16-7). The press baron who endowed the Columbia University School of Journalism, Joseph Pulitzer, similarly emphasized that ''it is the idea of work (…) primarily for the public that needs to be taught'' in journalism school (1904, p. 655).[23] (italics mine)

Carey shows that this "haphazard" approach, which continued well into the twentieth century, didn't impress the humanities departments where journalism was building its home. According to the author, "such a program of study was held, self-righteously and without much justification, in low regard on the campus." Carey also notes that "those rare occasions when one gathered with colleagues from the rest of the campus, particularly with those from English and other 'humanities', were encounters of withering, palpable contempt."[24] It should come as no surprise that "the history of journalism education in America has been shaped by its constant struggle for credibility,"[25] as the final chapter of this dissertation will demonstrate.

At the same time, it is also true that many journalists were themselves unenthusiastic about this academic enterprise. "Skepticism about journalism as an academic discipline," notes Medsger, "has been expressed since the first journalism courses were offered." According to Medsger, editors and reporters considered journalism education to be "a waste of time" and "tough work (…) closer to ditch-digging than to teaching or preaching, professions that found homes in American universities from the beginning." The author notes that before the 1960s, "many if not most

---

[23] Isabel Macdonald, "Teaching Journalists to Save the Profession," *Journalism Studies* (Volume 7, Issue 5, 2006), p. 744. 'Daddy' Bleyer's correct name is actually Willard Grosvenor Bleyer, not William. According to the birth of journalism education timeline developed for this dissertation (please see Appendix D), he was indeed the founder of the University of Wisconsin-Madison j-school, in 1912 (and is most definitely one of the journalism education "pioneers" -- he later created the first doctoral program in journalism), but the first journalism school was actually established by Walter Williams at the University of Missouri, in 1908.

[24] Carey, "Some personal notes on US journalism education," p. 13.

[25] Mirando, "Training and Education of Journalists," p. 76.

journalists came from working-class families, and they did not have college degrees." But by the 1960s, "a bachelor's degree became a *minimum qualification* for being hired as a journalist."[26] (italics mine) Medsger concludes by signaling the irony in that by the late twentieth century, when most journalists had degrees in journalism, "the major skeptics of the discipline were university administrators and communication-theory scholars, many of whom think of journalism courses as 'mere nuts and bolts' instruction in simple writing rather than as an intellectual pursuit."[27]

[26] Medsger, pp. 205-6. The author cites the 2002 American Journalist survey – conducted every 10 years by researchers at the School of Journalism at Indiana University –, according to which "only 11 percent of journalists working for news media in the United States did not have at least a bachelor's degree."
[27] Ibid., pp. 205-6.

The United States

The education of a man is never completed until he dies.
– General Robert E. Lee

David Hugh Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit divide the history of journalism education in the United States into four periods, with the first extending from the 1700s to the 1860s. During this time, according to the authors, most American journalists learned their trade through long apprenticeships.[28] Lisa Parcell also notes that "most colonial newspaper printers learned the trade as an apprentice, picking up what they could through working in the business."[29] Many of the editors of the day, according to Albert Sutton, had acquired their education in what they liked to term "the school of hard knocks."[30] Moreover, formal classroom-oriented learning in journalism was of little value during the 1700s and much of the 1800s, given the structure of both media and higher education.[31] Jim Upshaw adds that "news work started in the callused hands of printers who had emigrated for reasons other than news." These first workers to bring the colonist locally printed news of the world outside were "a far cry from today's white-collar journalists," and were "steeped in manual labor."[32] Mirando notes that few people living during this era could afford to support themselves solely by gathering information, writing, and editing – which were considered to be talents rather than skills, and more likely to be used

[28] David H. Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986), p. 42; Christopher Wilson, *The Labor of Words: Literary Professionalism in the Progressive Era* (Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985), pp. 20-24.
[29] Lisa M. Parcell, "Early American Newswriting Style: Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How," *Journalism History* (Vol. 37, No. 1), p. 4.
[30] Albert Alton Sutton, *Education for Journalism in the United States from its Beginning to 1940* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1945), p. 10.
[31] Joseph Mirando, "Training and Education of Journalists," p. 77.
[32] Jim Upshaw, "Characteristics of Journalists" in *American Journalism: Histories, Principles, Practices* (edited by W. David Sloan and Lisa Mullikin Parcell / McFarland, 2002), p. 66.

primarily by politicians and ministers.[33] According to Mirando, "one whose primary occupation was journalism was constantly involved in the painstaking work of printing and was rarely, if ever, referred to as a journalist.[34] Journalism had a strong identification with the printing trade in its early days, in contrast to the more intellectual pursuit of language study. As a result, "college was not the place where one learned to become a journalist," with higher education being initially reserved for the rich and professional classes. This is why "most early American journalists often got their start in journalism while serving a term of indentured servitude in a print shop."[35]

Upshaw notes that "most entered their craft in childhood, becoming 'printer's devils,' a job so nicknamed because it was dirty and unpleasant."[36] This is not entirely accurate; while *printer's devil* does refer to an apprentice who performed the drudgery work in a printing establishment, the origin of the phrase is not definitively known. Various accounts have been given, arguably due to the mysterious nature of the art of printing in its early days, which led many to believe the printer evoked the aid of the powers of evil. An early legend involves the monkish editor of *The Anatomy of the Mass*, printed in 1561, a work consisting of 172 pages of text and fifteen pages of errata, who very amusingly attributes these mistakes to the artifice of Satan, "who caused the printers to commit such numerous blunders; but he does not inform us whether it was really the

---

[33] Mirando, "Training and Education of Journalists," p. 77.
[34] Ibid., p. 77. The author proceeds to explain that "freedom to practice journalism is the implied meaning today, but that the Constitutional Convention of 1787-1788 this term would have had little meaning. The same influence is present in the printing terms that would come to describe many of the writing forms and methods that future journalism students would have to learn, such as scoop, slug, lead, sidebar, headline, and byline. The terms gave journalism strong identification as a trade rather than a profession, and such an identity was supported by a perceived need for an apprenticeship period. In order to learn the trade properly, the prospective printer-journalist firmly understood that time and space dictated how much or how little could be written and that an efficient publishing operation relied on assembly-line techniques. Such lessons were state of the art in journalism and are still today, but they were in conflict with the traditional values of the academy and still seen today as anti-intellectual."
[35] Ibid., "Training and Education of Journalists," p. 76.
[36] Upshaw, p. 66.

archangel fallen, or only his minor satellite, the printer's devil."[37] Another account refers to the "marvelous rapidity" with which the early printer produced copies of manuscript, which the superstitious attributed to the aid of black art. In their view, "the devil was deemed his [the printer's] natural assistant, and this word was, on this account, applied to printers' apprentices."[38] In a version related by Charles Rozan,

> Aldus Manutius (1440-1515), the celebrated Venetian printer and publisher, had a small black slave whom the superstitious believed to be an emissary of Satan. To satisfy the curious, one day he said publicly in church, 'I, Aldus Manutius, printer to the Holy Church, have this day made public exposure of the printer's devil. All who think he is not flesh and blood, come and pinch him.' Hence in Venice arose the somewhat curious sobriquet 'Printer's Devil.'[39]

Elizabeth L. Eisenstein writes about a description in the *Grub Street Journal* of an encounter with black and dirty newsboys "who were *so* black and dirty" that they were known as 'printer's devils.' These newsboys are overheard discussing the origin of their name, presumably derived from a Monsieur De Vile or Deville, who purportedly came to England with William the Conqueror.[40] And yet another story is about the first errand-boy employed by William Caxton, the first printer in England, who was the son of a gentleman of French descent named De Ville, or Deville, and that the word devil, as applied to a printer's apprentice in the English language, has this innocent origin.[41]

At any rate, Charles Moreau Harger also writes of the "old-time plan by which the beginner began as a 'devil,' sweeping out the office, cleaning the presses, and finally

---

[37] William Turner Coggeshall, *Five Black Arts: A Popular Account of the History, Processes of Manufacture, and Uses of Printing, Pottery, Glass, Gas-light, Iron* (Follett, Foster, 1861), p. 77.
[38] John Luther Ringwalt, ed. *American Encyclopaedia of Printing* (Menamin & Ringwalt, 1871), p. 137.
[39] Charles Rozan in Thomas Henry Huxley, "Our Small Ignorances," in *The Library Magazine*, Vol. XXII, Number 304 (March 1888), p. 472.
[40] Elizabeth L. Eisenstein, *Divine Art, Infernal Machine: The Reception of Printing in the West From First Impressions to the Sense of an Ending* (University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010), p. 107. For a fascinating article on the origins and activities of a printer's devil in accordance with this version, please refer to the October 1732 article of *Gentleman's Magazine*, located in Appendix G at the end of this dissertation.
[41] Ringwalt, p. 137.

rising to be compositor and writer."[42] According to Upshaw, the 'devil' was indentured by his family to the printer as early as age seven.[43] Lisa Parcell also notes that "parents of young boys, often only six or seven years old, apprenticed their sons to an experienced printer with an established shop," causing them to leave their homes and work for the printers from whom they learned the spelling, composition, and manual printing skills that would enable them to set up their own printing shop one day.[44] Upshaw adds that "he lived with an employer-mentor until adulthood – often in appalling conditions – until "the apprentice developed the skills and acumen needed to survive on his own."[45] After training as a printer's devil and then working their way through the ranks, Parcell notes that some apprentices eventually became master printers, having learned not only to set copy in type but to write advertisements, broadsides, and other pieces to sell in the shop, by this time. According to author, apprentices working under master printers, who published newspapers, might also gain writing experience by composing short pieces for a paper and "then, when these new master printers set up their own shops, often in new, growing towns, they carried with them the writing style and structure that they acquired as apprentices." In turn, this education was "passed on to new crops of apprentices, helping to create a relatively standard writing format across the colonies."[46]

Mirando notes that unlike the traditions of ministry, law, and medicine that have long relied on educated individuals with years of formal study, "the lessons of journalism developed in a largely haphazard manner initially through the experiences of town criers,

---

[42] Charles Moreau Harger, "Journalism As A Career" in *The Profession of Journalism* (ed. by Willard Grosvenor Bleyer / Boston, MA: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1918), p. 265.
[43] Jim Upshaw, "Characteristics of Journalists" in *American Journalism: Histories, Principles, Practices* (edited by W. David Sloan and Lisa Mullikin Parcell / McFarland, 2002), p. 66.
[44] Lisa M. Parcell, "Early American Newswriting Style: Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How," *Journalism History* 37, no. 1 (2011), p. 3.
[45] Upshaw, p. 66.
[46] Parcell, "Early American Newswriting Style: Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How," p. 4.

wandering bards, and balladeers, and, in America from the 1600s until the 20th century, of printers, postmasters, partisan editors, and Bohemian writers." According to the author, "even though language study formed the core of the classical liberal education from its very inception during the Middle Ages, prior to the 1900s American journalists were most likely to learn how to read and write while being trained how to set type, make paper, and run a press in the print shops that employed them as *printer's devils*."[47]

Having said that, Lisa Parcell observes that "although strong arm muscles were necessary for the labor-intensive work of printing, most colonial printers were highly literate men trained through long years of apprenticeship." Though printers often referred to themselves as 'mere mechanicks' or 'leather apron men,' in reality newspaper publishing was a highly literate craft, with knowledge of spelling, composition, and writing was essential to the job.[48] Parcell observes that early English printers' handbooks from 1747 and 1771 encouraged compositors to learn other languages and rely on their knowledge and judgment when composing type.[49] The author cites Campbell's *London Tradesman* of 1747: "A Youth designed for a compositor, ought to have a tolerable Genius for Letters, an apt Memory to learn the Languages: He must understand Grammar perfectly; and will find a great Advantage in the Course of his Business if he understands Latin and Greek."[50] Parcell also cites the views of Benjamin Franklin, the most famous colonial printer, on the ideal newspaper publisher in 1729 when he took over Samuel Keimer's *Pennsylvania Gazette*, worth reproducing here:

---

[47] Mirando, p. 76.
[48] Parcell, "Early American Newswriting Style: Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How," p. 4.
[49] Ibid., p. 3.
[50] R. Campbell, *The London Tradesman; Being a Compendious View of all the Trades, Professions, Arts, Both Liberal and Mechanic, Now Practised in the Cities of London and Westminster* (1747), quoted in Lisa Parcell, p. 3.

> [T]o publish a good News-Paper is not so easy an Undertaking as many People imagine it to be. The Author of the *Gazette* (in the Opinion of the Learned) ought to be qualified with an extensive Acquaintance with Languages, a great Easiness and Command of Writing and Relating things cleanly and intelligibly, and in a few Words; he should be able to speak of War both by Land and Sea; be well acquainted with Geography, with the History of the Time, with the several Interests of Princes and States, the Secrets of Courts, and the Manners and Customs of all Nations. Men thus accomplish'd are very rare in this remote Part of the World; and it would be well if the Writer of these Papers could make up among his Friends what is wanting in himself.[51]

Franklin himself had learned the trade as an apprentice in his brother's Boston printing shop, later refining his skills in one of London's leading printing houses.[52] This apprenticeship path was usually followed by subsequent colonial American journalists, who would then perfect their writing skills in colleges on the eastern seaboard or abroad.[53] According to Weaver and Wilhoit, some of these early "journalists," such as John Peter Zenger, were really printers and little else – they set other person's work into type. The authors point to other participants in early American journalism, such as Thomas Paine, who "were mainly writers without formal training whose knowledge of people and affairs came largely from the 'school of life'."[54] They note that this early emphasis on the 'school of life' served to reinforce the idea that "a journalist should be a 'gifted amateur' rather than a more narrow specialist, and that a journalist should be broadly and liberally educated."[55]

The second period of U.S. journalism education, extending from the 1860s to the 1920s, following Weaver and Wilhoit's division, "brought more formal journalism

---

[51] *Pennsylvania Gazette* (Philadelphia), October 2, 1729. The italics are in the original. / Quote in Lisa Parcell, pp. 3-4.
[52] David Weaver and G. Cleveland Wilhoit, "American Journalist," p. 42.
[53] Ibid., p. 42.
[54] Ibid., p. 42.
[55] Ibid., p. 42.

instruction in higher education."[56] More specifically, De Forest O'Dell situates the emergence of professional education for journalism in the United States in 1869, as the result of a thirty-nine year conflict between the American social order and the Penny Press.[57] O'Dell contextualizes the development of the English penny paper within the history of the Industrial Revolution and its concentration of population in municipalities, the growth of the newspaper reading habit, and "the perspicacity of those early publishers who perceived the possibility of deriving financial gain by paying less attention in their columns to the thought-provoking discussion of the day's social issues and providing more space for those staples of the present-day tabloid trade – sex and crime."[58] As discussed previously, the impetus for professionalization as an agent of legitimization is largely due to the penny paper and its provision of highly popular sensational news, with journalism education serving to reinforce this quest for legitimacy. O'Dell observes that the idea of training for the editor's chair had been discussed as early as March 4,1789, when John Ward Fenno, of *The Gazette of the United States,* called the newspapers of that day the "most base, false, servile and venal publications that ever polluted society," and suggested that the evil might be removed by the appointment of college-trained editors.[59] Further evidence of the development of the social movement for journalism education can be seen in the action of the Board of Directors of the Farmers' High School (now Pennsylvania State College) whose members recommended to the State Legislature in 1857 that education for journalism be made an integral part of the institution's

[56] Ibid., p. 42.
[57] De Forest O'Dell, *The History of Journalism Education in the United States* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935), p. 1.
p. 1.
[58] O'Dell, p. 1.
[59] *Gazette of the United States,* March 4, 1789. Quoted in O'Dell, p. 1.

curriculum.[60] In this sense, as argued previously, "higher education offered journalists the possibility to earn a sense of respect and, along the way, raise up the field of journalism to the status of a profession."[61]

Journalism education in the United States emerged in the late part of the nineteenth century, with the consolidation of the doctrine of objectivity in newspapers, as an integral part of the process of professionalization. The potential contribution of journalism schools to the legitimization of the profession is clearly reflected in the words of A. Ross Hill, President of the University of Missouri, upon the opening in 1908 of the University's School of Journalism, the first school of journalism in the United States (and in the world). I reproduce these words here:

> I believe it is possible for this school to give dignity to the profession of journalism, to anticipate to some extent the difficulties that journalists must meet and to prepare its graduates to overcome them, to give prospective journalists a professional spirit and high ideals of service, to discover those with real talent for the work and discourage those who are likely to prove failures in the profession, and to give the state better newspapers and newspapermen and a better citizenship.[62]

It could be argued that formally and professionally 'learning' the apolitical and non-literary news-writing in a college or university setting is also another trait of Anglo-American journalism. It is not by coincidence that the first practical print-shop approach course at Washington and Lee University, designed to help printers become information servants, and following all the Anglo-American 'sacred' mandates of what 'good journalism' should concern itself with (primarily, objectivity, and along with it the ideals

---

[60] O'Dell, p. 1

[61] Mirando, p. 77. The author notes further that "this line of reasoning is still used to justify the existence of schools of journalism and mass communication. The argument was a strong one especially after the Morrill Land Grand Act of 1862 made available thousands of acres of land for the founding of colleges that would provide training in a variety of practical subjects." Once again, the field of journalism studies and the rise of journalism to the status of a profession shall be discussed at length in the second chapter of this dissertation.

[62] A. Ross Hill, quoted in Medsger, p. 206.

neutrality, fairness, balance and, of course, the inverted pyramid), first appeared this early on – in 1869 – in the United States.[63] This early attempt at journalism education appeared, it should be emphasized, with objectivity emerging victorious as the 39-year-old fight between the scandalous, fallacious, unreliable penny press and the American social order began to take a turn. As noted previously, the *fact-centred discursive practices,* according to Jean K. Chalaby, were invented by the Americans and the British, like the modern concept of news. Chalaby writes that "these discursive practices can be identified as journalistic because their use was determined by norms and values themselves conditioned by regularities of the journalistic field emerging during the second half of the 19th century in England and America."[64] He states that while French journalism remained under the influence of its traditional spheres of origin – politics and literature – the Anglo-American news report form was telegraphic in style, as discussed in the second chapter of this dissertation.

Chalaby establishes a distinction between the Anglo-American news report and the classic French journal article by the way it is written; news reports are constructed 'around facts' (Anglo-American approach) and not around 'ideas and chronologies' (French approach), the most newsworthy fact being placed first.[65] He argues that the organizing principle of many articles in French newspapers was the mediating subjectivity of the journalists, as "French journalists did not only wrap information into their own observations but constructed their articles according to their interpretation of

[63] The first course in journalism to appear in a college curriculum was set up in 1869 at Washington and Lee University as part of a program of scholarships offered to printers in the South. Recipients received free tuition to combine classroom lessons with work in the composing room of the local newspaper under the supervision of a college faculty member. (Please see Joseph Mirando, p. 77.)
[64] Jean K. Chalaby, "Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention," p. 310.
[65] Chalaby, p. 312.

the related events, thus mediating between readers and reality."[66] It could be stated, then, that the objectivity-oriented Anglo-American news report differed from the subjective and opinion-oriented French newspaper article; the differences in narrative principle between these discursive practices – facts versus opinion – being the guiding force in the establishment of this distinction.[67]

This distinction was clearly visible in the early news-reporting and news-writing textbooks of the 1800s, which embraced objectivity as a central tenet long before the formal establishment of journalism education.[68] The most basic practices involved in reporting and news writing methods used by students of mass communication today are not only rooted in the 1860s but were well established by then, becoming "staples of early journalism education."[69] According to Mirando, the first journalism students studied the inverted pyramid style of writing instead of the time-honored narrative that was used in other classes and dominated earlier newspaper writing. The author notes that "they received training in practices associated with what is known today as *objective reporting* – factualness based on observable phenomena and newsworthiness based on an audiences' interests rather than the writer's interests."[70] (italics mine)

Furthermore, this distinction could not be made more evident when matters of a professional level, in terms of vocational training, are brought into question. American

---

[66] Ibid., p. 312.
[67] Ibid., p. 312.
[68] Joseph Mirando, "Embracing Objectivity Early On: Journalism Textbooks of the 1800s," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 16, no. 1 (Routledge, 2001).
[69] Joseph Mirando, "Training and Education of Journalists," p. 78.
[70] Ibid., p. 78. The author adds that "one of the most noted textbooks from this era was Edwin Suman's *Steps into Journalism.* Initially published by a correspondence school in 1894, it was still in circulation in the 1920s. Earlier popular journalism textbooks were based on a series of articles reprinted from the trade journal *The Journalist,* the forerunner of the modern *Editor & Publisher* magazine. These included *Writing for the Press* (1886) by Robert Luce, *The Ladder of Journalism* (1889) by Thomas Campbell-Copeland, and *The Blue Pencil and How To Avoid It* (1890) by Alexander G. Nevins."

journalists needed to be trained in order to give credibility to the specific set of "objective" practices American newspapers were trying to advance. But the American narrators of news were simply *reporters,* as opposed to the immediately recognizable literary figures of the French letters.[71] This is due to the fact that the press in the United States and in England grew independently from the literary field, "but this was not the case in France, where the emergence of the journalistic field was a long struggle of independence not only from the sphere of politics but also from the literary field."[72] Chalaby explains that the domination of literary forms and values assumed several facets in France, and that traditionally, French literary figures and celebrities have always been very involved in journalism (e.g., Honoré de Balzac, Robert de Lamennais, Alphonse de Lamartine, Alexandre Dumas and Victor Hugo; Émile Zola, a typical example of the dual career of novelist and journalist; and literary writers employed as reporters, special correspondents, or occupying managerial or non-writing editorial positions, among them Albert Camus, subeditor; Jean Cocteau, special correspondent; François Mauriac, columnist; Antoine de Saint-Exupery, reporter; George Simenon, correspondent for criminal affairs).[73]

While Anglo-American news values were tied to objectivity, French news values were tied to the literary field. According to Chalaby, the journalistic practice most literary in character was the most prestigious, and

---

[71] The rest of the world also followed in this tradition, most notably Latin America, where objectivity is not an occupational norm. There is a reason behind the fact that every major Latin American writer of the 19th and 20th century, without exception, is also a journalist. For an excellent account of the literary-oriented journalistic production via the Paris-based "world republic of letters," refer to Pascale Casanova's book by the same name. For a comparison of international journalistic occupational norms – or lack thereof – within three media systems (Polarized Pluralist, Democratic Corporatist, and Liberal), refer to the book by the same name by Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini.
[72] Chalaby, p. 313.
[73] Ibid., p. 313-14.

> This honour was conferred upon the chronicle. The chronicle format is loose. Usually, the writer made some amusing and refined comments on different topics chosen from the news of the week. The tone of a good chronicle was frivolous, the style brilliant. Thus, this genre was mastered by literary writers. A celebrated chronicler was Guy de Maupassant, a major literary figure of the closing decades of the 19th century.[74]

This could not be further from the Anglo-American reality. As argued previously, journalism education in the United States was to transform the reputation of journalism; "the image of rough drunks in the newsrooms would be replaced by an image of thoughtful, educated journalists" while "journalism schools would be, in part, the finishing schools of journalism."[75]

The "printer's devils" welcomed this training with open arms, in their longing to embrace the ideals of objectivity and gain professional credibility. Returning to the establishment of the first course in journalism to appear in a college curriculum in 1869 at Washington and Lee University, the printers/editors who owned and operated most newspapers were vociferous in their interest. According to Medsger,

> The enthusiasm of printers for the invitation to study journalism at the college is evident in an 1869 letter to Professor Johnston from John Plaxton of the Nashville Typographical Union. "We look upon this action of Washington College as a very important step toward raising American journalism from the slough of venality, corruption and party subservience into which it has too notoriously fallen to the high position it should occupy."[76]

This course at Washington College marked the beginning of journalism education at the university level in the United States and, by extension, the world. While journalism education started to become rooted in American higher education in the early

---

[74] Ibid., p. 315-16. The author cites two other celebrated journalistic genres, the first being of a polemic nature (the ability to polemicize being greatly admired in the circles of Parisian journalists, with many of the eminent figures of the French journalistic field being polemicists: Veuillot, Vallès, Rochefort, Dumont; Léon Daudet certifying that 'polemic is the soul of journalism') the second of a 'commentary' nature, "not as literary as the chronicle, not as virulent as the polemic" – thus establishing this hierarchy of journalistic discursive practices according to the 'literarity' of each practice.
[75] Medsger, p. 207.
[76] Ibid., p. 206.

twentieth century, there is general agreement that the first plan for future journalists to receive a college education was created by the losing general in the Civil War, Robert E. Lee.[77] The general received a number of job offers at the end of the Civil War, accepting one to become president of Washington College, now Washington and Lee University, in Lexington, Virginia.[78] Educated journalists, thought Lee, were a crucial rehabilitation force for the stricken South.[79] Sloan adds that the general believed an intelligent press plays an instrumental role in contributing to an informed, responsible citizenry, and thus in 1868 he proposed to the college's trustees that they establish 50 scholarships 'for young men proposing to make printing and journalism their life work and profession,' in his words.[80] Furthermore, O'Dell notes that "when Lee went to Lexington on active duty as a college president, the South was still suffering from the pain and ache of war" and that "distress was everywhere" as Lincoln "had been assassinated, 'carpet-baggers' were overrunning the country, and the future seemed to hold very little."[81] It is in the context of a need of educational regeneration in the South of the United States that the first journalism course, as part of a larger plan for future journalists to receive a college education, emerged. "The South called for help from all sources," writes O'Dell, "and the educational institutions soon saw drastic changes in their curricula had to be made."[82]

---

[77] Medsger, p. 205; Sutton, p. 7; Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 42; Sara Lockwood Williams, *Twenty Years of Education for Journalism: A History of the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri* (Columbia, Missouri: The E. W. Stephens Publishing Company, 1929), p. 4.
[78] Albert Alton Sutton, *Education for Journalism in the United States from its Beginning to 1940* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1945), p. 7; William David Sloan, "In Search of Itself: A History of Journalism Education" in *Makers of the Media Mind: Journalism Educators and Their Ideas* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990) p. 3; Sara Lockwood Williams, *Twenty Years of Education for Journalism: A History of the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri* (Columbia, Missouri: The E. W. Stephens Publishing Company, 1929), p. 4; Betty Medsger, "The Evolution of Journalism Education in the United States," in *Making Journalists* (ed. Hugh de Burgh / Routledge, 2005) p. 205.
[79] O'Dell, p. 5; Medsger, p. 205.
[80] Sloan, p. 3.
[81] O'Dell, p. 6.
[82] Ibid., p. 7.

On that note, General Lee sent the following notation to his board of trustees on March 30, 1869; reproduced here for documentation purposes:

> I beg leave to submit for your consideration several propositions from the faculty which would not have been presented until your regular meeting in June but for the fact that, should they receive your approbation, the necessary changes in the catalogue of the present session, now preparing for publication, will be made.
>
> The proposition recommending the institution of fifty scholarships for young men proposing to make printing or journalism their profession (…)
>
> I will only add that all the foregoing subjects have been maturely considered by the faculty and have received their unanimous consent.
>
> (Signed) R. E. Lee
> President, Washington College[83]

Resolutions by the board of trustees, cited in O'Dell's work, are the following:

> *Resolved:* That the board of trustees be requested to authorize the faculty to appoint to scholarships, to be called . . . scholarships [sic], not exceeding 50 in number, *young men intending to make practical printing and journalism their business in life,*[84] such scholarships to be free from tuition and college fees on condition that, when required by the faculty, they shall perform such disciplinary duties as may be assigned them in a printing office or in other positions in the line of their professions for a time equal to one hour in each working day. (italics mine)
>
> *Resolved:* That the board of trustees be requested in order to carry the foregoing provision into effect, to make such arrangements for or with a printing office as may afford practical instruction and, so far as practicable, compensate employment in their business to such young men.[85]

Under this widely publicized plan, writes Medsger, the college offered scholarships for men to study journalism, business and agricultural chemistry.[86] According to Sutton, "the training was to consist of instruction in printing in a local plant, and it was designed to prepare students for service on newspapers of the time, which, for the most part, were operated by editors who also were practical printers."[87] The author

[83] O'Dell, p. 14; Sara Lockwood Williams, p. 4.
[84] Once again, pertinent to note the (Anglo-American) association between journalism and printing.
[85] O'Dell, p. 14-15.
[86] Medsger, p. 205.
[87] Sutton, p. 7.

adds that "the student's editorial training was to be obtained while he stood before the type-case, composing his articles as he set them up on type."[88] Medsger refers to this as "a radical idea, not only because no college in the nation had offered courses in journalism, but because then, as now, Washington and Lee, like most colleges then, was known for its basic liberal arts education, not professional education."[89] De Forest O'Dell agrees that it was a radical idea. He writes that General Robert E. Lee, President of Washington College, "shocked his colleagues and the editors of his day when he asked his board of trustees to provide instruction in newspaper technique."[90]

Medsger notes that records at Washington and Lee do not indicate how many people studied journalism in response to Lee's call, but it is known that the scholarships, originally offered in 1869, lasted only a few years.[91] Sutton adds that the scholarships were never used, and the plan, as proposed by Lee, was abandoned in 1978.[92] And although De Forest O'Dell refers to the first journalism course established at Washington College as "meagre,"[93] it was a vital step in getting journalism education off the ground, and other colleges and universities followed suit, amassing support from several sources and organizations. Sutton elaborates on the far-reaching effects of the efforts of Lee despite the failure of this initial venture. According to the author, "newspaper editors and educators alike heard of the plan and began to discuss the merits of the proposal to include instruction of journalism in the curriculum of colleges and universities."[94] Mirando notes that land-grant colleges, mainly in the Midwest, used the support of state

[88] Sutton, p. 7.
[89] Medsger, p. 205.
[90] O'Dell, p. 5.
[91] Medsger, p. 205.
[92] Sutton, p. 7; O'Dell, p. 17.
[93] O'Dell, p. 2.
[94] Sutton, pp. 7-8.

press associations to develop many of the earliest journalism courses.[95] As a result, John A. Anderson put the idea of teaching students of journalism the fundamentals of printing into effect at Kansas State College in 1873, via the establishment of a course in practical printing.[96] The University of Missouri set up a course in the History of Journalism offered by Professor David Russell McAnally, head of the department of English in 1878;[97] another course called Materials of Journalism started in 1884, showing the early attention given to practical procedures at this university.[98] Other public colleges in the Midwest that joined the movement to start journalism courses included Iowa State University (1892), Indiana University (1893), University of Kansas (1894), University of Michigan (1895) and the University of Nebraska (1898).[99]

Journalism courses employing "innovative approaches" were being established on the private college front, particularly in the Ivy League.[100] In 1871, according to Mirando, Yale offered students the opportunity to study and discuss journalistic trends in literature and history on a regular schedule.[101] The first degree in journalism was offered by another Ivy League school, Cornell University, in 1875.[102] The University of Pennsylvania developed the first organized comprehensive curriculum in journalism, held by the prestigious Wharton School of Business; the five courses listed in the 1893-94

---

[95] Mirando, p. 77. The efforts of the Missouri Press Association, for instance, are well documented – leading directly, in fact, to the establishment of the first recognized school of journalism in the United States (please refer to Sutton, p. 12; and Stephen Banning, "The Professionalization of Journalism: A Nineteenth Century Beginning"). The school of journalism at Washington and Lee University (Virginia) was also made possible by funds from the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association. Likewise, the department of journalism at Rutgers University was formed through the initiative of the New Jersey Press Association (please refer to Sutton, p. 39).
[96] Sutton, p. 10.
[97] Sutton, p. 10. According to the author, this course was "the first attempt at a systematic presentation of the growth and development in this field."
[98] O'Dell, p. 36; Mirando, p. 78-9; Sutton, p. 10.
[99] Mirando, p. 78-9.
[100] Mirando, p. 78; Sutton, pp. 38-9.
[101] Mirando, p. 78.
[102] Sutton, p. 10; Mirando, p. 78; O'Dell, p. 21.

catalogue art and history of newspaper making, law of libel and business management, newspaper practice (exercises in reporting, editing of copy, conversation [sic], etc.), current topics (lectures on live issues in the United States and foreign countries), and special lectures by visiting journalists.[103]

But although the establishment of journalism courses, degrees, and ultimately journalism schools proliferated, it should be noted that journalism education was also seen as "a passing campus fad" by the dawn of the 20th century.[104] Several leading journalists as Horace Greeley, E. L. Godkin, and Charles Dana were on record as making harsh statements firmly against the promotion of journalism education.[105] As an example, I will single out an argument made by Frederic Hudson, managing editor of *The New York Herald,* quite indicative of the preference given to practice in the newsroom versus theory in the classroom:

> Such an establishment as *The New York Herald,* or *Tribune,* or *Times* is the true college for newspaper students. Professor James Gordon Bennett, or Professor Horace Greeley would turn out more real genuine journalists in one year than the Harvards, the Yales, and the Dartmouths could produce in a generation.[106]

Frederic Hudson's words were shared by many other influential newspapermen, including E. L. Godking, of *The New York Evening Post*; Horace Greeley, of *The New York Tribune*; J. C. Goldsmith, editor of *Frank Leslie's Illustrated*; William Hyde, editor of *The Missouri Republican*, to name but a few.[107] According to Hazel Dicken-Garcia, at that time, "controversy flared about whether journalism education could offer any better

---

[103] Mirando, p. 78; Sutton, p. 11; James Melvin Lee, *Instruction in Journalism in Institutions of Higher Education*, U.S. Bulletin No. 21 (Department of Interior, Bureau of Education, 1918) p. 10.
[104] Mirando, p. 78.
[105] O'Dell, pp. 20-21 (the author thoroughly documents several of these statements); Mirando, p. 78; Sutton, p. 10.
[106] Frederic Hudson, quoted in O'Dell, p. 20. O'Dell incorrectly identifies Frederic Hudson with *The New York Tribune*.
[107] Sutton, p. 8.

preparation than experience."[108] William David Sloan also comments on this controversy, stating that "most journalists' arguments in the late 1800s emphasized one theme: newspaper offices, not college classrooms, were the only place where an aspiring journalist could learn the trade." Sloan notes an observation by Henry Watterson, editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal: "There is but one school of journalism, and that is a well conducted newspaper office." The author singles out Whitelaw Reid of *The New York Tribune*, one of the "handful of journalists who advocated education for the field," and his lecture entitled "The School of Journalism," delivered April 4, 1872, at New York University. In it, Reid proposed a model curriculum aimed at providing a well-rounded education for aspiring journalists, including political history, American and world history, politics, law, literature, modern languages, philosophy, and economics, combined with professional instruction. According to Sloan, Reid's ideas typified the early suggestions for a college curriculum, emphasizing liberal arts over practical training, and many of the programs founded in the next half century would use that approach.[109]

In addition to Reid, other equally important editors lined up in favour of the formal establishment of journalism education, including George W. Curtis, of *Harper's Weekly*; William Penn Nixon, of *The Chicago Inter-Ocean*; David G. Croly, of the *New York Graphic*; and, most importantly, Joseph Pulitzer, editor of *The New York World*.[110] Several of these favourable opinions by leading editors and publishers were collected by Eugene M. Camp, of the editorial staff of *The Philadelphia Times*.[111] Additionally, Camp has also found that most respondents to a survey of leading professionals favored a broad,

[108] Hazel Dicken-Garcia, *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*, p. 217.
[109] William David Sloan, p. 6.
[110] Sutton, p. 8.
[111] Ibid., p. 8.

general education for journalists – including economics, law, politics, oral and written communication, and history.[112] Camp collected these opinions to present them in an address before the Alumni Association of the Wharton School of Business of the University of Pennsylvania, in an effort to interest that school in establishing technical instruction in journalism.[113] In his address, entitled "Journalists: Born or Made?" Camp argued that the conditions of the newsroom made it impossible for a newcomer to obtain proper training there. As a result the university in 1893 took up his challenge and began to offer courses in the fall semester under the supervision of Joseph French Johnson, a former financial editor of the *Chicago Tribune*, and later staff at the *Republican* in Springfield, Massachusetts, and the *Ohio Tribune*.[114] Camp believed that the university should 'not expect to graduate editors' and emphasized a liberal education for his students.[115]

By the turn of the twentieth century, "the time was ripe for journalism education to become much more than a fad."[116] Labour had become more specialized, and the reporter's work also emerged as specialized needs and activities. According to Marianne Salcetti, "the training of reporters for newsroom work was increasingly viewed as occurring within university classrooms." The author cites Joseph Pulitzer's statement that 'the spirit of specialization is everywhere.'[117] James Carey also notes that "by the turn of the century, we had entered the age of the reporter." According to the author, "the reporter became the archetypal figure of journalism simply because the 'glut of

[112] Dicken-Garcia, p. 218.
[113] Sutton, p. 8.
[114] Everette Dennis and Ellen Wartella, *American Communication Research: The Remembered History* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 129.
[115] William David Sloan, p. 7.
[116] Mirando, p. 78.
[117] Salcetti, "The Emergence of the Reporter," p. 60.

occurrences' forced him or her to the center of the enterprise and made the newspaper an instrument of news gathering and writing rather than an excuse for editorials or printing official documents." Reporters were not educated, however; Carey describes them as "an unlikely collection of itinerant scribblers, aspiring-or more often failed-novelists, ne'er-do-well sons or daughters of established families."[118] Joseph Mirando notes several factors contributing to the consolidation of the idea of journalism education: the passing of nineteenth century outspoken leaders as Horace Greeley, educational theories of John Dewey and William James being in vogue, and the emphasis in academia rapidly shifting from a focus on the goals of the institution to the goals of individual students.[119] Moreover, preparation for the 'writing-room,' notes Salcetti, had shifted to the classroom for reporters, "whose job qualifications increasingly mirrored the editorial division of labor."[120] Most importantly, professional training "was to emphasize intellectual and ethical training as the priority over the more mechanical skills of writing news copy."[121]

Great impetus was given to the movement for journalistic instruction in institutions of higher learning by the proposal made by Pulitzer in 1903, which set in motion a series of events that raised journalism education from just an idea to a full-fledged movement.[122] A detailed position on the possibilities of such a school was given

---

[118] Carey, James W. "Where Journalism Education Went Wrong," Columbia University, New York. Available online: http://frank.mtsu.edu/~masscomm/seig96/carey/carey.htm The author notes further that "most importantly, they [reporters] were the upwardly mobile children of immigrants with an inherited rather than an educated gift of language, without much education and certainly without much refinement."
[119] Mirando, p. 78.
[120] Salcetti, p. 61.
[121] Ibid., p. 62.
[122] Sutton, p. 11; Mirando, p. 79; Willard Bleyer, *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism*, pp. 426-26.

the following year in an article in the *North American Review*, as shall be discussed later.[123]

Pulitzer directed his personal secretary, Dr. George W. Hosmer, to prepare a brochure titled "The Making of a Journalist: What a Technical and a Professional School is Needed" dealing with the need of professional training for newspaper work.[124] Pulitzer then instructed Hosmer to take copies of the pamphlet to the presidents of Harvard and Columbia universities, Charles Eliot and Nicholas Murray Butler respectively, asking each man if he found the pamphlet's main idea acceptable, and informing them that "a friend" was very interested in making substantial gift for the purposes of establishing a school of journalism.[125] Joseph Mirando writes that "both presidents gave their enthusiastic support," but Butler won over Eliot because he "had already presented the idea to Columbia's Board of Trustees, who gave approval to establishing a school of journalism just eight days before Eliot could respond to Hosmer's inquiry."[126] De Forest O'Dell, Albert Sutton, William David Sloan, and Betty Medsger, on the other hand, offer slightly differing accounts. According to O'Dell, President Butler received the pamphlet before President Eliot, who was not at Cambridge when Dr. Hosmer called on him, and only got the document one month later, upon his return. Butler wrote Hosmer of "his mild interest" in the proposal and suggested further correspondence, should the anonymous donor still be interested. Meanwhile, Pulitzer had been "deeply moved by President Butler's reception of the proposal, and was elated over approaching the

[123] Entitled "The College of Journalism," the article was published in *The North American Review* issue of May, 1904, pp. 641-80; see Sutton, p. 13.
[124] O'Dell, p. 58; Mirando, p. 79; Sutton, p. 13. The document is referred to as "The Hosmer Pamphlet: The Making of a Journalist," and is reproduced in full in Appendix A of this dissertation.
[125] O'Dell, p. 58; Mirando, p. 79; Sutton, p. 13.
[126] Mirando, p. 79. The author states that Eliot had written "a note responding to Hosmer that included an outline for a curriculum that offered courses in newspaper management, production, law, ethics, history, and writing."

realization of his dream," and the school was established at Columbia.[127] William David Sloan, in contrast, highlights that Columbia had turned down Pulitzer's first offer back in 1892, and "it did not jump at his second." In the version by Sloan, President Butler and college trustees doubted whether journalism was a legitimate academic subject and actually feared for how offering it might affect Columbia's academic reputation. Sloan adds that "they also were reluctant to do anything that might give the impression that Pulitzer or his newspaper, the New York *World*, had an influence on the school – despite the fact that Pulitzer's proposal included a statement to the effect that once he had given the money, he would keep his hands off the program."[128] The author notes that "Pulitzer was so eloquent and persuasive in arguing the case of college journalism education that eventually the trustees accepted." He adds that Pulitzer did try to influence the implementation of the program, as the trustees had expected, "and their wrangling ended only after he acquiesced in their demand that the college have full control." Sloan explains that Butler and the trustees, for their part, failed to abide fully by the terms of the agreement. Very tellingly, it was not until 1912, a year after Pulitzer's death, that Columbia finally began construction of the building to house the journalism school. It opened the following year, writes Sloan.[129]

The version by Albert Sutton starts by highlighting Pulitzer's desire for a programme "which emphasised editorial training in the collection and dissemination of news, with major stress placed on social sciences." It was imperative to avoid courses

[127] O'Dell, p. 58.
[128] Sloan, p. 7.
[129] Ibid., p. 8.

dealing with the business aspect of newspaper publishing.[130] Pulitzer's intentions were evident in the following remarks, worth reproducing here:

> I am sure that, if my wishes are to be considered, business instruction of any sort should not, would not, and must not form any part of the work of the college of journalism (…) nothing, in fact, is more inconsistent and incompatible with my intentions or repugnant to my feelings than to include any of the business or commercial elements of a newspaper in what is to be taught in this department of Columbia College.[131]

The courses which had been prepared by Dr. Eliot at Harvard, on the other hand, "placed stress on practical courses designed to prepare for the business department of a newspaper" and included: newspaper administration (the organization of a newspaper office and functions of various departments and services), newspaper administration (the study of printing presses and other mechanical devices used in publishing), the law of journalism, ethics of journalism, history of journalism, the literary form of newspapers (approved usages in punctuation, spelling, abbreviations, typography, etc.), and background courses coordinated with journalism.[132] In Sutton view, Columbia's proposed curriculum, which favoured the social sciences and ignored the business aspect of newspapers, was closer to Pulitzer's heart. The author attributes these divergent philosophies to the different programs of journalism in the leading schools and departments of journalism today [1945], arguing they continue to reflect the views expressed by Eliot and Pulitzer, as I shall discuss in the final chapter of this dissertation.[133]

---

[130] Sutton, p. 13.
[131] Joseph Pulitzer, quoted in James Melvin Lee, *Instruction in Journalism in Institutions of Higher Education*, p. 13; reproduced in Sutton, p. 13.
[132] Sutton, p. 13; James Melvin Lee, p. 13.
[133] Sutton, pp. 13-14.

In turn, Betty Medsger, argues that Pulitzer "focused more sharply on the need to improve the minds of journalists than on the need to smooth journalists' rough edges." According to the author, when Pulitzer proposed endowing a school of journalism at Columbia, "he had to work hard to sell the idea." Medsger writes that Ivy League colleges "were not enthralled with the idea of adding mere professional studies, especially journalism, to their curricula" and that, "to some extent, the colleges' attitude was elitist, but their administrators also believed strongly that an education in liberal arts and the sciences, rather than in studies geared toward specific professions, was the ideal education for anyone."[134] Thus, according to Medsger, "Columbia accepted Pulitzer's offer, but only after a public debate took place over several years, with influential journalists and educators participating in it."[135] O'Dell notes that the "announcement of the new school brought forth both high praise and harsh criticism from the newspaper and magazine editors of the country."[136] Mirando states that "editorials in major newspapers and magazines across the country generally applauded Pulitzer's actions" while those "critical of the endowment recognized it as at least a praiseworthy gesture while expressing doubt that the school would improve the skills of journalists."[137] O'Dell reproduces several of these editorials in his work, notably the responses given by Lincoln Steffens writing in *The Bookman* (edition of October 1903), and H. W. Boynton in *The Atlantic Monthly* (edition of May 1904).[138] An editorial in *The Outlook* for August 22, 1903 reads:

---

[134] Medsger, p. 207.
[135] Ibid., p. 207.
[136] O'Dell, p. 63.
[137] Mirando, p. 79.
[138] O'Dell, p. 63.

> Columbia University is to have a School of Journalism – related to the general educational work of the University precisely as is its School of Law or of Medicine. This is absolutely new in the field of education; there have been courses of lectures on journalism in colleges, and private institutions have taught or attempted to teach the art, but the systematic training for newspaper work in a fully equipped institution established solely for that purpose is a novel undertaking, and may be regarded as one of the most interesting educational experiments of our time (…)[139]

It is, indeed, remarkable to note the association made by *The Outlook* between the professional training for journalism and that of law and medicine, regarding the craft as an art which merits a place in the university. Horace White of *The Chicago Tribune* writes in *The North American Review* issue of March 1904 that while he first saw "no need of a School of Journalism,"

> I am, nevertheless, glad that Columbia University has been supplied by the means to establish one. This is not intended as a paradox. Columbia already has the plant and the teaching force for the training of journalists in so far as they can be trained otherwise than by practice; but both the plant and the teaching are susceptible of improvement. There is no danger that they will be overloaded by the addition of one or two million dollars to the existing resources. If the authorities of Columbia are fit for their places, general culture will receive an impulse from Mr. Pulitzer's impulse and journalism will show therein.[140]

Arguing that journalism was a profession for which one should be educated, Pulitzer responded to the criticism of the proposed school using "viril language" and "punctuated throughout with sharp thrusts," according to De Forest O'Dell.[141] Mirando highlights the importance of the following statement by Pulitzer: "I wish to begin a movement "that will raise journalism to the rank of a learned profession, growing in the respect of the

[139] Reproduced in O'Dell, p. 63.
[140] O'Dell, p. 64. Entitled "The College of Journalism," the article was published in *The North American Review* issue of May, 1904.
[141] Ibid., p. 64.

community as other professions far less to the public interests have grown."[142] In Pulitzer's own words as pertaining to the Columbia Endowment, in his will:

> I am deeply interested in the progress and elevation of journalism, having spent my life in that profession, regarding it as a noble profession and one of unequaled importance for its influence upon the minds and morals of the people. I desire to assist in attracting to this profession young men of character and ability, also to help those already engaged in the profession to acquire the highest moral and intellectual training. There are now special schools for instruction for lawyers, physicians, clergymen, military and naval officers, engineers, architects, and artists, but none for the instruction of journalists. That all other professions and not journalism should have the advantage of special training seems to me contrary to reason. I have felt that I could contribute in no more effectual way to the benefit of my profession and to the public good than by providing for founding and maintaining adequate schools of journalism. To that end I have entered into agreements with the Trustees of Columbia University in the City of New York (hereinafter called Columbia University) dated April 19th, 1903, March 19th, 1904, and April 12, 1904, under and pursuant to which I have turned over to the University in cash and securities at agreed valuations, one million dollars ($ 1,000,000) or so much thereof as may not have been paid in my lifetime, by my executors (…)[143]

As noted previously, Pulitzer did not live to see the establishment of the Columbia School of Journalism, which did not open until 1912, but the impact of his endowment is undeniable.[144] It is pertinent to note that scholars working in the history of journalism education – O'Dell (1935), Sutton (1945), Weaver and Wilhoit, (1986), Sloan (1990), Carey (2000), Mirando (2002), Zelizer (2004), Medsger (2005) – are unanimous in signalling the historical significance of the Pulitzer School as a pivotal moment affecting

---

[142] Mirando, p. 79.
[143] *The Pulitzer Will As It Pertained To The Columbia Endowment* reproduced in full in O'Dell, p. 107.
[144] Mirando, p. 79. By then, between the opening of the first school of journalism separate from any other academic unit on a college campus was established (University of Missouri, 1908) and Columbia (1912), seven colleges had set up whole departments of journalism and three had separate schools of journalism (please refer to the timeline in Appendix D), p. 79.

and influencing all aspects of the field of journalism, from professionalization to education.[145]

The Pulitzer effect on journalism education dates back to 1903, given "two awe-inspiring" occurrences: the sheer size of Pulitzer's endowment (two million dollars; notice, again, this was 1903), on one level, and the projected plans for operation of the proposed school being published in detail in the *New York World,* to the surprise of editors and educators alike, on another.[146] Mirando refers to the sense of legitimacy Pulitzer's gift gave journalism education as "priceless."[147] According to the author, "Columbia officials acknowledged in an article in the *New York World* that their school of journalism would be on equal footing with the university's schools of law, medicine, engineering, architecture and teaching." Mirando notes that Pulitzer was considered "the top journalist of his day," despite his yellow journalism war with William Randolph Hearst, and "for good measure Columbia trustees allowed him to nominate a board of advisors that included two more prominent publishers to endorse the undertaking, Greeley's successor at the *New York Tribune,* Whitelaw Reid, and the *Chicago Daily News'* Victor F. Lawson." Additionally, he notes that "Harvard, America's leading university, had weighed in with its response from Eliot, who had led the institution since 1869," explaining that Butler was also distinguished in his own right with the publication of a book, *The Meaning of Education*, in 1898. Finally, for good measure, Pulitzer also

[145] The Columbia School of Journalism would also later directly influence – and serve as model for – the first three original journalism schools in Canada – Ryerson, Western Ontario, and Carleton – as I discuss later on in this work.
[146] O'Dell, p. 55.
[147] Mirando, p. 79.

added to the board of advisors Cornell University President Andrew White, who had established the first degree in journalism.[148]

Once the Pulitzer School of Journalism became a reality (again, in 1912), journalism courses, departments and schools across the United States were organized quickly, "and the public was given opportunity to observe the school of which Pulitzer had dreamed, and which had been publicized so highly by the Pulitzer-Eliot discussion, actually producing results."[149] Numbers increased year by year since 1912, until by 1934 "there were 455 collegiate institutions in the United States offering journalism instruction, and 812 teachers of journalism throughout the country" while "both the Pulitzer and the Eliot plans have been followed in this development."[150] Credit for this period of rapid growth is also due to the establishment of the first recognized school of journalism at the University of Missouri in 1908, which along with the announcement of the Pulitzer endowment to Columbia, served as "an added incentive" to institutions flirting with the possibility of offering courses in journalism.[151] Finally, recognition should also be given to the model advanced by Willard G. Bleyer at the University of Wisconsin, creating separate journalism departments within colleges of liberal arts, as opposed to independent professional schools like Missouri (1908) and Columbia (1912).[152] A third pattern – the fusion of journalism and mass communications – came later, around the 1940s; the influence and significance of these three models for journalism education shall be discussed at length in the final chapter of this dissertation.

---

[148] Mirando, p. 79.
[149] O'Dell, p. 95.
[150] Ibid., p. 95.
[151] Sutton, p. 16.
[152] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 42.

According to William Sloan, "with these schools having laid the groundwork, journalism education fairly exploded."[153] Mirando notes that 31 colleges in the United States offered at least one course in journalism by the time Columbia's school of journalism opened in 1912; Albert Sutton's figure, from data compiled by Dean Walter Williams of the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri in the same year, cites the following 32 colleges and universities as offering "some kind of instruction" in journalism: Beliot College, the Universities of California, Colorado, Columbia, De Pauw, Iowa State College, Universities of Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kansas State Agricultural College, Universities of Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Marquette, Massachusetts Agricultural College, Universities of Michigan, Missouri, Nebraska, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh, North Dakota, Notre Dame, Ohio State, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, Wisconsin, New York, and Southern California.[154] Mirando cites the 1918 government monograph by James Melvin Lee, which showed the number had increased to 91 by that year, with 26 of these colleges and institutions offering enough coursework for students to earn a major in journalism.[155]

It was also during this period that professional associations for educators of journalism began to emerge. Citing Willard G. Bleyer's *Main Currents in the History of American Journalism,* O'Dell points out that the American Association of Teachers of Journalism was organized in 1912, and the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism in 1917.[156] O'Dell mentions furthermore that "the latter has served as an unofficial standardizing organization and through the tireless work of its

[153] Sloan, p. 10.
[154] Mirando, p. 79; Sutton, p. 16, quoting "Editorial," *The Journalism Bulletin*, Vol. IV (1917), p. 25.
[155] Mirando, p. 79.
[156] O'Dell, p. 95 citing Bleyer, p. 427.

leaders has proved to be an important factor in improving the standards of the nation's journalism curricula," including thirty member schools by 1935 and being an advocate for a national survey of schools of journalism.[157] Mirando also outlines the organizational significance of this period, as faculty and students began to establish alumni support groups and professional associations that are still alive today, serving to strengthen journalism's place in higher education.[158] The author singles out three prominent student organizations, all founded in 1909 – the Society of Professional Journalists (originally Sigma Delta Chi at De Pauw University), Women in Communications, Inc. (originally Theta Sigma Phi at the University of Washington), and the Society for Collegiate Journalists (originally Pi Delta Epsilon at Syracuse University).[159] O'Dell puts emphasis on Sigma Delta Chi and Theta Sigma Phi having urged closer cooperation between schools and the working press; both of these organizations along with Kappa Tau Alpha, the national honor society for journalism students founded in 1910 at the University of Missouri, "have advocated a high standard of scholarship in journalism education."[160] Mirando also points out that the main organization for faculty, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (AEJMC) that we know today, was founded in 1912 as the American Association for Teachers of Journalism (later the Association for Education in Journalism); as well, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications and the Association of Schools of Journalism

[157] O'Dell, p. 95.
[158] Mirando, p. 80.
[159] Ibid., p. 80.
[160] O'Dell, p. 95.

and Mass Communication "both have their roots in the 1916 establishment of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism."[161]

The third period of Weaver and Wilhoit's history of journalism timeline, extending roughly from 1920s to the 1940s, saw journalism programs in the United States established on a much firmer basis.[162] By 1920 the number of colleges offering journalism courses had risen to 131 (from the aforementioned 91 in 1918), jumping to 171 the following year.[163] By 1926, to 230, with 50 of them offering majors in journalism.[164] Finally, by 1936, despite tight financial conditions brought on by the Great Depression, 532 colleges had courses in journalism.[165] Citing figures provided by a report for the year 1928-29 by the *Journalism Quarterly*, Mirando notes that about 1,000 college students earned bachelor's degrees in journalism between 1909 and 1918, rising to 5,000 graduates between 1918 and 1928 and to about 14,000 between 1928 and 1938; additionally, faculty members teaching journalism numbered about 172 by 1917, 426 by 1929 and 894 by 1936.[166]

Sloan notes that "all of these programs were designed around either the Missouri concept of professional skills or the Pulitzer-Bleyer concept of studying the press in society, or a combination of the two." According to the author, the predominant approach at this time was an emphasis in broad education with some specialized training in

[161] Mirando, p. 80. The author proceeds to extensively discuss industry support to journalism education, as well as other private endowments (notably the McCormick and Patterson families of the Chicago area, endowing the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University).
[162] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 42.
[163] Sloan, p. 10.
[164] Mirando, p. 79.
[165] Ibid., p. 79.
[166] "Journalistic Education in the United States," *Journalism Quarterly*, VI (1929), quoted in Mirando, p. 79.

journalism, in order to assure that journalism fulfilled its obligations to society,[167] as shall be discussed at length in the final chapter of this dissertation. Willard Bleyer created the "Ph.D. minor" in journalism within the University of Wisconsin's doctoral programs in political science, sociology, and history.[168] Weaver and Wilhoit note that "although his own background was in English, Bleyer located journalism in the social sciences rather than in the humanities – a decision that had a far-reaching impact on the kind of journalism research and education carried out in many U.S. colleges and universities in the years to come."[169] Many founders of the major journalism programs, and the nation's leading journalism educations, came out of the journalism minor Ph.D. program at Wisconsin, including Fred Siebert, Chilton Bush, Ralph Nafziger, Curtis MacDougall, and Ralph Casey.[170] Bleyer's pupils carried empirical social science assumptions with them to such schools as Stanford, Northwestern, and Minnesota.[171] The authors note that the main thrust at this time was to follow the Bleyer school of thought by integrating journalism with the social sciences and, as a result, journalism schools began hiring Ph.D.s primarily from political science, sociology, and psychology.[172] The implications of this shift from the humanities to the social sciences will be discussed at length in the fifth and last chapter of this thesis.

---

[167] Sloan, p. 10.
[168] Weaver and Wilhoit, pp. 42-43; Carolyn Bronstein and Stephen Vaughn, "Willard G. Bleyer and the Relevance of Journalism Education, *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs*, 166 (June 1998), p. 21.
[169] Ibid., p. 43.
[170] James W. Tankard Jr., "The Theorists" in *Makers of the Media Mind: Journalism Educators and Their Ideas* (ed. William David Sloan / Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990), p. 230; Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[171] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[172] Ibid., p. 43. The authors note that though some came from the humanities, especially history, often even they took a social-science viewpoint. They observe that "largely because of this shift toward the social sciences in many leading U.S. journalism schools, more emphasis began to be put on ways of observing the world and systematically recording and analyzing such observations. More emphasis was placed on generalizing from specific observations, especially in journalism and mass communication research."

The final period of U.S. journalism education, in Weaver and Wilhoit's timeline, extends from the 1940s to the present, and began with the establishment of a journalism research division at the University of Minnesota in 1944, according to the authors.[173] It was also marked by Wilbur Schramm, who became director of the School of Journalism at the University of Iowa in 1943, doing much to drive journalism researchers to think about mass communication theory. While at Iowa, Schramm proposed a new interdisciplinary "doctorate of communication degree" and his books – particularly *Mass Communications* and *The Process and Effects of Mass Communication* – were "attempts to define the new field of mass communication based on a social science approach."[174] Weaver and Wilhoit note that other institutions – especially the Big Ten – also established doctoral programs of their own; Stanford on the West Coast and North Carolina on the East Coast extended this tradition beyond the Midwest.[175] The authors note that these Ph.D. programs were typically run by faculty members who had gained their terminal degrees in sociology, psychology, or political science, and "as a result, their protégés tended to be more closely attuned to social-science perspectives and methods than to humanistic ones."[176]

The origins of these major models of journalism instruction – Williams, Pulitzer, Bleyer, and Schramm – provide a context for the state of journalism education and training today. The fifth and final chapter of this thesis shall build on the history of journalism education presented here in order to demonstrate how all of these complex tensions contribute to the uncomfortable position that journalistic training occupies within

[173] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[174] Tankard Jr., p. 230.
[175] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[176] Ibid., p. 43.

the university. Academically, journalism education draws on the humanities and the social sciences, while remaining outside of both. Pedagogically, journalism educators are asked to offer a 'critical' approach to phenomena while also teaching students practical skills of use to those seeking professional careers. The next chapter also explores the troubled marriage between communication studies and journalism, culminating in the recent call for the reorganization of the various subjects of journalism (i.e. law, ethics, communication theory, political economy of journalism, media history, etc.) into a single field of Journalism Studies. It concludes by looking at the continuing impact of these unresolved difficulties on journalism education today.

The next portion of this chapter provides an account of the emergence of journalism education in Canada, which shares much in the Anglo-American tradition, but is also much younger, and possesses its own set of characteristics and challenges, naturally.

Canada

> *I view journalism as a critical social practice – that is to say, as a practice not only shaped by the practitioner's view of the world but one that can be carried out with the intention of influencing the world. The critical counterpoint to journalistic 'objectivity' is being open about one's bias and coming clean about one's intentions.*
>
> – Marc Raboy, THE MEDIA IN QUEBEC: TOWARDS TEACHING CRITICAL MEDIA PRACTICE

The final section of this chapter aims to provide a brief overview of the founding of journalism schools in Canada. The history of Canadian journalism education shares in the Anglo-American tradition, but it differs radically from the U.S. experience in one important way: while journalism schools in the United States existed for well over a century, journalism schools in Canada were established only at the end of World War II. According to journalism educator and media critic Marc Edge,

> Journalism education in Canada lags far behind the field in the U.S., both in history and numbers. The first university-level schools of journalism in Canada did not open until the late 1940s, and until the mid-1970s there were only three four-year journalism schools there, all in the dominant province of Ontario.[177]

Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum note that despite entering its seventh decade, journalism education in Canada has only rarely been the subject of empirical investigation by its practitioners, or anyone else for that matter. According to the authors, "a literature review turned up a handful of academic critiques and manifestoes, as well as several salvoes aimed at a general audience, but only one survey chapter purporting to describe the field in any detail (Johansen and Dornan 2003)."[178] Knox and Goodrum state that "we could find almost no evidence of any attempt to compile even the simplest figures,

---

[177] Edge, p. 1.

[178] Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum, *Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope,* p. 2. The authors refer to the study by Peter Johansen and Christopher Dornan, "Journalism Education in Canada" in *Journalism Education in Europe and North America* (ed. Romy Fröhlich and Christina Holtz-Bacha / Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 2003), pp. 65-92.

such as how many institutions offer journalism programs and how many students are enrolled in them – let alone analysis of geographic distribution, relation to the labour market, curricula, modes of delivery or pedagogical methods."[179] Furthermore, T. Joseph Scanlon observes that "trying to tell the story of journalism education in Canada is like trying to trace the course of a quiet stream which, as the result of a cloudburst, has suddenly become a raging river and flooded its banks."[180] The central purpose of the second portion of this chapter is tell this story, despite these difficulties; the lack of detailed resources from which to draw on, other than the aforementioned study by Johansen and Dornan, being but the main one.

Citing several US-based studies, Edge observes that "journalism education at the university level in Canada is not as mature a field as it is in the United States, where instruction in the subject has progressed through several stages of development over almost a century (Sloan, 1990: 10)." Edge notes that the same pattern of development is evident in Canada,

> but when compared with the U.S. "each stage seems to have come roughly a half-century later" (Johansen , et. al, 2001: 473) As a result of a shift in emphasis from the teaching of skills and technique to the offering of more advanced, conceptual coursework in U.S. journalism schools, some scholars see journalism itself moving from craft status to profession there, unlike in other countries where teaching of the subject is "still in the stage of transition from trade school to academic institution." (Spichal & Sparks, 1994: 40) Journalism education in Canada lags behind in its development, obviously fitting the latter pattern. (Edge, 2003: 10)[181]

In their study entitled "Journalism Education in the United States and Canada: not merely clones," Peter Johansen, David H. Weaver, and Christopher Dornan argue that journalism

[179] Ibid., p. 2.
[180] T. Joseph Scanlon, "Journalism Education in Canada," *International Communication Gazette* 15, no. 2 (January 1, 1969), p. 159.
[181] Edge, p. 2.

education in Canada developed more slowly, "but tended to trace similar pathways."[182] The authors explain that

> Discussion of such teaching occurred as early as 1902, when the chancellor of Queen's University, Kingston, launched an essay contest on the subject. All but one of the 13 contributors—many of them practising journalists—argued against journalistic training *per se*, however, on the grounds that a liberal education is preferable to a narrow specialization (*Queen's Quarterly*, 1903). Given that prevailing view, it is not surprising that Canada saw only sporadic, industry-sponsored, non-degree teaching until the mid-1940s (Desbarats, 1996).[183]

Marc Edge notes that even today in Canada "the number of university programs in the subject could still be counted on the fingers of two hands. (Johansen, et. al, 2001: 470)[184]" and contrasts this with the over 450 four-year journalism programs in the United States, some of which had already been in operation since the early twentieth century.

According to Edge, the Canadian journalism industry has traditionally eschewed university education, giving preference instead to "on-the-job training or, at best, the British craft-school approach to education in the subject at two-year colleges,"[185] a circumstance detailed later in this chapter. Furthermore, Edge makes the crucial point that "as most Canadian journalism schools have been in operation for less than 30 years, there is not a critical mass of journalism school graduates built up there, and most working journalists, who entered the business through the traditional apprenticeship system, are opposed to the very concept of journalism education."[186] The author cites several prominent Canadian journalists describing how they abhor the idea of journalism

[182] Peter Johansen, David H. Weaver and Christopher Dornan, "Journalism Education in the United States and Canada: not merely clones" in *Journalism Studies* 2, no. 4 (2001), p. 471.
[183] Johansen et al, p. 471.
[184] Edge, p. 2.
[185] Ibid., p. 3.
[186] Ibid., p. 3.

school,[187] and then claims that the "professional voice dominates the skills vs. theory debate in journalism education in Canada in large part because the journalism school tradition has much less to sustain it there than in the U.S."[188]

Johansen, Weaver and Dornan account for Canada's gravitation towards an American-style journalism schooling by explaining that politically and culturally, the country "shifted its attention from Britain to the United States during the early twentieth century" and that, more fundamentally, "culture in general became a way through which Canada could construct its own national identity, and this led to massive state intervention in the cultural arena (Robinson, 2000)."[189] But in contrast to its US counterpart, argue the authors, "government has played a more direct role in the birth and evolution of Canada's journalism education system." Furthermore, according to Knox and Goodrum, Canada's highly decentralized federal system, where control over education at all levels falls to the governments of the 10 provinces, along with the linguistic dualism that is a central fact of Canadian history, has made the education system something of a patchwork."[190]

Johansen and Dornan equate the development of full programs on several Canadian campuses with the American impetus for professionalization; however, as mentioned previously, this emergence took place almost half a decade later, near the close of World War II.[191] Declaring a lack of firm evidence, the authors write that "we can

---

[187] Edge quotes Robert Fulford ("A highly dubious enterprise … an embarrassment to many who teach it and some who study it"), Barbara Amiel ("I suspect the people are good people 'in spite of' not 'because of' their journalism studies") and Allan Fotheringham ("You can't teach journalism, any more than you can teach sex. You're either good at it or you're not.")
[188] Edge, p. 4.
[189] Johansen et al., page 471.
[190] Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum, *Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope,* page 3. Regardless, the authors acknowledge the many similarities among the provincial systems.
[191] Peter Johansen and Christopher Dornan, "Journalism Education in Canada," in Romy Fröhlich and Christina Holtz-Bacha, eds., *Journalism Education in Europe and North America: An International Comparison* (Hampton Press, 2003), p. 69.

only speculate that professionalization lurked behind newsmen's efforts to promote journalism courses in London, Ontario, and Halifax, Nova Scotia." The authors point to this development as the first of three waves of Canadian journalism education.[192]

Furthermore, while the emergence of journalism education in the United States (via Robert E. Lee) was to be used as a rehabilitating force in the South after the end of the American Civil War, Johansen, Weaver and Dornan point out that "at the outset, the president of Carleton College in Ottawa (now Carleton University) was asked by a government official to set up a degree course in journalism so that soldiers returning from World War II would not have to go abroad, with government funding, for journalism training."[193] T. Joseph Scanlon credits H. W. Jamieson, a federal government employee responsible for arranging assistance to returning Canadian servicemen who wished to carry on the education interrupted by World War II, with starting journalism education in Canada.[194] According to the author, "because Mr. Jamieson had received a number of applications from servicemen who wished to study Journalism and because there were no degree programs in Canada, he wrote – on March 27, 1944 – to Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, president of a newly established college called Carleton College (now Carleton University) in Ottawa, the federal capital."[195] Following an exchange of letters between Jamieson and Tory, Carleton created its journalism department, in 1945, the first in Canada.[196] By the spring of 1946, according to Scanlon, Carleton awarded its first six degrees; three of those six were Canada's first Bachelors of Journalism.[197] The

[192] Ibid., p. 69.
[193] Johansen et al., page 471.
[194] Scanlon, p. 159.
[195] Ibid., p. 159.
[196] Johansen et al., page 471; Scanlon, p. 159.
[197] Scanlon, p. 159.

University of Western Ontario (London) followed Carleton, also in 1945, and the Toronto-based Ryerson Institute of Technology (now Ryerson Polytechnic University), "which was itself founded in 1948 to retrain and reintegrate veterans, [and] established journalism instruction within its printing and graphic arts department."[198]

The creation of Canada's first journalism school is also intimately documented by its founder and first director, Wilfrid Eggleston (1901-1985), in his memoir entitled *While I still remember: a personal record.*[199] Eggleston was a Canadian journalist and chief censor for Canada from 1942 until 1944; before World War II he worked as a journalist for the *Toronto Star, Time* and many other publications, as well as writing a syndicated newspaper column. As Eggleston recounts, Dr. Henry Marshall Tory, Carleton College's first president, and his close collaborator, Dr. John E. Robbins, "drew up a program of studies which would lead to the degree of Bachelor of Journalism [in 1945]." He explains that "the decision to found such a course had been made the previous year [1944] because of the request from a considerable number of war veterans for some professional training in the subject." Eggleston writes that a course in the history of journalism taught by Max Freedman officially inaugurated the school of journalism at Carleton in October [of 1945]; "the announcement also listed Dr. Douglas Leechman, F. C. Mears and myself as lecturing in forms of journalistic writing" and noted that "R. U. Mahaffy and R. K. Carnegie were to instruct in reporting, D'Arcy Finn was to teach editing, Percy J. Philip and Grattan O'Leary were to give talks on editorial methods and publishing policy."[200] According to Scanlon, all the men named were professional journalists: Max Freedman later became Washington correspondent for the Manchester Guardian; Dr. Leechman was

[198] Johansen et al., page 471.
[199] Wilfrid Eggleston, *While I Still Remember: A Personal Record* (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1968).
[200] Eggleston, page 293.

an anthropologist and a successful freelancer; F. C. Mears was Ottawa correspondent for the Montreal *Gazette* and dean of the Parliamentary Press Gallery; R. U. Mahaffy later became editor of the Ottawa *Journal*; R. K. Carnegie was superintendent for the Canadian Press in Ottawa; D'Arcy Finn was managing editor of the Ottawa *Citizen*; Percy Philip was Ottawa correspondent of the New York *Times*; Grattan O'Leary, who then became a senator, was editor of the Ottawa *Journal*. The practice of employing professionals as instructors continued until the time of Scanlon's writing, 1969.[201]

Eggleston recounts that in a covering note with copies of the timetable, Dr. Tory told an official of the Department of Veterans Affairs that he was "quite proud of the set-up, but somewhat disappointed at the registration – I doubt if an equal faculty can be found anywhere else in Canada." Eggleston explains that

> one reason the registration was so small was that entrance into the journalism course required as a prerequisite two years of university work in the humanities and social sciences. As events proved, there were many veterans enrolled in the arts course who were aiming at journalism as soon as they qualified. These would turn up in force two years later.[202]

Meanwhile, two other journalists had a similar plan in mind for the creation of a journalism school in London, Ontario. According to Scanlon, Hugh Templin, editor of the weekly Fergus *News-Record*, and Arthur R. Ford, author, columnist and editor of the London, Ont., *Free Press*, "had worked out their program with the Board of Governors of the University of Western Ontario and with the university's president, W. Sherwood Fox."[203] Templin and Ford raised $5,000 to buy some typewriters and acquire the Canadian Press wire service "and, in late 1945, saw the university appoint George W. McCracken as professor of journalism." As noted previously, the Western program was

[201] Scanlon, p. 160.
[202] Eggleston, page 294.
[203] Scanlon, p. 160.

up and running in early 1946, just a few months after Carleton's. Scanlon also notes the strangely analogous backgrounds of McCracken at Western and Eggleston at Carleton: both men were graduates of Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario; both men had worked for the Toronto *Daily Star*, Canada's largest newspaper; and both men had gone into government service during the war, McCracken with the Wartime Information Board, Eggleston as a censor, eventually chief censor for Canada.[204] The program at UWO convocated its first journalism graduates in 1948.[205]

Johansen and Dornan situate the final event of the first wave at Ryerson Institute of Technology (now Ryerson University), in Toronto.[206] Scanlon writes that Canada's third major program "began rather differently," in contrast to Carleton and UWO, starting as a course in printing and graphic arts, with editorial work in journalism "added only as an afterthought."[207] Johansen and Dornan concur that journalism at Ryerson "offered technical courses in a range of industrial and business disciplines," like British polytechnics, and "began as something of an afterthought," in 1948.[208] The program hired its first full-time instructor, Earl J. Beattie, in 1949, to expand the editorial work.[209] Bit by bit, the Ryerson program began to resemble Carleton and UWO, writes Scanlon.[210] Johansen and Dornan add that journalism became a separate department within a decade, offering its own two-year program; Ryerson received degree-granting power in 1972 and introduced a Bachelor of Applied Arts program, becoming a full university in 1993.[211]

---

[204] Ibid., p. 160.
[205] Johansen and Dornan, p. 70.
[206] Ibid., p. 70.
[207] Scanlon, p. 161.
[208] Johansen and Dornan, p. 70.
[209] Scanlon, p. 161; Johansen and Dornan, p. 70.
[210] Scanlon, p. 161.
[211] Johansen and Dornan, p. 70.

The relatively stronger role of government in Canada – in comparison to its US counterpart – is highlighted by Johansen, Weaver and Dornan, regarding what the authors refer to as the "second spurt of growth" in the late 1970s:

> In 1970 a Senate committee lamented the lack of English-language journalism instruction at universities outside the province of Ontario (Canada, Senate Committee on Mass Media, 1970). Some (Sloan et al., 1981; Gaunt, 1992; Tate et al., 2000) have suggested that this led to the creation of new units at Montreal's Concordia University in 1975; King's College, Halifax, in 1978; and the University of Regina in 1979. Certainly these schools brought degree programs to three of the four regions that the Senate committee said were underserved, but market demand, caused by explosive growth in student numbers, was probably more directly influential than a parliamentary report backed by nothing more than moral suasion.[212]

The authors also refer to a final third wave of growth, which dates from the mid-1990s. where four English-language degree-level programs where established in "ingenious ways to maximize marketability and minimal cost,"[213] They claim that "in their own way, these too are responses to government pressure, in this case state underfunding of universities."[214]

In addition to a stronger governmental role, Canadian journalism education is also set apart by the two-year-college British craft-school approach, as mentioned previously in this chapter. Johansen et al. describe this characteristic in full detail:

> In one area, community college journalism, Canada seems proportionately ahead of the US. The Association of Canadian Community Colleges (2001) lists some 30 programs or more than twice as many as are found at the University level. This solid infrastructure may well reflect the influence of Britain, where professional information was generally not seen as a university function until

[212] Johansen et al., p. 472.
[213] The authors proceed to provide a few illustrations: "For example, St. Thomas University, a small liberal arts institution in Fredericton, New Brunswick, has since 1996 collaborated with a nearby community college to offer a program leading to a Bachelor of Applied Arts degree. Thus the university provides a popular career-oriented program although no journalism instruction is conducted on its campus. A similar arrangement provides a French-language degree in journalism from the University of Ottawa. The other new degree programs are at Mount Royal College (Calgary) and University College of the Cariboo (Kamloops, BC)." (Notes, page 481 – footnote 4)
[214] Johansen et al., page 472.

> polytechnics achieved university status in1992. Program duration varies from one to three years, depending in part upon students' preparation at entry. Community college curricula are invariably more directly vocational than those at universities. Heavier teaching loads and lower prestige and salaries also mean that the colleges tend to attract faculty with less experience, or with experience limited to less prestigious positions (Sloan et al., 1981). As a result of these factors, graduates tend to launch their careers in secondary media markets.[215]

Regarding curricula, it may be argued that Canadian journalism schools followed a similar pattern given that the founders of Canada's first two journalism programs – Carleton and University of Western Ontario – closely studied the philosophy underlying the curriculum of Columbia's Graduate School of Journalism.[216] Writing in 1969, Scanlon notes that Carleton, Western and Ryerson are all oriented toward professional journalism and away from communications research. The author notes that "this is perhaps not surprising when the directors of all three programs have been and are experienced professionals."[217] The Canadian model, which does not follow the social sciences/mass communications course that started to dominate journalism education in the United States since the 1950s, has three components: news production practices, the media's historic place in social and political life, and liberal education across academic disciplines. All three elements are incorporated into Canadian journalism undergraduate programs.[218]

In other words, just as the School of Journalism at Columbia University served as a model for the creation of many journalism schools in the United States, it was also the archetype chosen by the first three journalism schools in Canada: Carleton (undergraduate

---

[215] Johansen et al., page 472.
[216] G. Stuart Adam, "The World Next Door: A Commonwealth Perspective," *Gannett Center Journal* 2, no. 2 (1988), pp. 109–17.
[217] Scanlon, p. 161,
[218] Johansen et al., p. 473. For an in-depth discussion about the problematic relationship between journalism and mass communications as disciplines in the United States, please refer to the fifth chapter of this dissertation.

program established in 1945), the University of Western Ontario (established in 1945), and Ryerson (established in 1948). Edge maintains that "Western Ontario's journalism school even followed Columbia's move from an undergraduate offering to a Master's program in 1974," though the degree required three semesters to completion, instead of two, and was the first to depart from the Columbia model, supplementing skills training with courses in ethics, history, law, and theory, according to Peter Desbarats, who served as the school's dean from 1981 until 1997.[219]

Turning to the origins of the journalism program at Carleton University in Ottawa, Edge notes that it is "generally regarded as the leading J-school in Canada, but perhaps not coincidentally it is also the one that has moved farthest from the original Columbia ideal:

> Carleton's journalism school, which enrolls approximately 500 undergraduates and several dozen graduate students, is also unique in Canada for including a considerable mass communication component. An undergraduate program in communication studies was added in 1977 to supplement the journalism stream, a Master's program commenced in 1991, and since 1997 Carleton has also offered a Ph.D. program in the subject. (Siegel, et. al., 61) According to Desbarats, this comprehensive scope makes Carleton's journalism school "closer than any other Canadian school to the type of institution now prevalent in the United States." (Desbarats, 1996: 233)[220]

Edge asserts that the journalism school at Ryerson was the only one of the original three post-war Canadian schools that still adhered faithfully to the practical Columbia model, and that

> …even since Ryerson graduated in 2001 from polytechnic to full research university status, its journalism school, which enrolls about 550 students a year, has retained a relentlessly vocational approach. Its curriculum is almost exclusively devoted to skills training, except for courses on such standard subjects as Media Law and Ethics, and a couple of laudable offerings titled Covering Diversity and Newsroom Leadership. As such it is ripe for reform similar to that

[219] Edge, p. 5.
[220] Ibid., p. 5.

instigated recently at its model program by Columbia's new president, Lee Bollinger.[221]

In addition, Edge notes that "the stunted growth of university journalism schools in English Canada did not extend beyond the borders of Ontario until the mid-1970s, when Concordia University in Montreal began offering a degree in the subject in the province of Quebec."[222] And by the end of the 1970s, four-year journalism schools had opened across Canada: in the east coast, at the University of King's College in Halifax, and in western Canada, at the University of Regina. Having said that, "despite a promise dating from 1980 of a graduate school of journalism at the University of British Columbia, higher education in the subject did not reach the west coast until 1998."[223] As for the French-language university-level journalism education developing in Quebec, Enn Raudsepp notes they consisted only of 30-credit minor programs within other departments, where, lacking a power base of their own, they were grossly underfunded and understaffed." The author cites the cases of Université de Montréal, where the program was part of the evening extension department and was staffed almost entirely by part-time instructors, and Laval and UQÀM, where the programs were located within the communications studies departments, which had other priorities and orientations. Raudsepp states that, for the most part, the journalism educators were professional journalists who moved easily between media jobs and the university, while the communications professors tended to be full-time academics with little or no media

[221] Edge, p. 5-6.
[222] Ibid., p. 6.
[223] Ibid., p. 7.

experience, and concludes that "there was a strong suggestion of the two solitudes in these camps."[224]

The English Canadian journalism programs, on the other hand, were enjoying "considerably more autonomy and prestige. None of the seven university-level programs was a minor appendage of a communication studies department, and two, Carleton and Western, were constituted as free-standing professional schools with comparatively large budgets and faculties."[225]

On another note, Johansen et al. argue that three distinct characteristics set Canadian journalism schools apart from American: greater curricular differentiation in the United States programs, the type of academic unit within which journalism study is located, and the absence of a national accreditation system in Canada; the rest of this section will discuss these differences as outlined by the authors.

According to a survey of about 40 institutions in 1924, U. S. journalism studies were concerned mostly with reporting, copy reading, feature writing, editorial writing, criticism, history, comparative journalism, and ethics.[226] Today's programs add work in media or communication law, photojournalism or visual communication, public relations, advertising, broadcast news, telecommunications, new media, communication theory, and research methods, to these abovementioned "news-editorial" subjects.[227] Johansen et al. explain that "many programs have expanded their mission beyond training students to be working journalists" and therefore "now offer classes in more general communication

[224] Enn Raudsepp, "Reinventing Journalism Education," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1989), p. 3.
[225] Raudsepp, p. 4.
[226] William Ralston Lindley, *Journalism and Higher Education: The Search for Academic Purpose*, (Stillwater, Oklahoma: Journalistic Services, 1975), p. 4.
[227] Johansen et al., page 473.

skills and theory, both for those who wish to work in the communications field and those who simply want to learn about public communication."[228] By contrast, Canadian educators offer "similar but not identical instruction."[229] For starters, American students are required to specialize in one of several media-specific sequences, principally news-editorial (i.e. newspaper journalism), broadcasting, public relations or advertising. About one-third of American undergraduate journalism students follow one of the three basic journalism sequences (news-editorial, broadcast journalism, or journalism in general), while about another third follow in public relations and advertising; 10% of the remaining third follow radio and television (telecommunications) and the remainder major in other areas (including mass communication, mass media, speech communication, English film or cinema studies, and organizational communication).[230]

Canadian journalism programs, on the other hand, "have long required all students to complete roughly equivalent work in both broadcast and print journalism, perhaps because the nation's fewer job opportunities oblige students to be more broadly prepared."[231] The authors add that "the curricular line between journalism and other forms of media education is less sharply drawn in the US than Canada, then; at least until quite recently, so too was the institutional demarcation between journalism and other

---

[228] Ibid., page 473.
[229] Ibid., page 473.
[230] Ibid., page 473; the authors refer at length to Becker et al., "Undergrad Enrollments Level Off, Graduate Education Declines" in *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 55(3), pp. 68-80.
[231] Ibid., page 473-4. The authors add that "Even at the master's level, where some programs provide specialization, graduates are generally expected to be competent in the several media. On the other hand, Canadian journalism schools do not offer specialization in public relations or advertising. Some mount a single optional course in public relations, but the general view is that the social function of journalism is so different from that of the persuasive arts that common communication techniques alone do not justify a curricular marriage. As a result, students interested in public relations, for example, are likely to attend a unit devoted to it exclusively, such as the Department of Public Relations at Mount Saint Vincent University, a university in Halifax that does not teach journalism."

forms of communication education."[232] By contrast, Canadian journalism departments were traditionally separate from communications. As noted previously, Carleton, Ryerson and UWO were all "oriented toward professional journalism and away from communications research," as late as 1969.[233] It wasn't until 1977 that Carleton ushered in a trend toward more comprehensive units by introducing an undergraduate program in mass communication studies, followed in 1991 by a master's degree and, in 1997, a Ph.D. program.[234] Although other journalism schools – notably Western Ontario and Concordia – merged their journalism and communication units in the late 1990s, those moves were fostered principally by administrative rationalization rather than organic change.[235]

Johansen et al. also treat the question of the decelerated expansion of journalism departments in French-language universities mentioned previously in this section, adding that they were, paradoxically, "well ahead of their Anglophone counterparts in developing communication departments."[236] The authors claim the reason Quebec was slower than the rest of Canada to take up journalism training is still unknown; and that it could be related, in part, to the fact that Francophone journalists have historically been more likely to adopt a guiding rather than informing function, and a literary rather than

[232] Johansen et al., page 474. The authors cite Becker and Graf's argument "that the birth of radio and television had an impact on journalism education because those media drew their first announcers from speech departments, where more emphasis was put on speaking ability than on writing and editing. When it became clear the new media would be a serious news source, journalism schools assumed a greater role, but the link between broadcast media and speech departments meant that education of journalists was not confined only to journalism units. Some US institutions lumped speech and journalism into single units or made them part of larger communication colleges."
[233] Scanlon, p. 161.
[234] Johansen et al., page 474.
[235] Ibid., page 474.
[236] Ibid., page 474.

reporting style (Gagnon, 1981); US-style journalism training may be poorly suited to serve such roles.[237]

Finally, the last significant characteristic of Canadian journalism schools' curricula is the lack of a national accrediting body. In the United States, curricula are influenced to some extent by the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC), a nationwide agency tracing its roots to 1945.[238] With equal representation from academe and the media industry, the ACEJMC "serves to assure prospective students and employers that certified programs meet accepted quality standards."[239] By contrast, Canada appears to show greater curricular diversity due to the lack of an equivalent national accrediting body, due to the fact that programs are too small for certification to be needed, and probably because provincial governments have jurisdiction over education.[240] Canada's accrediting practice – or lack thereof – resulted

---

[237] Johansen et al., page 474. The authors note that "in recent years, universities have begun to offer journalism programs, just when the two linguistic groups have grown closer in their attitudes toward journalism's social role (Pritchard and Sauvageau,1999). Whatever the case, however, just as journalism gave rise to communication studies in English Canada, communication departments played parent to journalism in French Canada."

[238] As previously argued in this dissertation, it was thanks to the Pulitzer School that professional associations for educators of journalism began to emerge in the United States (i.e. the American Association of Teachers of Journalism organized in 1912, and the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism in 1917). The main organization for faculty, the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (AEJMC) that we know today, was founded in 1912 as the American Association for Teachers of Journalism (later the Association for Education in Journalism); as well, the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications and the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication both have their roots in the 1916 establishment of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism.

[239] Johansen et al., page 474-475. The authors note that the ACEJMC council "evaluates programs only upon request, and against criteria that gauge such factors as physical, financial and human resources. ACEJMC's one criterion on curriculum stipulates that no more than one-quarter of an undergraduate's course work can be in the major field of journalism/mass-communication, and at least 65 per cent must be in basic liberal arts and sciences. Though the guidelines do not go into further detail, the effect seems to be to constrain the journalism component to a fairly standardized menu of offerings from one campus to another, and its influence extends well beyond the 100 or so programs that hold accredited status."

[240] Ibid., page 475. The authors cite the Royal Commission on Newspapers (Canada, 1981, p. 156) referring to this circumstance as "enriching, especially in a field as undefined and as general as journalism."

in a "somewhat balkanized system of schooling" which discourages even non-governmental agencies from acting on a national basis.[241]

Knox and Goodrum note that the last 30 years have seen significant growth in both university and college journalism programs, with every province (although none of the three northern territories) now boasting at least one post-secondary journalism program.[242] According to the authors, over 40 post-secondary institutions – about one-quarter of the national total – offer a course of study leading to some kind of journalism credential. The growth of college programs has been particularly swift, with more students enrolling in college journalism programs than in those of the universities each year, and significantly more journalism credentials (diplomas and degrees) are awarded by colleges than by universities.[243] Additionally, Knox and Goodrum highlight the arising of a degree-diploma or hybrid program, a distinctive and "possibly unique form of journalism education" offered jointly by a university and a college, with the university providing the academic courses and degree while the college supplies the practical training and diploma. The development of these hybrids, according to the authors, "is evidence of both the adaptability of institutions of higher learning and the demand among students for a solid post-secondary education to prepare for a career in journalism."[244] But the dual journalism school problematic – i.e. academic versus vocational training, social sciences versus humanities – currently affects Canada as much as it affects the United States. The paradoxical double discourse of expansion and shutting down which

[241] Johansen et al., page 475. The authors note that "even within the same province, government policy encourages diversity. For example, the Ontario Council on Graduate Studies (2001) must approve any new graduate program before government funding is authorized; its statutes oblige the council to consider, among other things, the need to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs and facilities."
[242] Knox and Goodrum, p. 3. The authors add that all provinces but Newfoundland have at least one program leading to a distinctive journalism degree.
[243] Ibid., pp. 3-4.
[244] Ibid., p. 4.

characterizes the Anglo-American journalism education scene (i.e. the threat of closure of Columbia's journalism school in 2003 on one hand, the expansion of the 'academic field' of 'journalism studies' with the creation of strictly academic journalism graduate programs all over the United Kingdom, on the other) is not different in Canada, if the threat of closure of Western Ontario's school of journalism in 1993 and the creation of the journalism studies master's program at Concordia in 2009 are anything to go by. The complexity of these unresolved difficulties shall be discussed at length in the final chapter of this dissertation, which deals with the central questions facing journalism education and journalism studies specifically pertaining to their continuing impact in the United States and Canada today.

Chapter V

The Double Dichotomy at the Heart of Journalism Education

Introduction

> *The establishment of schools of journalism later on was the result of a reaction in academic circles to the fact that the profession lacked scholastic backing. At the moment, this does not apply to the print media only, but to all areas of the media that have been or will be invented.*
>
> – Gabriel García Márquez, THE BEST PROFESSION IN THE WORLD

> *And although we have to act in that environment, we have to reconstruct it on a simpler model before we can manage it. To traverse the world men must have maps of the world.*
>
> – Walter Lippmann, PUBLIC OPINION

The historical account of the emergence of journalism education in the previous chapter points to "a double dichotomy at the heart of journalism."[1] Academically, as a cross-disciplinary subject, journalism draws on the humanities and the social sciences, while remaining outside of both. Pedagogically, journalism educators are asked to offer a 'critical' approach to phenomena while also teaching students practical skills of use to those seeking professional careers. Thus, note Howard Tumber and Marina Prentoulis, "journalistic education has to incorporate both 'idealist' and 'realist' aspirations and both 'practical' and 'intellectual' dimensions."[2]

G. Stuart Adam frames the internal division within journalism faculties as a split "between professors who identify with the practice of journalism and professors who identify with the university and its traditions of teaching and research." The author notes that "the debate and sense of discontent that these external and internal conflicts have generated are reflected in a number of documents."[3] Adam proceeds to cite the

---

[1] Tumber and Prentoulis, p. 69.
[2] Ibid., p. 69.
[3] G. Stuart Adam, "Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice: The Problems of Curriculum and Research in University Schools of Journalism," *Canadian Journal of Communication* (1988), Vol. 14, No. 2, p. 70.

"unfriendly question" posed by Everette Dennis, the principal author of a recent report on the future of journalism education: "Should journalism education exist at all? There are those in the academy and the media industries who seriously doubt its value and say so with blunt force."[4]

Michael D. Murray and Roy L. Moore argue that "the debate about whether journalism education is something you experience and learn on the job or is a profession requiring an understanding of theory and practice (worthy of a place in higher education) goes back at least to the early 1870s." As an example, the authors cite an 1872 editorial by Whitelaw Reid of the *New York Tribune* proposing that journalists be educated in the liberal arts and trained in the practice of journalism in institutions of higher education.[5]

What is particularly ironic about the assertion that schools of journalism did not arise to meet the needs of editors and publishers is that so many of the most important ones were actually established by powerful, influential newspapermen.[6] For instance, the world's very first journalism school, at the University of Missouri, only exists thanks to the efforts of the Missouri Press Association (as does Rutgers, an initiative of the New Jersey Press Association, and Washington & Lee, made possible through funds by the members of the Southern Press Association). And the two most prestigious journalism schools in the United States, Columbia and Northwestern, were founded thanks to large endowments by Joseph Pulitzer and Joseph Medill Patterson, respectively.[7]

---

[4] G. Stuart Adam, p. 70. Writing in 1988, the author refers to the document *Planning for Curricular Change: A Report of the Project on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication Education*, School of Journalism, University of Oregon, Eugene, 1984.
[5] Michael D. Murray and Roy L. Moore, pp. 44-45. Please refer to Chapter IV of this dissertation for further examples of positions taken in this heated debate.
[6] Albert Sutton, pp. 38-39.
[7] Ibid., p. 39. Joseph Medill was a famous editor of the Chicago *Tribune* who later became mayor of that city.

Academic literature addressing the aforementioned 'unfriendly question' is ridden with analogies which describe the existential malaise of journalism schools and departments. Journalism education, according to Enn Raudsepp, "has ended up as neither fish nor fowl; it feels itself unloved by the industry and tolerated, barely, by the academy."[8] David Skinner, Mike Gasher and James Crompton refer to journalism education as

> the servant of two masters. On the one hand, journalism educators seek to satisfy the demands of news organizations by providing a steady stream of graduates ready for the newsroom. On the other hand, journalism schools are asked to meet the standards of university administrators who perceive post-secondary education as something more than vocational training.[9]

William David Sloan calls this peculiar feature of j-schools "schizophrenic," with journalism education not knowing which way to go: Should it become primarily professional, or should it be a traditional academic discipline?[10] The author also highlights its possession of "a sense of inferiority to both professional journalism and academia," and its futile attempt to prove itself to both.[11]

To make matters worse, according to G. Stuart Adam "the academic and professional elements of journalism curriculum are like two nations warring within the bosom of a single state."[12] This debate has also been described by both Ron Lovell and Everette Dennis as "the dialogue of the deaf" that serves no one.[13] Furthermore, Mark Deuze addresses "a lack of (international) consensus and disciplinary dialogue in

---

[8] Enn Raudsepp, 1989, p. 9.
[9] David Skinner, Mike Gasher and James Crompton, "Putting Theory to Practice: A Critical Approach to Journalism Studies" in *Journalism* (2001), Vol. 2, No. 3, p. 344.
[10] William David Sloan, Makers of the Media Mind, p. 4.
[11] Ibid., p. 4.
[12] G. Stuart Adam, "Thinking Journalism," *Content* (July/August 1988), p. 5.
[13] Ron Lovell, "Triumph of the Chi-Squares: It's a Hollow Victory," *The Quill* (October 1987), pp. 22-23; Everette Dennis, "Whatever happened to Marse Robert's dream?" *Gannett Center Journal* 2 (1988), pp. 1-22.

journalism" by highlighting that "throughout the history of journalism (education and studies), the field has had to balance between industry and university, each with its own institutionalized expectations and assumptions."[14]

The work in this chapter departs from the idea that this "debate" is not new and has, in fact, been around for more than one hundred years. Since its inception, the subject of journalism education – let alone its status as discipline in the academy – has always undergone difficult redefinitions given the very nature of the "ethical and strategic dilemmas faced by critical media teachers within journalism schools," the most fundamental being "the clash between the vocational function of such schools and a pedagogy threatening (and often seeking) to disrupt that function."[15] Akin to a Borgesian circular ruins,[16] this clash is at the core of the theorizing of relations between critical analysis and professional academic training: journalism education creates and recreates itself in its vague attempt to address its place in the university and relevance to the industry.

The final chapter of this dissertation, therefore, aims to address the academic difficulties of bridging the gap between theory and practice by returning to – and retracing – the arising of this internal tension of offering a 'critical'/theoretical approach to phenomena while teaching students practical skills with some use to those seeking professional careers. The first major difficulty within journalism education is, therefore,

---

[14] Mark Deuze, "What is journalism?: Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered," *Journalism* 6, no. 4 (November 1, 2005), p. 443.
[15] Will Straw, "Teaching Critical Media Studies," *Canadian Journal of Communication* (1985), Vol. 11, No. 1, p. 7.
[16] This fantasy short story by the great Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges ("The Circular Ruins" in *The Garden Of Forking Paths*) seems to symbolize writers as creators who engender one another and whose existence and originality would be impossible without their predecessors. A wizard goes to the circular ruins, a location possessing strong mystical powers, to create another human being from his own dreams – but at the end of the story, "with relief, with humiliation, with terror, he understood that he too was a mere appearance, dreamt by another."

the very difficulty of dealing – and attempting to address – both the needs of the industry and the academy, as demonstrated in the historical account of journalism education offered in the previous chapter. The first section of this chapter, therefore, offers a supplement to this history by addressing the different teaching philosophies which arose as a result of the "theory versus practice" split since the very early attempts at formally educating journalists, and which still troubles journalism education today.

This chapter then explores the emergence and enduring complications of the troubled marriage between the disciplines of communication studies and journalism, with journalism wandering between the humanities and the social sciences, never arriving at a place of its own. As the second section will demonstrate, the emergence of "mass communications" and other disciplines in the social sciences further complicated the "theory versus practice" split by creating an additional "theory versus theory" split within journalism education's theoretical component. With courses such as Public Opinion and the Effects of Mass Communication worming their way into the margins of the curriculum, to borrow from James Carey,[17] the discussion of the need to provide journalists with a theoretical foundation to its practice was now even more convoluted. Journalism schools suddenly became "departments of journalism and mass communication," but this new social sciences orientation would then become the site of an even sharper conflict with the more practical journalism subfields, and "was not soon to be accepted as an overarching term for the various sequences of journalism education or even to feel at home among them."[18] With journalism unable to overcome the

[17] Carey, Some personal notes on US journalism education, p. 13.
[18] Tom Dickson, *Mass Media Education in Transition: Preparing for the 21st Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), p. 60.

perception of vocational training, the field of mass communication took off, as a valid academic discipline, on its own.

As a result, scholars like James Carey and G. Stuart Adam lament the occupation of journalism schools by the science of communication, which in their view has undercut journalism's own potential as an academic field. Carey and Adam, and many others, advocate "journalism studies" as an essential part of journalism education, but as a separate field that is completely academic and basically consists of a group that has separated from media studies, and communications studies itself. The dissertation then concludes by looking at the continuing impact of these unresolved difficulties on journalism education today.

Betty Medsger provides an excellent analogy for the forceful and highly problematic insertion of journalism education within mass communications and its variants today:

> During more than a century of existence, journalism education in the United States has been defined in numerous ways, shaped and reshaped to suit numerous purposes. In the beginning, it was a discrete field of study designed to improve the quality of journalism. Recently it has been a confusing field. In some universities, journalism education, like hundreds of journalists during the war against Iraq, is embedded. It is embedded with public relations, advertising and assorted other disciplines that together are considered a generic form of communication. Like the embedded journalists, embedded journalism education at times is uncertain about its priorities.[19]

We should start, then, by naming some of the major difficulties highlighted by journalism studies for academics working within journalism schools and journalism departments. Adam selects five difficulties – quoting, again, the Oregon Report of 1984 – that are worth noting, for they are still highly pertinent today. These include, first, the

[19] Betty Medsger, "The evolution of journalism education in the United States," in *Making Journalists: Diverse models, global issues* (edited by Hugo de Burgh / London, New York: Routledge, 2005), p. 205.

lack of change in paradigm in journalism education to which Medsger alludes. The second is that, despite their initial "lofty ideals," by the 1970s and 1980s, journalism schools were mostly "industry-oriented trade schools" – following the industry, not leading it. Third, there is very little direct connection between the courses offered in a journalism school and the rest of the university. Fourth, the field of journalism education "has long been beset by a conflict between faculty members who regard themselves primarily as teachers and researchers and those who identify themselves as masters of the profession." And lastly, and most important for our purposes here, "the notion that craft courses adhere to professional standards set by the industry and that conceptual courses are governed by the realm of scholarship is still a persistent pattern."[20]

The journalism school existential crisis has been characterized by a paradoxical discursive dichotomy, between expansion and extinction. The last decade has brought the ultimate examples of both of these discourses at work. On one extreme is the 2002-2003 very public 'crisis' at Columbia University's prestigious Pulitzer's school. In July 2002, the university's new President, Lee C. Bollinger, shocked both the academic and journalistic communities when he decided to postpone the selection of a dean for the Graduate School of Journalism to rethink the role that a school of journalism should play in today's information era.[21] The announcement was made before Bollinger settled into his new office, and before he met the journalism faculty; the President actually rejected the finalists for Dean of the School, who had been selected by a search committee, and assembled instead a task force of prominent journalists and academics to help him decide

[20] Ibid., p. 71.
[21] Herman Wasserman, "Journalism Education as Transformative Praxis," *Ecquid Novi* 26, no. 3 (2005), p. 160. Please refer to Appendix H for Bollinger's letter.

what the School should become.[22] At the other extreme is the formation of new journalism programs, many of them at the master's level – new departments, and theory/academic master's in journalism studies in universities and colleges, especially in Canada and the United Kingdom.[23] Equally significant is the 2004 petition to the International Communication Association (ICA) for the creation of a Journalism Studies Division, successfully established in 2005. Steered by a group of "100 active scholars," the division claims "journalism is becoming an increasingly autonomous field of study" and makes a point to operate within a distinction between *journalism* and *the media*.[24] The recent launch, in 2000, of two new international journals in the field – *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism* (Sage) and *Journalism Studies* (Routledge) – aims to promote journalism theory, journalism research and professional education in journalism with a critical perspective on its specific functions, structures and practice. The very first words published in the editorial of the first issue of *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism*, penned by Howard Tumber (City University, London), Michael Bromley (Cardiff University) and Barbie Zelizer (University of Pennsylvania), acknowledge that "the status of journalism has always been indeterminate as a profession or a craft." Following the disclaimer, the authors argue that "over the past 30 years, however, as a field of study, the character of its indeterminacy has changed, as has the need to be more directed about how we think of journalism and journalism study. This is therefore an opportune time for the launch of this new Journal."[25] Likewise, the very first editorial of

[22] Medsger, pp. 219-20.
[23] For example, the Journalism Department at Concordia University in Montreal inaugurated the first theoretical MA program in Journalism Studies in Canada in the fall of 2009.
[24] Please refer to Appendix E (Petition to the ICA for the establishment of a Journalism Studies Division) and Appendix F (ICA Infosheet: Journalism Studies Interest Group at ICA) of this dissertation.
[25] Howard Tumber, Michael Bromley, and Barbie Zelizer. "Editorial." *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism* 1, no. 1 (April 1, 2000), p. 5.

the very first issue of *Journalism Studies*, signed by Bob Franklin (Sheffield University, UK), Gerd G. Kopper (Dortmund University, Germany), Elizabeth Toth (Syracuse University, USA), and Judy Vanslyke Turk (University of South Carolina, USA and Zayed University, United Arab Emirates) sees the publication's *raison d'être* as the provision of "a global, critical forum for journalists, academics, journalism trainers and students of journalism, to debate the central issues confronting journalism understood both as a subject focus for scholarly and intellectual inquiry and as a field of professional practice." That said, Franklin et al. agree that "this desire to meld theory and practice represents a substantial ambition" and proceed to argue that "if the marriage between Journalism and the academy is problematic, we believe that divorce is not merely undesirable but unthinkable."[26]

For that reason, we should analyse the multiple redefinitions of journalism education during more than a century of existence, beginning with a historical account pinpointing the factors contributing to the uncomfortable position that journalistic training – as well as journalistic theory, if there is indeed such a thing – occupies within the university.

[26] Bob Franklin, Gerd G. Kopper, Elizabeth Toth, and Judy VanSlyke Turk, "Editorial," *Journalism Studies* 1, no. 1 (December 2000), p. 5.

Not nipped in the bud: The difficult placement of journalism in the academy

> *Perhaps the shortcoming of journalism schools is that they teach many things that are useful to the profession, but very little about the profession itself.*
> – Gabriel García Márquez, THE BEST PROFESSION IN THE WORLD

Barbie Zelizer notes that the study of journalism in the United States "emerged from years of justifying its viability and positioning in the academy to contemplate the development of the social sciences during the mid-20th century."[27] The author refers to the development of journalism's study as "conflicted and uneven."[28] William David Sloan argues that journalism education still confronts some of the same, most basic questions and issues it has always faced, despite its growth. The author writes that "some professional journalists still consider college training unnecessary, if not useless in some of its forms, and scholars in other academic areas continue to question its legitimacy."[29] Scholars writing about journalism education are unanimous in declaring that "skepticism about journalism as an academic discipline has been expressed since the first journalism courses were offered."[30] According to Medsger, editors and reporters considered journalism education to be "a waste of time" and "tough work (…) closer to ditch-digging than to teaching or preaching, professions that found homes in American universities from the beginning."[31] Albert Sutton notes that as soon as they learned of Robert E. Lee's plan to provide journalism training at Washington College in 1869, newspapers and editors alike began to discuss the merits of the proposal to include instruction of

[27] Barbie Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, pp. 15-16.
[28] Ibid., p. 20.
[29] Sloan, Makers of the Media Mind, p. 4.
[30] Medsger, p. 205.
[31] Ibid., pp. 205-6.

journalism in the curriculum of colleges and universities.[32] De Forest O'Dell provides a similar report, writing that "both the academic world and the newspapers were greatly interested in the news of the courses in journalism."[33] Both Sutton and O'Dell supply an ample account of the polarized ends in this debate, as discussed in the previous chapter of this dissertation.

It is important to remember that Lee's initiative came at a time when most of the country's weeklies and many of the journals in small towns were owned and operated by practical printers, who usually conducted a job-printing business as well.[34] Newspapers were small enterprises which generally afforded a living for only one man, with the editor and printer often being one and the same person. O'Dell notes these papers were not penned and put in type, but rather "composed as the 'editor' stood in front of his type case with his 'stick' and 'set' them."[35] It was for printers of this sort, their sons and helpers, that Robert E. Lee's 'press scholarships' were intended: the aim was to train the printer to be an editor rather than to qualify the prospective editor in the art of printing.[36]

According to O'Dell, the close relationship between the editor's chair and the printing office was still in evidence in 1869, and can be clearly seen in the manner in which the entire program of journalism education at Washington College was approached. In the summer of that year, notes the author, Major John J. Lafferty was appointed a member of the faculty and called the "superintendent of instruction in Typography and Stenography." His firm also provided the typographical equipment.[37]

---

[32] Sutton, pp. 7-8.
[33] O'Dell, p. 17.
[34] Ibid., p. 15.
[35] Ibid., p. 15.
[36] Ibid., p. 15.
[37] Ibid., p. 16. Major Lafferty was formerly an officer in the Confederate army, according to O'Dell.

The 1870s thus marked the establishment of formal journalism education programs. According to Johansen et al., these early efforts—such as those founded at Washington College in 1869, Kansas State College in 1873, the University of Missouri in 1878, and the University of Pennsylvania in 1893—stressed technical printing skills as well as writing and editing, rather than reporting.[38] Sutton notes that "the training was to consist of instruction in printing in a local plant, and it was designed to prepare students for service on newspapers of the time, which, for the most part, were operated by editors who also were practical printers."[39] The author adds that "the student's editorial training was to be obtained while he stood before the type-case, composing his articles as he set them up on type."[40]

At the turn of the century, two divergent educational philosophies emerged from the two responses to Pulitzer's proposal for the creation of a journalism school. In 1903, as noted in the previous chapter, the media mogul directed his personal secretary, Dr. George W. Hosmer, to prepare a brochure titled "The Making of a Journalist: What a Technical and a Professional School is Needed," which was then presented to Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University, and to Charles W. Eliot, president of Harvard.[41] Pulitzer recommended a program which emphasized editorial training in the collection of news, emphasizing the social sciences and carefully avoiding courses with the business aspect of newspaper publishing.[42] This plan was put into action at Columbia, which followed Pulitzer's instructions to the letter. The first two directors of the school,

[38] Peter Johansen, David H. Weaver, and Christopher Dornan, "Journalism Education in the United States and Canada: not merely clones," *Journalism Studies* 2, no. 4 (January 2001), p. 471.
[39] Sutton, p. 7.
[40] Ibid., p. 7.
[41] O'Dell, p. 58; Mirando, p. 79; Sutton, p. 13.
[42] Sutton, p. 13.

Talcott Williams and John Cunliffe,[43] were prominent senior newsmen "who avoided the business aspects of journalism and required students to use the city of New York as their reporting beat."[44]

Dr. Eliot at Harvard, on the other hand, had presented Pulitzer with a list of courses emphasizing the practical and business aspects of a newspaper. As a result, writing in 1945, Albert Sutton states that "programs of journalism in the leading schools and departments of journalism today show the continuing effects of the views expressed by Eliot and Pulitzer."[45]

O'Dell argues that "both Joseph Pulitzer and Charles Eliot were motivated by desires to serve mankind."[46] In his view, "even though the two men proposed separate paths for journalism instruction, each believed firmly that his individual plan would result in social betterment." The author notes that "when Mr. Pulitzer directed Dr. Hosmer to journey to Harvard with the pamphlet proposing professional education for journalists he did not know that a totally different philosophy of newspaper procedure would spring from this act, to confront his projected program of training for the editor's chair."[47] According to O'Dell, Dr. Eliot, who wrote the rival plan, was "no doubt" equally

---

[43] Dr. Cunliffe had previously been a professor in the English department here at McGill University. His author entry in the rare books division of McLennan library for the manuscript of his *History of the Dominion of Canada* reads: "John William Cunliffe (1865-1946) was born at Bolton, England, in 1865. He was educated at the University of London and at Columbia University. He was a lecturer in English at McGill University from 1899 to 1905, and Associate Professor from 1906 to 1907. At Columbia University, Cunliffe was a Lecturer in 1907, and Professor of English and Associate Director of the School of Journalism from 1912 to 1920. He published a number of works, many concerning English literature." (source: http://www.archives.mcgill.ca/resources/guide/vol2_3/gen01.htm)

[44] Mirando, p. 80.

[45] Sutton, p. 14.

[46] O'Dell, p. 94.

[47] Ibid., p. 94.

surprised to find that he had brought forward one of the two major philosophies of present-day education for journalism."[48]

The plan of Joseph Pulitzer for journalism education was actually first put into action by Dr. Willard Grosvenor Bleyer of the University of Wisconsin, who established a class in journalism in 1905.[49] According to O'Dell, Dr. Bleyer's ambition for journalism education may be seen from his discussion of "A Great Need of the Profession," where he contends that:

> The American Bar Association and the American Medical Association have been active in fostering education in preparation for their respective professions, and have succeeded in having laws enacted governing admission to and the practice of their professions. On the other hand, because journalists are unorganized, practically all that has been done to develop and improve education for journalism has come from university professors in charge of schools and departments of journalism in American universities. It has been only by the persistence of those university teachers in carrying on their work that the indifference, not to say hostility, of newspaper writers and editors has been overcome in the course of the last twenty years.
>
> Journalists on daily newspapers have nothing similar to the county bar and medical societies, to state bar and medical organizations, or to the American Bar Association or the American Medical Association (…) Journalism will never rise to the level of other great professions until newspaper men and women in active service on daily newspapers throughout the country organize themselves into strong local, state, and national societies. Nor will effective measures be taken toward solving the many problems of newspaper reporting and editing until such organizations are available to undertake the task. Well-organized circulation, advertising, and publishing departments will continue to assert authority to influence news and editorial policies unless newspaper writers and editors establish and maintain vigorous associations capable of insisting on the preeminence of the news and editorials in their papers.[50]

In Medsger's view, Bleyer "put a very heavy burden on the study of journalism" from the start. She cites his 1905 declaration that the graduates of journalism schools are

---

[48] O'Dell, pp. 94-95. It is amazing that O'Dell's statement, written in 1935, reads as if it were written today.
[49] Ibid., p. 69.
[50] Willard G. Bleyer, "A Great Need of the Profession," in Lawrence L. Murphy (Ed.), *An Introduction to Journalism* (1930), pp. 202-203.

"necessary to protect society and government against immature, half-educated, unscrupulous journalists."[51] The author singles Bleyer as one of the proponents of the view that journalism education would "transform the reputation of journalism," replacing the image of rough drunks in the newsrooms by an image of thoughtful, educated journalists. "Journalism schools would be, in part," writes Medsger, "the finishing schools of journalism."[52] This view is very evident in Bleyer's *Journalism Quarterly* article, "What Schools of Journalism Are Trying to Do," as seen here:

> [T]he function of most of the courses in journalism is to teach students how to think straight about what is going on in the world at large and how to apply what they have learned to understanding and interpreting the day's news. . . . [I would] be willing to pit the average journalism graduate against the average liberal arts graduate, not on the basis of his fitness to enter upon a journalistic career, but on the basis of his ability to think straight and to apply what he has learned to present day social, political, and economic problems. That, after all, is the final test of the value of a college education, and that is the test that I believe the average school of journalism graduate is ready to meet.[53]

Sloan also addresses this vision, pointing out that "Bleyer held firmly to the view of Progressive reformers of the period that society needed to be improved and that one means to accomplish the improvement was through professionalization of occupations." Additionally, Sloan points out that in those views, Bleyer agreed with Joseph Pulitzer.[54]

As noted previously, Bleyer was the first journalism educator to put Pulitzer's plan into action, at the University of Wisconsin in 1905. Although changes were made to the curriculum in later years, including courses in advertising and typography, "the principles of Pulitzer, which emphasized the professional significance of journalism, have

---

[51] Betty Medsger, pp. 206=7.
[52] Ibid., p. 207.
[53] Willard G. Bleyer, "What Schools of Journalism Are Trying to Do," *Journalism Quarterly* 8 (1931), pp. 35-44.
[54] Sloan, p. 10.

been the major influence in the growth of Wisconsin's program under Dr. Bleyer."[55] According to Carolyn Bronstein and Stephen Vaughn, development of the Wisconsin curriculum was guided by Bleyer's conviction that students had to be trained to avoid the pitfalls associated with modern reporting. The authors note that course offerings developed rapidly under his direction; by 1910 the journalism program could boast of a new newspaper laboratory, with more than 100 students enrolled in half dozen courses.[56] Journalism was formally designated a department, affiliated with English, in 1912; in 1927, the faculty and regents approved the School of Journalism, with Bleyer as the director.[57]

O'Dell notes that Dr. Bleyer's theory of education for newspaper work can be clearly understood from an examination of the course of study in the School of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin. According to O'Dell, emphasis is placed on preparation for the editorial department, with training in journalism given only after the student has made preliminary preparation in literature and the social sciences.[58] In 1913, Bleyer's program even began requiring journalism students to write a senior thesis.[59] The business interests of the newspaper are given attention, but – sticking to its Pulitzer roots – are not as heavily emphasized as the editorial department.[60]

O'Dell also notes that "the close cooperation with the different social science departments of the University which has been given by the School of Journalism is

---

[55] O'Dell, p. 69.
[56] Carolyn Bronstein and Stephen Vaughn, "Willard G. Bleyer and the Relevance of Journalism Education," *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs* 166 (June 1998), p. 19.
[57] Bronstein and Vaughn, pp. 19-20.
[58] O'Dell, p. 71.
[59] Bronstein and Vaughn, p. 19.
[60] Ibid., p. 71.

evidence of the importance placed upon such subjects by Dr. Bleyer and his associates."[61] Sloan highlights that the program at Wisconsin did not emphasize journalism skills solely for the sake of providing a trained labor force for the newspaper business. The curriculum built by Bleyer intended to help students understand how the press worked in a democratic society. According to Sloan, students also learned practical skills also, but Bleyer hoped that his graduates would do more than get jobs on newspapers, wanting them to help make conditions in both the press and society better. The author notes that "although his views resembled those of Pulitzer, Bleyer imagined the ideal journalist as a scholar also."[62]

Stephen Reese also writes about Bleyer's conception of a journalist-scholar, noting that despite the strong research orientation he implemented at Wisconsin, "Bleyer did not make the strong distinction between theory and professional practice that so often colors current controversy."[63] Bronstein and Vaughn also note that Bleyer did not favour sharply separating the worlds of research and professional journalism, as he believed that "learning the methods of advanced research could enhance the quality of reporting, and would improve the ability of journalists to translate university research to the general public."[64] Reese adds that Bleyer "advocated regular contact between professionals and faculty and, consistent with the Wisconsin Idea, thought that research would help improve professional practice."[65] Bronstein and Vaughn note this as well, writing that "Bleyer urged increasing contacts between professional journalists and university faculty."[66]

---

[61] O'Dell, p. 71.
[62] Sloan, p. 10.
[63] Stephen Reese, "The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education: Recasting the Academic versus Professional Debate," *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 4, no. 4 (Fall 1999), p. 72.
[64] Bronstein and Vaughn, p. 21.
[65] Reese, "The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education," p. 72.
[66] Bronstein and Vaughn, p. 21.

James Carey, Barbie Zelizer and Stephen Reese single out Willard Bleyer as contributing one of the key approaches to journalism research and inquiry by journalism schools established by 1927. Zelizer credits Bleyer's strong research orientation for viewing vocational training as insufficiently scientific, and history as "a largely romantic and descriptive field that did not blend well with the rest of the academy,"[67] as well as for integrating journalism with liberal arts. Bleyer was very emphatic about his love of social sciences:

> Unfortunately for too many of the students enrolled in our liberal arts colleges, lack of purpose and direction in their work results, under the elective system now generally in vogue, in a more or less haphazard choice of studies, with little effort on their part to think seriously about what they are studying in application to present-day problems. A well-organized four-year course of study in preparation for journalism in which required and elective courses in history, economics, government and politics, sociology, psychology, science and literature are being pursued at the same time that students are taking courses in journalism gives purpose and direction to the student's work and shows them what these other studies mean in relation to the life and the work of the world.[68]

Bronstein and Vaughn note that "Bleyer's emphasis on research set the Wisconsin program apart from other, more practically oriented programs such as the one built by the former journalist, Walter Williams, at the University of Missouri."[69] According to Sloan, while Pulitzer's goal at Columbia was to improve society through improving journalism, Missouri's purpose was to train journalists for the profession.[70] Betty Houchin Winfield situates Williams' plan as part of a "nationwide movement toward professionalism and a state-wide movement toward journalism education, an idea that had simmered for

[67] Zelizer, p. 16.
[68] Willard G. Bleyer, "What Schools of Journalism Are Trying to Do," *Journalism Quarterly* 8 (1931), pp. 35-44.
[69] Bronstein and Vaughn, p. 21.
[70] Sloan, Makers of the Media Mind, p. 9.

decades. Public service would be a major component."[71] Stephen Banning goes as far as declaring that "interest in professionalization of journalism made a quantum leap as the first school of journalism was founded at the University of Missouri in 1908."[72]

The world's first journalism school was also the first to put the Eliot plan for journalism education into use.[73] Founded in 1908, eight years earlier than Pulitzer's school at Columbia, this school was established with wide-ranging public support from many groups, especially the Missouri Press Association, which had been directly responsible for the establishment of a chair of journalism at the institution several years earlier, and vigorously campaigned for a regular school since.[74] Walter Williams, a printer and confirmed newspaperman with a high school education, was named dean, convinced by the university's outgoing and incoming presidents, following a year-long abortive search, despite the fact that he had no college education.[75] In fact, his academic qualifications went no further than the grade and high school education he received in Boonville, Missouri, before learning the printer's trade. That said, Williams was preceded by a reputation for not only his talents as a newsman but also his attention to the form, or design, of news; he was an accomplished professional long before the opening of the Missouri School of Journalism.[76] Having served as journalist and editor of the weekly *Columbia Herald* since 1889, Williams had emphasized newspaper design as an

---

[71] Betty Houchin Winfield, ed., "Emerging Professionalism and Modernity," *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2008), p. 8.
[72] Stephen Banning, "Press Clubs," *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* (ed. Betty Houchin Winfield / Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2008), p. 81.
[73] O'Dell, p. 88.
[74] Sara Lockwood Williams, *Twenty Years of Education for Journalism*, p. 3; Sutton, p. 12; Sloan, pp. 7-8; Betty Houchin Winfield, "Emerging Professionalism and Modernity," p. 8.
[75] Sloan, p. 9; Winfield, pp. 9-10. Williams would later serve as president of the university.
[76] Lora England Wegman, "Newspaper Design's Status at a Turning Point in Journalism Education," in *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* (ed. Betty Houchin Winfield / Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2008), p. 232.

important service to readers.[77] Naturally, his experience would influence the campus laboratory paper, the *University Missourian*. According to Joseph Mirando, this campus daily newspaper came complete with its own fully-equipped newsroom, printing press, photography labs, wire services, and hundreds of student reporters. Moreover, the author notes that the *Missourian* gave 'blanket coverage' to the nearby town of Columbia and became the model all other student newspapers would strive to become.[78]

In 1909, according to Sloan, Williams reported to the Missouri Press Association that the curriculum included courses in "history and principles of journalism, ethics of journalism, newspaper administration, news gathering, reporting, editorial writing, correspondence, newspaper jurisprudence, the law of libel, illustrative art, comparative journalism, and newspaper making, which includes all branches of newspaper work."[79] While Pulitzer and Bleyer wanted to improve society through improving journalism, Missouri's purpose was to train journalists for the profession.[80] The purpose of this first school of journalism, as stated with blunt force by Dean Walter Williams, was "to train for journalism – not to make journalists."[81] Many schools of journalism would later adopt curricula similar to Missouri's, which "with substantial emphasis on courses in professional skills."[82] The program strongly adhered to Dr. Eliot's proposal, focusing on editorial work, operation of the business office, and operation of the mechanical department.[83] According to Sloan, the year following his presentation to the state press,

---

[77] Frank Warren Rucker, *Walter Williams* (Missourian Publication Association, 1964), p. 53-54; Lora England Wegman, p. 232.
[78] Mirando, p. 81.
[79] Sloan, p. 9.
[80] Ibid., p. 9.
[81] Sara Lockwood Williams, *Twenty Years of Education for Journalism*, p. 53.
[82] Sloan, p. 9.
[83] Edd Applegate, *Journalism in the United States: Concepts and Issues* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2011), p. 110.

Dean Williams stated his pedagogical philosophy, which he called "the new education for journalism."[84] According to Williams,

> It differs from the old in its recognition of journalism as a profession, as law and medicine are professions. It does not make less insistence upon the broad, general, cultural education nor does it set aside the training which only practical experience can give. The new education for journalism seeks to supplement these with specific instruction, correlating with professional courses and certain carefully chosen academic courses.[85]

Having served as a newspaperman, Walter Williams had a broad grasp of the needs of the profession and the skills that would be useful to a professional journalist in the newsroom. The pedagogical philosophy of the new education for journalism which he proposed followed this idea. Writing on "The College of Journalism" in *The World Today*, Dean Williams noted that:

> The distinctive feature of the new School of Journalism aside from its recognition of journalism as a profession, is the employment of the laboratory method. In this way, actual practical training in newspaper-making will be given. If the instruction is faithful and efficient, the student taking this work will certainly be better equipped for success in journalism than those who have not had such training. In the conduct of the newspaper, assignments will be given, the general news field covered, editorials written, telegraphic news edited, exchanges read, and every department conducted as in the office of the large daily journal. In this way the practical laboratory work will be applied to journalism, as it has been with such large success to the teaching of medicine and law and education. In addition courses will be given in English, Composition, History, Economics, Sociology, Psychology, Philosophy, Logic, Government, Finance, paper management and publishing, fitting the prospective journalist for the highest service in the profession. Courses will be given in illustrative art, looking toward cartooning, general illustration, and magazine illustrations. A course will be given in libel law, discussing the freedom of the press, privileged publications and all features of the law as it relates to newspapers. It will cover four years and will lead to a degree, bachelor of science in journalism, in which he will complete both the courses in the College of Arts and Science, usually known as the academic course, and the professional course in journalism.[86]

---

[84] Sloan, p. 9.
[85] Walter Williams / Quoted in Sloan, p. 9.
[86] Walter Williams, "The College of Journalism," *The World Today* (December 1908).

Williams would go on to train and place thousands of professional journalists in newspapers across the country and press associations around the world. O'Dell cites a figure of 1,187 Missouri journalism graduates between 1909 and 1930.[87]

Everette Dennis notes that Williams also helped to found the National Editorial Association, the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism, and the Press Congress of the World.[88] As highlighted by Betty Houchin Winfield, organizations are an integral part of the professionalization of journalists, and 1908 was also "an auspicious time for both professional organization and agreed-upon ethics."[89] The National Press Club was founded on May 12 of that year. This national organization, with its building in the capital, "was to be not just a club to attend after the D.C. bars closed at midnight, but a place that would 'foster the ethical standards of the profession'."[90] Most significantly the NPC would add to its ethical standards Walter Williams' *Journalists' Creed*.[91]

Winfield notes that Williams had enunciated a type of 'journalists' creed' for years in speeches and in his 'History and Principles' class, as a moral basis for professionalism. According to the author, "by 1914, Williams wrote down those beliefs as a moral code, as the terms for professionalism, and as commandments for journalistic behaviour."[92] She remarks that Williams' Creed was one of journalism's first codes of ethics, which would come to be followed by those of the American Society of Newspaper Editors (1922) and the Society for Professional Journalists (1926). Adopted by

---

[87] O'Dell, p. 92.
[88] Everette Dennis, *American Communication Research: The Remembered History* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., 1996), p. 192
[89] Betty Houchin Winfield, p. 11.
[90] Ibid., p. 11.
[91] Ibid., p. 11. Please refer to Appendix C of this dissertation.
[92] Ibid., p. 12.

newspapers and journalists around the world, and memorized by Missouri students for decades, the Journalists' Creed continues to be part of the National Press Club website today.[93]

Dean Williams is also credited with pioneering the linkage between "community journalism" and journalism education. According to William Howard Taft, there were 91 dailies, 11 semi-weeklies, and 774 weekly newspapers in Missouri when the School of Journalism was established.[94] Many of these editors and publishers were active members of the Missouri Press Association, and were strong supporters of journalism education at a university. As a result, they expected "an experience community newspaper, Walter Williams, and his faculty to train future staffers in the best manner possible," thus the school gradually moved on to offer courses in editing, copyediting, and advertising, with new courses being added as new needs appeared (i.e. courses in management, circulation, photoengraving, and so on).[95]

As synthesized by Michael D. Murray and Roy L. Moore, historians of journalism and mass communications often compare and contrast the rationale behind theoretical models of journalism education as represented by the two founding university-based programs at the University of Missouri (Walter Williams, 1864-1935) and the University of Wisconsin (Willard G. Bleyer, 1873-1935).[96] As noted previously, these approaches are distinguished by a strong adherence to the academic-based Pulitzer view, on the part of program instituted at Wisconsin by Bleyer, and the practical-based Eliot view, as

---

[93] Winfield, p. 12.
[94] William Howard Taft, "Community Journalism: A Continuous Objective," *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession* (Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2008), p. 64. The author cites figures from the Ayer Directory.
[95] Taft, p. 64.
[96] Michael D. Murray and Roy L. Moore, *Mass Communication Education* (Iowa State Press, 2003), p. 43.

instituted by Williams at Missouri. Otherwise put, Bleyer and Williams, pioneers of journalism education, are "historical figures associated with different orientations toward training journalists: a professional-school tradition at Missouri versus a liberal arts tradition at Wisconsin."[97] At any rate, the philosophies of Pulitzer and Eliot "were to have a lasting, if often misconstrued, impact on journalism education."[98]

Bleyer's approach at Wisconsin integrated journalism with liberal arts, whereas Walter Williams established a free-standing professional school at Missouri, emphasizing hands-on training in a 'real world' environment. But although Wisconsin emphasized research more than did Missouri, Stephen Reese notes that "Bleyer did not make the strong distinction between theory and professional practice that so often colors current controversy. Indeed, he advocated regular contact between professionals and faculty and, consistent with the Wisconsin Idea, thought that research would help improve professional practice."[99]

While both are considered the 'founding fathers' of journalism education,[100] Bleyer is the one credited with pioneering the promotion of journalism as a legitimate university discipline, with emphasis on teaching journalism as a social science rather than as a vocational subject.[101] The complications and difficulties of these two differing approaches to a pedagogy of journalism – one practical, one theoretical – were not nipped in the bud one hundred years ago. The vocational versus theoretical dichotomy continues to pose the major challenge to journalism education today, made even more complex with

---

[97] Murray and Moore, p. 43.
[98] Walter Wilcox, "Historical Trends in Journalism Education," *Journalism Educator* 14, no. 3 (1959), p. 3.
[99] Stephen D. Reese, "The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education," p. 72.
[100] Edwin Emery and Joseph McKern, "AEJMC: 75 Years in the Making," *Journalism Monographs* (November 1987), p. 104.
[101] Everett M. Rogers, *A History of Communication Study: A Biographical Approach* (New York: The Free Press, 1994), pp. 19-20.

the emergence of communication studies as an academic discipline, as the next section of this chapter will demonstrate.

These hugely significant differences aside, Williams and Bleyer worked together to establish a national organization for journalism educators. Although a few other journalism professors had previously met to conceive and create such an organization in 1910 at the University of California, Williams invited professors from the 32 schools that in 1911 were offering some journalism instruction during Journalism Week at the University of Missouri in April of that year.[102] Writing that "it was time to organize for the common good," Ronald T. Farrar notes that the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, as the new organization became known, was created. The author adds that "in giving direction to the emerging organization, Walter Williams was joined by a man also destined to become a towering figure in the field, Willard Grosvenor Bleyer of the University of Wisconsin."[103] "Daddy" Bleyer was thus chosen as the AATJ's first president.[104] He would then be 'instrumental' in the creation of two pillars of the journalism education establishment in the United States: the Association of Journalism Education Administrators (now 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).[105]

The next section of this chapter covers the influence of these two models of journalism education in the first part of the 20th century, the period of 'rapid growth' with

---

[102] Ronald T. Farrar, *A Creed for My Profession: Walter Williams, Journalist to the World* (University of Missouri Press, 1998), p. 179; Murray and Moore, p. 44.
[103] Ibid., p. 180.
[104] Ibid., p. 80. The author notes that this discussion is drawn heavily from his own essay, "The Push for Standards and Recognition: A Brief history of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism," in Seventy-Five Years of Journalism and Mass Communications Leadership (Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communications, 1993), pp. 54-71.
[105] Medsger, p. 208.

journalism programs established on a much firmer basis. Most significantly, it covers the complicated place of journalism as both an object of study and an area of inquiry as a hybrid, interdisciplinary mix of the humanities of social sciences, which forces it to lie somewhere between professional and academic in its outlook.[106]

[106] Reese, "Progressive Potential," p. 72.

Journalism and Mass Communications: The Troubled Marriage

The newspaper editor telephoned the director of his journalism school, the one he attended 25 years before and remembered with such fondness. He had decided he should step down as vice president of the school's alumni advisory board.

"I don't identify with the school anymore," he explained. "You're hiring all those PhDs. Hell, an editor like me wouldn't even qualify for a job on the faculty. Let's face it. You're not really a J-school anymore. You're mass communications. All I really care about is journalism. Sorry, but I don't think I can be of much help."

– John Maxwell Hamilton, BRIDGING THE GAP: PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS AND JOURNALISM EDUCATORS SHOULD JOIN FORCES TO STRENGTHEN BOTH OF THEIR DOMAINS

It is widely agreed that "the trademark of journalism education in the early 20th century was emphasis on technical matters."[107] James Carey explains that, in its early days, the journalism "curriculum attempted to duplicate the atmospherics of a newspaper, and education was largely an old-fashioned apprenticeship carried out via extensive laboratories that dominated the program of study, supplemented and sometimes replaced by work at the student newspaper."[108] Weaver and Gray note that until the 1920s, most programs were either adjuncts to English departments or originated there, with Missouri and Columbia Universities founding separate schools of journalism in 1908 and 1912, respectively, proving the exception to the rule.[109] According to Mirando, the 'typical school of the 1910s, 20s, and 30s' offered a selection of courses in history, ethics and law, but devoted most attention to reporting, writing and editing.[110] The author adds that some schools also included courses in a broad mass media context such as management, circulation, printing, advertising, publicity, and broadcasting, but the focus was news-editorial study designed to prepare reporters for newsroom work.[111] As a matter of fact,

[107] Mirando, p. 80.
[108] Carey, "Some Personal Notes on US Journalism Education," p. 20.
[109] Weaver and Gray, 1980.
[110] Mirando, p. 80.
[111] Ibid., p. 80.

Mirando notes that "for a school to become a member of the American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism, majors were required to devote about half or more of all their journalism courses to reporting, news writing, copy reading, editing, and editorial writing."[112]

Although journalism schools had been in existence for 25 years or more by mid-century, they still had not found their subject matter – journalism. According to Carey, "what was taught was rather unsystematic – largely the transmission of the accumulated folk wisdom of the craft, organized around the professional and technological separation of the media: newspapers here, magazines there, radio and television somewhere else." The author notes that "the craft was presented somewhat haphazardly without much historical understanding, criticism, or self-consciousness. Despite vainglorious local histories, largely testimonies to self-delusion, this was pretty much the situation at all American journalism schools."[113]

As noted in the previous chapter, the period from 1920s to the 1940s saw journalism programs in the United States established on a much firmer basis.[114] A number followed the pattern set by Missouri in 1908 and Columbia in 1912 of becoming independent professional schools, while others became separate departments within colleges of liberal arts, notably English departments. All of these programs followed either the Walter Williams concept of professional skills, or the Pulitzer-Bleyer concept

[112] Mirando, p. 80. The author proceeds to write that "the technical approach led to a strict vocational emphasis. Regardless of whether they were college graduates, former reporters and editors were considered the most capable instructors, and plenty of working journalists taught classes part time or supervised students' work through special arrangements with newspapers. Classrooms contained typewriters and students were required to bang out stories directly on the keyboard instead of preparing rough drafts and neat outlines in their best handwriting as they learned in freshman English. Journalism students were frequently expected to put in time on the campus newspaper or at the university newsbureau, and many found correspondent work for a local or out-of-town daily paper."
[113] Carey, *Some Personal Notes on US Journalism Education*, p. 13.
[114] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 42.

of studying the press in society, or a combination of the two. Regardless, "each of the principal visionaries of journalism education—Bleyer at the University of Wisconsin, Walter Williams at the University of Missouri School of Journalism and Pulitzer at Columbia University—looked beyond the immediate goal of educating journalists and improving newspapers." Betty Medsger is emphatic in stating that "the larger goal to which they aspired was to produce a more informed citizenry through better journalism."[115]

Wilbur Schramm writes that "Eliot's plan cast a long shadow."[116] He also notes that the majority of the journalism schools and departments that came into being in the first decades of the century had followed the practical example. As mentioned previously, this was a period of very rapid growth: there was only one school in 1910, at Missouri, and four departments; by 1917, 84 institutions offered work in journalism; finally, in 1934, there were 455 institutions and about 812 teachers. As Schramm remarks, "by about this time, there were stirrings of change in curricula."[117]

In 1927, Bleyer had created the "Ph.D. minor" in journalism within the University of Wisconsin's doctoral programs in political science, sociology, and history.[118] Weaver and Wilhoit note that "although his own background was in English, Bleyer located journalism in the social sciences rather than in the humanities – a decision that had a far-reaching impact on the kind of journalism research and education carried out in many U.S. colleges and universities in the years to come."[119] Schramm attributes the major

---

[115] Betty Medsger, p. 208.
[116] Wilbur Schramm, "The Master Teachers," in *American Communication Research*, p. 129.
[117] Schramm, "The Master Teachers," p. 129.
[118] Weaver and Wilhoit, pp. 42-43; Carolyn Bronstein and Stephen Vaughn, "Willard G. Bleyer and the Relevance of Journalism Education, *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs*, 166 (June 1998), p. 21.
[119] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.

stirrings of change in curricula to a generation of strong directors who were, or would soon be, in charge of the major journalism programs: Eric Allen of Oregon, Carl Ackerman of Columbia, Willard Bleyer of Wisconsin, Ralph Casey of Minnesota, Frank Mott of Iowa and later Missouri, Theodore Olsen of Northwestern [sic],[120] Chilton Bush of Stanford, Lawrence Murphy and later Fredrick Siebert of Illinois, John Drewry of Georgia, Nelson Antrom Crawford of Kansas, and Ralph Nafzinger, who became director at Wisconsin and was an important figure in the national journalism organization.[121] Many of these leaders and founders of the major journalism programs, and the nation's leading journalism educations, cited by Schramm, came out of the journalism minor Ph.D. program at Wisconsin, including Siebert, Bush, Nafzinger, MacDougall, and Casey.[122] It is important to note, though, that Schramm also points to their varying educational backgrounds, from only high school (i.e., Walter Williams) to PhDs; their discipline being English, most often, and later, political science. Schramm also notes that "their newspaper experience varied from a year or two on a copy desk to years as an editor or foreign correspondent;" the average time spent on newspapers being about six years.[123]

As far as 'the Bleyer children,' they would carry empirical social science assumptions with them to such schools as Stanford, Illinois, Northwestern, Michigan

[120] The correct name is Kenneth Eugene Olson, appointed Dean of the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University in 1937. Under his leadership, in 1938, the school was the first to offer a five-year program leading to a Master of Science in Journalism, as shall be discussed later. Olson held a BA from Northland College (1916) and another BA, and MA in Political Science, from the University of Wisconsin at Madison.
[121] Schramm, "The Master Teachers," pp. 129-130.
[122] James W. Tankard Jr., "The Theorists" in *Makers of the Media Mind: Journalism Educators and Their Ideas* (ed. William David Sloan / Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990), p. 230; Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[123] Schramm, "The Master Teachers," p. 130.

State, and Minnesota, among others.[124] Everett Rogers notes that this strategy was "quite radical for its time," but it eventually was widely accepted.[125] Weaver and Wilhoit add that the main thrust at this time was to follow the Bleyer school of thought by integrating journalism with the social sciences and, as a result, journalism schools began hiring Ph.D.s primarily from political science, sociology, and psychology.[126] Rogers cites an account by Fred S. Siebert (1970), who served as an early director of the School of Journalism at Illinois and later as dean of the College of Communication at Michigan State, and considered Daddy Bleyer 'the outstanding pioneer' in journalism education: "He established the first real operating school of journalism, with [a] … research orientation at Wisconsin."[127] Rogers highlights that Wisconsin in the 1930s was "the seed institution for journalism training based in the social sciences, and Daddy Bleyer was the pioneering figure."[128]

Bronstein and Vaughn note that "in his efforts to transform newspapers in ways that could heighten connections between readers and their institutions, including government, Bleyer resembled such contemporaries as Charles Horton Cooley, Robert Park, and John Dewey." The authors note that these three theorists, like Bleyer, "believed in progress and linked the expansion of communication to social goals."[129] Tom Dickson points out that progressive educator John Dewey's 1916 work, *Democracy and*

---

[124] Transcript of interview with Ralph Nafziger (July 8, 1970), AEJ Collection, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Everett M. Rogers, *History of Communication Study*, p. 19; Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[125] Everett M. Rogers, p. 19.
[126] Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43. The authors note that though some came from the humanities, especially history, often even they took a social-science viewpoint. They observe that "largely because of this shift toward the social sciences in many leading U.S. journalism schools, more emphasis began to be put on ways of observing the world and systematically recording and analyzing such observations. More emphasis was placed on generalizing from specific observations, especially in journalism and mass communication research."
[127] Fred S. Siebert / Cited in Rogers, p. 19.
[128] Rogers, p. 19.
[129] Bronstein and Vaughn, p. 7.

Education, "was to have a major impact on higher education and journalism education years after it was published."[130] In *Democracy and Education*, Dewey defined the requirements for thought and learning: "that there must first be an experience that the student finds to be of interest and a problem to be solved coming from that experience." In it, Dewey stated that a "curriculum which acknowledges the social responsibilities of education must present situations where problems are relevant to the problems of living together, and where observation and information are calculated to develop social insights and interest."[131]

Barbie Zelizer also notes the 'parallel interest' in journalism which developed in the social sciences, spearheaded by sociologist Robert Park at the University of Chicago. Zelizer explains that Park had implemented different studies of journalists in the school of urban ethnography during the 1930s (citing Park, Burgess and McKenzie, 1925, as an example), and as a result scholars would see "journalism as a setting worthy of systematic analytical study." She explains that inspired by the work of John Dewey and George Herbert Mead in pragmatism, "Park envisioned a periodic newspaper, *Thought News*, as a way of bringing together journalism and the new social sciences." Zelizer notes that the paper never appeared, but it nonetheless marked an attempt to address journalism's scholarly study.[132]

Meanwhile, according to Sutton, the American Society of Newspaper Editors expressed an interest in education for journalism in a meeting in 1923, pointing out the need for a working relationship between newspapermen and the schools. Sutton notes

---

[130] Tom Dickson, *Mass Media in Transition: Preparing for the 21st Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Taylor and Francis, 2000), p. 22.
[131] John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (1966), p. 192 / Quoted in Dickson, pp. 22-23.
[132] Barbie Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, p. 16.

that two years later, "it adopted a resolution declaring that academic and professional training should consist of either a complete course at a school of journalism in some university leading to a degree, or attendance at such a school in a recognized institution, supplementing the regular college course."[133] The author proceeds to cite ASNE's statement that it "commends as the ultimate goals of schools of journalism their development into graduate schools to the end that their educational standards shall be on par with those maintained at the best schools of law or medicine."[134]

As a result, and since then, Columbia University has been converted into a strictly graduate school. At first, during its first two decades of existence, it closely followed the stipulations of Pulitzer's will, avoiding all business aspects of journalism and instructing their students to use the city of New York as their reporting beat.[135] But in 1935, four years after Carl Ackerman, an alumnus of the school, becoming director, the Columbia program abolished its undergraduate journalism major, set up a new admissions policy requiring students to have a bachelor's degree, and limited the curriculum to graduate study – as the provision for a year of professional journalism study.[136]

Consequently, several other schools and departments followed to make provisions for a year of graduate work beyond their requirements for the bachelor degree; Missouri, Wisconsin, Iowa, Stanford, and Emory were among those adopting this five-year plan.[137] The Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University was the first to break away entirely from the traditional sequence by setting up a five-year plan for professional training, modelled after that of law schools and leading to a master of science degree in

---

[133] Sutton, p. 25.
[134] Ibid., p. 25.
[135] Mirando, p. 80.
[136] Sutton, p. 25, Mirando, p. 80. Today Columbia restricts classes to the master's and doctoral levels.
[137] Sutton, p. 25.

journalism.[138] Founded in 1921 by Joseph Medill Patterson and Robert McCormick, owners of the Chicago *Tribune*, the model at Medill had gained fame thanks to the efforts of its first director, Harry F. Harrington, who required students to take assignments directly from the city desks of Chicago daily newspapers, and also employed a faculty made up of dozens of Chicago journalists who taught on a part-time basis.[139] The five-year plan was inaugurated in 1938, under Director Kenneth Olson, one of 'the Bleyer children' who carried to Northwestern the empirical social science he acquired while pursuing his MA in Political Science at the University of Wisconsin.[140] The plan aimed to provide students with a broad background in English, economics, history, political science, sociology, and commerce, in addition to professional training under seasoned teachers with wide newspaper experience.[141] Like the schools of law, the Medill School of Journalism required three years of college work for admission to the professional courses; students began concentrating their journalism courses in the fourth year to earn a bachelor's degree and in a fifth year earn a Master of Science in journalism.[142] Mirando notes that in the coming years, "Medill retained the hands-on approach and expanded it into a prominent Washington reporting program and a strong magazine curriculum that took advantage of Chicago's geographic market advantages."[143]

As noted previously, the most popular way of teaching journalism in the early twentieth century was via the close alignment of classes with the publishing operation of a campus or community newspaper, under the goal of offering not only training in

---

[138] Sutton, p. 25.
[139] Sloan, p. 13.
[140] Transcript of interview with Ralph Nafziger (July 8, 1970), AEJ Collection, State Historical Society of Wisconsin; Everett M. Rogers, *History of Communication Study*, p. 19; Weaver and Wilhoit, p. 43.
[141] Sutton, p. 26; Mirando, p. 80.
[142] Mirando, p. 80; Sutton, p. 26.
[143] Mirando, pp. 80-81; Sutton, pp. 25-26. As an aside, as of March of this year, the school has changed its name to The Medill School of Journalism, Media, Integrated Marketing Communications.

reporting and editing, "but to advance a socialization process focusing on the reality of working in a newsroom."[144] Joseph Mirando notes that this procedure was developed by Walter Williams in its most advanced form: by establishing a daily newspaper on the University of Missouri campus with its own fully-equipped newsroom, complete with a printing press, photography labs, wire services, and hundreds of student reporters, giving blanket coverage to the nearby town of Columbia and became the model all other student newspapers would strive to become.[145] O'Dell argues that this was Williams's method to fight what he referred to as 'the second major objection' urged against the School of Journalism: that journalism can be taught only in a newspaper office and not in a school. As Williams saw it, "if the School of Journalism is also a newspaper office, then this objection is without weight."[146] Furthermore, Mirando points out that the first two textbooks ever authored by journalism professors – *The Practice of Journalism* by Walter Williams and Frank Martin and *The Writing of News* by Charles Ross – appearing in 1911, were built on this approach – luring students to major in journalism via the spirit of the technical/vocational model, composed of practicality, relevance and glamour. The author notes argues that "few other classes at a typical college can offer students opportunities to hear their own teachers give first-hand accounts of history-making events, to rub elbows with decision-makers, and to have their names printed in bold print above an article that will be read and talked about by thousands of people."[147]

---

[144] Mirando, p. 81.
[145] Ibid., p. 81.
[146] O'Dell, p. 92. The first objection made by Williams in this document reproduced by O'Dell (an article in the December 1908 issue of *The World Today*) is to the claim that journalists need no training, "that the reporter, the editor, is born, not made. It is urged that there is something mysterious about newspaper work, which only those divinely inspired may know. This was said formerly about lawyers and doctors and preachers and indeed the followers of every vocation. It is no more true of journalism than of any other occupation," writes Williams (cited in O'Dell, p. 91).
[147] Mirando, p. 81.

Mirando notes that in 1939, with most schools placing emphasis on a technical/vocational approach, less than 50 of the nation's 1,000 college journalism instructors held a Ph.D., while more than 100 had no college degree at all.[148] The trend changed dramatically after 1940, when journalism schools rapidly began hiring more professors with a doctorate, with most of them earning their terminal degrees in interdisciplinary programs that included journalism within programs in sociology, political science, and economics,[149] such as the PhD minor established by Bleyer at Wisconsin. This is no coincidence, for as noted by Rogers, "Bleyer's purpose in establishing the doctoral program at Wisconsin was to train a cadre of journalism professors with competence in the social science aspects of communication."[150] The author notes further that "Daddy Bleyer was in an advantageous position to promote his notion of the social sciences in undergraduate journalism training," given his status as 'informal' founder of journalism education in U.S. universities.[151]

Zelizer argues that "a number of U.S. scholars capitalized on the new interest in the social sciences so as to enhance journalism education, often within the newly developing paradigm of communication."[152] She cites among them four of Bleyer's students – Siebert, Casey, Nafziger, and Bush – who "independently experimented with the formal integration of the university's research mission into their journalism units." To that effect, notes Zelizer, "they developed Ph.D. programs, insisted on a 25/75 rule by which only 25% of the journalism curricula could focus on skills courses, and developed seminars on academic topics such as public opinion and survey research for the

[148] Mirando, p. 82.
[149] Ibid., p. 82.
[150] Rogers, p. 22.
[151] Ibid., p. 22.
[152] Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, p. 17.

edification of journalism students."[153] Mirando, Sutton and James Herring also note the fast ascension of social science study in this era, with courses entitled 'Public Opinion,' 'Social Influences of the Press,' 'Mass Communication and Society,' broadcasting and public relations being created at twice the rate of any other journalism class.[154] Carey also notes that "signs of change were in the air," with broadcasting slowly making its way into the curriculum, "though it brought with it an even more technologically intensive education in newsrooms organized like broadcast stations."[155] He argues that "some landmark research that still holds up well had come out of journalism schools," citing Frederick Seibert's *Freedom of the Press in England from 1476 to 1776* (published at the University of Illinois) as an example, and observing that it "had earned the grudging recognition of other faculties."[156] Most significantly, Carey notes that "the peripatetic Wilbur Schramm had introduced 'communications' and quantitative research at Iowa, Illinois and Stanford," adding that courses such as Public Opinion and the Effects of Mass Communication had "wormed their way into the margins of the curriculum" as a result.[157]

Zelizer notes that Schramm, who headed Iowa's program after Frank Luther Mott in 1942, had facilitated blended enterprises at institutions as wide-ranging as the Universities of Iowa, Illinois, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Stanford.[158] She adds that Schramm would incorporate the work of Paul Lazarsfeld in sociology, Harold Lasswell in political science, and Carl Hovland in social psychology to push journalism in the

[153] Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, p. 17.
[154] Mirando, p. 80.
[155] Carey, Some personal notes on US journalism education, p. 13.
[156] Ibid., p. 13.
[157] Ibid., p. 13.
[158] Zelizer, p. 17; Dennis and Wartella, 1996.

direction of the social sciences.[159] According to Theodore Peterson, Schramm was reacting against "the purely descriptive studies, studies that lacked dimension, studies that had been the chief contributions made by journalism schools to research."[160]

Schramm had prioritized the study of mass communication "as a social institution, its organization, its social control, its place in the social structure, its content, its audiences, its responsibilities and performances."[161] According to Zelizer, this new social sciences orientation would be the site "where newly formed questions of production, influence, effect, and structure became the reigning research focal points of the time: Researchers began to think about how to situate journalists in a network of motivations, agendas, and interactions, how to frame journalists as a group with systematic relations, and how to situate journalists and news making in a world replete with peer pressures, rewards, and punishments, and their effects on the public."[162]

David H. Weaver and Maxwell E. McCombs note that with the "shift toward the social sciences in many leading U.S. journalism schools, more emphasis began to be put on ways of *observing* the external world and systematically recording and analyzing such observations. More emphasis was placed on *generalizing* from specific observations, especially in journalism and mass communication research." (italics original)[163] Dennis and Wartella write that "social scientists became particularly active in media studies, not as an end in themselves, but as part of a larger project on human behaviour and individual

[159] Zelizer, p. 17.
[160] Theodore Peterson, "The Press as a Social Institution" in *American Communication Research* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996), p. 86.
[161] Wilbur Schramm, *Responsibility in Mass Communication* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957), p. 5.
[162] Zelizer, p. 17.
[163] David H. Weaver and Maxwell E. McCombs, "Journalism and Social Science: A New Relationship?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (January 1980), p. 481.

cognitions."[164] According to the authors, these efforts were usually in the realm of applied research, and "abutted similar (and sometimes related) work in journalism schools that had strong reasons for wanting to know more about media and their influences."[165] Zelizer notes further that "the resulting scholarship demonstrated that journalism did not just reflect a world 'out there' but was the outcome of collective action engaged in shaping that reflection."[166]

Mass communication emerged in journalism education in the late 1940s, writes Tom Dickson, "as a term that might better represent the burgeoning field of journalism education."[167] According to Walter Wilcox, the term once used "to denote the anatomy, process, function and effect of the mass media and their audiences," now seemed to have the potential "to bring some sort of unity to a field hitherto considered in piecemeal."[168] And the field continued to bourgeon. In 1950, note Weaver and Combs, "the Ph.D. in journalism and mass communications was established at the University of Minnesota, and other universities, particularly in the Midwest, established doctoral programs of their own." The authors add that this tradition was extended to other regions via Stanford on the West Coast and North Carolina on the East Coast. The authors write that "typically, these doctoral programs were run by scholars who had gained their terminal degrees in sociology, psychology, social psychology, or political science." They note that "as a result, their protégés tended to be more closely attuned to social science perspectives and methods than to humanistic ones," and thus the use of social science approaches was

---

[164] Dennis and Wartella, p. ix.
[165] Ibid., p. ix.
[166] Zelizer, p. 17.
[167] Tom Dickson, *Mass Media Education in Transition: Preparing for the 21st Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), p. 60.
[168] Walter Wilcox, "Historical Trends in Journalism Education," *Journalism Educator* Vol. 14, Issue 3 (1959), p. 7.

favoured in journalism and mass communication research and, to a lesser extent, in classes on public affairs reporting.[169]

But according to Dickinson, because of its theoretical focus, however, "mass communication was to come into sharp conflict with the more practical journalism subfields and was not soon to be accepted as an overarching term for the various sequences of journalism education or even to feel at home among them."[170] Betty Medsger has an even more tragic account of the engagement that would lead to the troubled marriage between journalism communication. She begins her argument by stating that

> There is wide agreement with the claim made by Rogers in *A History of Communication Study* (1994) that Schramm, head of journalism education at Iowa shortly after World War II and later the founder of communication research institutes at the University of Illinois and Stanford University, was "the founder of the field, the first individual to identify himself as a communication scholar." Schramm created "the first academic degree-granting programs with communication in their name; and he trained the first generation of communication scholars … Schramm set in motion the patterns of scholarly work in communication study that continue to this day," wrote Rogers (1994: 29), of the University of New Mexico.[171]

According to Medsger, the development of communication studies in the twentieth century was inevitable because "as technologies expanded the size of the audience for various kinds of communication, it was natural that some scholars of human behavior would feel compelled to study what a mass audience was and how it behaved, how mass media behaved, and what impact mass media had on various demographic groups as well

[169] David H. Weaver and Maxwell E. McCombs, "Journalism and Social Science: A New Relationship?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (January 1980), p. 481.
[170] Tom Dickson, *Mass Media Education in Transition: Preparing for the 21st Century* (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2000), p. 60.
[171] Medsger, p. 210.

as on the overall population."[172] Medsger then remarks that the creation of a new academic discipline can be "a difficult bureaucratic task, given the reluctance, or at least slowness, of universities to adopt new structures." According to the author, "Schramm decided to avoid that hassle by grafting communication studies onto an existing discipline, journalism."[173] In her view, "he chose journalism at Iowa, as he would later at Illinois and Stanford." Medsger's thesis is that Schramm and the other early communications scholars had found it useful to 'piggyback' on journalism programs, and thus his "Blueprint for a School of Journalism"[174] is merely an attempt to circumvent a bureaucratic difficulty by establishing an academic program for an existing discipline (journalism) as opposed to one that is not even born (mass communication).

James Carey shares Medsger's thesis. According to the author, "when journalism education was being bred at Columbia and a modern social science of place developed at Chicago, a somewhat different tradition was taking root in the great land grant universities of the middle west."[175] Carey also doubts Schramm's intentions for journalism at Iowa, writing that "mixed and somewhat unsavoury motives drove the introduction of journalism into the curriculum of these universities." The author notes that lobbying for the creation of independent schools and departments was 'typically' done by state press associations, made up of small and medium sized daily newspapers, rather than the large urban ones.[176] Lobbying to establish a journalism school with a

[172] Medsger, p. 210. The author also argues that "there were political and commercial interests eager to understand and use whatever could be learned about—or could be done to or for—the masses. In addition to serving scholarly purposes, communication scholars served commercial and political interests in their research on communication issues."
[173] Medsger, p. 210.
[174] Please refer to Appendix B in this dissertation for a rare copy of Schramm's "Blueprint."
[175] Carey, Some personal notes on US journalism education, p. 18.
[176] Ibid., p. 18.

communications department as an ulterior motive moves very much away from the original, standard pattern.

Beate Josephi joins in the chorus, writing that "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."[177] Josephi notes further that "unlike Pulitzer, Professors Bleyer, [Walter] Williams and Schramm were interested only in journalism, not journalists,"[178] a statement which is somewhat odd given all we have affirmed about Walter Williams, who did not even have a college degree. At any rate, Medsger claims that Schramm, unlike Bleyer or Pulitzer, "did not see journalism as an intellectual activity," and "he had very little interest, in fact, in preparing students to become journalists."[179] In her view, "those who studied under Bleyer had been journalists, and their primary interest remained journalism. Those who studied under Schramm had found the infrastructure of journalism education a convenient base for their discipline, but their interest in journalism was secondary, if even that."[180]

Carey is emphatic in stating that "in the long run, embedding journalism in communications did enormous damage to the craft and ultimately to democratic politics."[181] The author establishes a strong distinction between Schramm's tradition and "the older science of communication founded at Chicago, which was congenial to journalism and its noblest aspirations." In contrast, he argues that "the new sciences

[177] Beate Josephi, "Journalism Education," *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, p. 44.
[178] Ibid., "Journalism Education," p. 44.
[179] Medsger, p. 211.
[180] Ibid., p. 211.
[181] Carey, Some personal notes on US journalism education, p. 21.

made journalism one of its subjects and objects."[182] Over time, according to Zelizer, they would come "to address the world of journalism by dividing it via its technologies of production, separating newspapers, magazines, television, and radio from each other as topics of inquiry, and by the time they expanded to include other areas, like advertising and public relations, journalism was marginalized within its own curriculum. As a result, notes Carey, the curriculum came to lack "historical understanding, criticism, or self-consciousness."[183] It thus failed to provide, writes Zelizer, "a persuasive sense of the craft or world of journalism to complement the science of journalism as set in place by social science inquiry."[184] The field of 'journalism studies,' of which Zelizer is a strong proponent, proposes to address this failure by establishing an academic discipline – with its own literature, its own set of questions, its own methods – for this purpose.

Carey concludes the functional rather than intrinsic reading of journalism reduced the study of journalism to that of a signalling system, while simultaneously failing to increase "our understanding of journalism as a social act, a political phenomenon, and an imaginative construction of the social."[185] Furthermore, Zelizer notes that scholars who did resist journalism's adoption by the social sciences and insisted, instead, on offering "a more broadly defined though still humanistic curriculum for journalism education, curricular efforts were not made that did not sufficiently develop journalism as a focus of inquiry, either."[186] The final section in this chapter takes this insufficiency as a point of departure.

---

[182] Ibid., p. 21.
[183] Ibid., p. 13.
[184] Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, p. 18.
[185] Carey, Some personal notes on US journalism education, p. 21.
[186] Zelizer, Taking Journalism Seriously, p. 18.

Josephi correctly notes that the troubled marriage between journalism and mass communications "left journalism education in the uneasy spot between practical and academic studies where it still finds itself."[187] That said, journalism education still remains, as Marianne Salcetti puts it, "an enduring area in which the predictability and control of the newsroom workforce is contested around the notion of trade school versus professional training."[188] But throughout the history of journalism (education and studies), according to Mark Deuze, the field has had to balance between industry and university, each with its own institutionalized expectations and assumptions.[189]

As a result, and as noted previously, the complex tensions that characterize the 'emerging' field of journalism studies today are rooted in the field of journalism education, and the difficult relation that the training for this profession has had with its place in the university. The final section of this chapter offers an examination of the different proposed solutions, and calls for change, offered by scholars and educators in journalism today.

[187] Josephi, p. 45.
[188] Salcetti, p. 63.
[189] Deuze, What is Journalism?, p. 443.

A truce for the turf wars? Journalism Studies and its fight for independence

The history of journalism education is part of the history of the transformation of the American university into a professional school, and the transformation of American society into a domain of professional power and expertise.

– James W. Carey, A PLEA FOR THE UNIVERSITY TRADITION (1978)

The final section of this chapter departs from the exploration of the enduring complications of the troubled marriage between the disciplines of communication studies and journalism, with journalism wandering between the humanities and the social sciences, never arriving at a place of its own. More specifically, it offers an examination of the growing body of academic literature examining these difficulties in the light of recent shifts in the kinds of knowledge that inform the field of journalism education. These difficulties – theory versus practice, humanities versus social sciences – now include "challenges to journalistic ethics, media convergence, and the emergence of new information and communication technologies." Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum note that "current critiques seldom align themselves as strictly pro-practice or pro-theory, but seek instead to accommodate the changing needs of journalism as a reflective practice having its own body of theory."[190] The authors provide a broad categorization of the targets of these critiques, including excessive focus on practice, excessive focus on theory at the expense of skill acquisition, calls for the merging of theory and practice, warnings about creeping industry or corporate dominance through the underwriting of facilities and research, and calls for increased emphasis on technology and online or internet reporting.[191] Additionally, there are those who claim that "journalism is becoming an increasingly autonomous field of study" and makes a point to operate within a distinction

[190] Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum, *Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope,* p. 4.
[191] Ibid., pp. 4-5.

between *journalism* and *the media*.[192] Scholars grouped in this category call for the reorganization of the various subjects of journalism (i.e. law, ethics, communication theory, political economy of journalism, media history, etc.) into a single field of Journalism Studies, arguing that "journalism has become crucial to such concerns is indicated by our use of concepts such as: *public journalism, civic journalism*, *development(al) journalism,* and *peace journalism*."[193]

Mark Deuze writes that "nothing is as practical as a theory."[194] The author remarks that several attempts have been made to group and summarize the various theoretical approaches to the study of journalism (Shoemaker and Reese, 1996; Schudson, 1996; Weischenberg, 1997; Cottle, 2000). But "such summarizing is not without its problems," cautions Deuze, because "the available publications are so widely differing, that any attempt leads to issues of whether or not the various concepts and definitions are still comparable."[195] Additionally, he claims, "it is all to easy to pick a certain broad area within the available frameworks and claim it as right, as in empirically most widely tested."[196] Taking these difficulties into account, the last section of this chapter aims provide an overview of these claims and attempts.

Several scholars argue against journalism education's excessive focus on practice. Michael Cobden argues that "the first thing university journalism schools have to do if they want to survive is to start behaving like university schools. That means playing by the university's rules, but in a way that allows them to serve the practice of journalism."

---

[192] Please refer to Appendix E (Petition to the ICA for the establishment of a Journalism Studies Division) and Appendix F (ICA Infosheet: Journalism Studies Interest Group at ICA) of this dissertation.
[193] Please refer to Appendices E and F of this dissertation.
[194] Mark Deuze, "Educating 'new' journalists: Challenges to the curriculum," *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator 56*, No. 1 (2001), pp. 7-8
[195] Ibid., p. 8.
[196] Ibid., p. 8.

According to Cobden, teaching the basic techniques of journalism "is not enough of a challenge for university schools," who should instead "set themselves up as leaders, not followers, of working journalists."[197] Steward Gillian poses important questions:

> Are journalism schools simply training grounds? Is their only purpose the production of a workforce ready, willing and able to fit like cogs into the media machines that hire them? How can journalism professors be critical of the media machines while at the same time preparing students to work for them? And how publicly critical can any professor be when she/he depends on the media machines to provide internships for students?[198]

Mike Gasher, moreover, argues that "theory infuses practice, it in large part explains the particularities of a practice like journalism, and it addresses journalism's most fundamental questions: What is journalism for? Why are we doing this? Who are we serving with our practice?"[199] According to Gasher, "a necessary part of teaching students how to *do* journalism, then, is not only making them familiar with the theories that inform the practice, but making those theories themselves topics for discussion. Again, we need to turn assumptions into questions: Does this practice serve the community? If so, how? If not, can the practice be changed?"[200] Here, in the author's view, is where research comes in. Deuze shares this idea, arguing that the immediate dismissal of theory from the curriculum, or even the discussion because of its perceived clash with the daily practices and routines of media professionals, leads to the burying of the reflective potential of the educators and students involved.[201]

---

[197] Michael Cobden, "Getting Beyond the Basics: J-Schools Need to do More than Teach Students the Practical Tools of the Trade," *Media* 4, no. 3 (1997), p 27.
[198] Steward, Gillian, "A Prescription for Success: Perhaps it's Time for J-Schools to Retrench, Go Back to the Roots of Journalism as Well as the Roots of the Communities that Spawned them," *Media* 10, no. 2 (2002), p. 14.
[199] Mike Gasher, "It's Time to Redefine Journalism Education in Canada," *Canadian Journal of Communication* 30, no. 4 (2005), p. 665.
[200] Ibid., p. 669.
[201] Mark Deuze, "Educating 'new' journalists: Challenges to the curriculum," pp. 8.

Writing specifically about the situation in Canada, Marc Edge notes that education here "lags far behind where it is in the U.S., not only in history and sheer numbers, but also in the state of the debate." Edge argues that Canadian practitioners, "many of whom dismiss the notion of instruction even in skills and instead argue for the traditional apprenticeship system, have long held the upper hand over academics."[202] Considering "the paramount perception of necessary changes to the curriculum and overall approach of journalism education and further programs and a corresponding lack of vision on the road ahead," Mark Deuze concludes that "this suggests that our dominant idea of what journalism is, or should be, is in need of critical reflection."[203]

A second category of the targets of the critiques of journalism education is excessive focus on theory at the expense of skill acquisition. According to Knox and Goodrum, "these scholars often cite evidence of low levels of educational specialization among journalists, and include analysis of the often tense relationship between journalism programs and their parent institutions."[204] Betty Medsger is arguably the most vociferous in this group. Mike Gasher offers an excellent summary of Medsger's position, which he terms "a call to maintain a narrow vocational approach to journalism education" and is worth reproducing here:

> While she argued that the university's duty is to create new knowledge, she characterized new journalism knowledge as a vocational skill set that applied critical thinking only to students' news assignments and not to the institution of journalism itself. The value of a journalism education, she said, was the ability to do journalism. She favoured research, but spoke of research the way most journalists do, divorced from theory, methodology, and the existing scholarly literature. She decried the move by universities to hire faculty members with PhDs, because this would displace faculty members who have actually done

[202] Marc Edge, "Professionalism versus pragmatism," *Media* 10, no. 2 (Winter 2003), pp. 10-12.
[203] Mark Deuze, "Educating 'new' journalists: Challenges to the curriculum," pp. 7-8.
[204] Paul Knox and Abby Goodrum, *Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope*, pp. 4-5.

> journalism, without ever acknowledging that the PhDs being hired also have news industry experience.[205]

James Carey laments that "the science of communication that developed and occupied journalism schools created and fed off a natural hostility between journalism and the arts of social control." In Carey's view, "not only has this undercut the potential of journalism as an academic study and left it marooned, it has also radically compromised the possibilities of a democratic and public life in the contemporary world."[206] G. Stuart Adam shares Carey's rejection of the problematic fusion of journalism and mass communication. "It may be fair to imagine journalism as connected to mass communication systems; it may be fair to think of large newsrooms as the venue of much, perhaps most, journalistic activity; it is essential to think of the techniques of news-reporting and news-writing as essential pedagogic starting points in journalism education," writes Adam. "But it is wrong to allow the terms journalism and mass communication to blend uncritically."[207]

The dominant category in Knox and Goodrum's survey, unsurprisingly, calls for the merging of theory and practice. According to the authors, essays in this category comprise the larger body of the literature and offer diverse approaches to crafting curricular balance. Knox and Goodrum point out that "some of those writing in this vein believe that situating journalism within the broader context of communication or critical discourse studies offers a solution to the theory/praxis conflict."[208] They note that "this

---

[205] Mike Gasher, "It's Time to Redefine Journalism Education in Canada," p. 667. / The author is critiquing Medsger's keynote address entitled "Reconsidering those little questions: Who? What? When? Why? How? *Conference on Journalism Education. November 8, 2003* (Ryerson University, Toronto, ON) and her well-known study of journalism education, *Winds of Change: Challenges Confronting Journalism Education* (Arlington, VA: The Freedom Forum, 1996); please refer to the bibliography of this dissertation.
[206] James Carey, "Some Personal Notes on US Journalism Education," p. 23.
[207] G. Stuart Adam, "Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice," p. 73.
[208] Knox and Goodrum, *Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope,* p. 5.

view contends that communication provides the theoretical framework within which journalism is practiced," while, on the other hand, other scholars contend that journalism must be seen as an academic discipline in its own right – separate from communication studies, and having a distinct body of research and practice.[209] Their goal is to promote journalism theory, journalism research and professional education in journalism with a critical perspective on its specific functions, structures and practice.

As noted previously, this case is clearly made by Howard Tumber, Michael Bromley and Barbie Zelizer, who acknowledge that "the status of journalism has always been indeterminate as a profession or a craft." Following the disclaimer, the authors argue that "over the past 30 years, however, as a field of study, the character of its indeterminacy has changed, as has the need to be more directed about how we think of journalism and journalism study. This is therefore an opportune time for the launch of this new Journal."[210] Likewise, the editorial team of *Journalism Studies* – comprised by Bob Franklin, Gerd G. Kopper. Elizabeth Toth, and Judy Vanslyke Turk highlights the need for the provision of "a global, critical forum for journalists, academics, journalism trainers and students of journalism, to debate the central issues confronting journalism understood both as a subject focus for scholarly and intellectual inquiry and as a field of professional practice."[211]

---

[209] Ibid., p. 5.
[210] Howard Tumber, Michael Bromley, and Barbie Zelizer. "Editorial." *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism* 1, no. 1 (April 1, 2000), p. 5.
[211] Bob Franklin, Gerd G. Kopper, Elizabeth Toth, and Judy VanSlyke Turk, "Editorial," *Journalism Studies* 1, no. 1 (December 2000), p. 5.

Conclusion

Theodore Glasser explains that rise of 'media studies' and now 'journalism studies,' along with the beginning of the demise of 'mass communication,' which never attracted the 'studies' appendage, "amounts to something more than a change in nomenclature." According to the author, "it represents, at least in some quarters, a shift in thinking about how to make sense of certain institutions and their practices; it marks a renewed interest in the humanities as an intellectual resource; it even implies some resistance to the notion that 'communication' provides the best or proper framework for the study of media and journalism."[1]

Calling for a critical approach to journalism based on critical communication theory, Skinner, Gasher and Crompton explain that the very structure of journalism faculties poses "one of the major difficulties in reforming journalism education" and that "putting these to practice at the level of news production is another matter entirely."[2] Paraphrasing Warren G. Bovee, the authors mention that "in both the literature on journalism education and in the classroom, *doing* journalism and *talking about* journalism are typically considered two different things."[3] And citing the editorial by Tumber, Bromley and Zelizer, they note that "journalism is taught almost everywhere chiefly by current and former practitioners whose academic groundings rarely intersect with the media/communication/cultural studies constituency."[4]

---

[1] Theodore L. Glasser, "Journalism Studies and the Education of Journalists," *Journalism Studies* 7, No. 1 (2006), p. 146.
[2] Skinner et al., p. 344.
[3] Ibid., p. 344. The authors cite Warren G. Bovee, *Discovering Journalism*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999).
[4] Ibid., p. 344.

Stephen Reese points out that the professional role of journalism education is often equated with that of other professional schools, but

> the role of most journalists in media organizations is more subordinate than that of their counterparts in law firms or medical practices. Those professionals are preeminent over their employers in their adherence to a transcendent code of conduct, and the organization or partnership exists to support the professional activity. Likewise, restricted access to the learned professions by way of academic credentials means that education critics from professional communities of law, medicine, engineering, and so forth, start from a common basis of shared university experience. No such expectation can be made for the diverse practitioners of journalism, which requires no license.[5]

So "the emphasis remains on skills development to produce employable graduates who are ready to pull their weight in the time-constrained 'miracle' of industrial news production," but

> the problem is that *much of this method is presented uncritically, as simply 'the way it is'*. Students 'learn by doing' and serious study of the larger ideological dimensions of news values, story form and narrative structure, and the commercial influences on principles of layout and design, is rendered secondary to skills acquisition. What is missing from this craft-based approach is a clear understanding that *news production is, in fact, the convergence of theory and practice, and that any attempt to provide fair, balanced and accurate depictions of events involves much more than a simple presentation of 'the facts'*. This is tantamount to having a method that denies any relation to epistemology. Students are taught a way of seeing and presenting the world without fully understanding the reasons why they are employing a particular method or the impact that the tools they utilize have on the depictions they render. *There is little understanding that their methods yield very particular ways of seeing, and ultimately, ways of knowing the world.*[6] (italics mine)

So if journalism is a "hybrid, interdisciplinary mix of the humanities and the social sciences, and lies somewhere between professional and academic in its outlook,"[7] how can the gap between 'theory' and 'practice' be bridged? Skinner, Gasher and Crompton summarize some of the proposed ways of incorporating critical perspectives

[5] Reese, Stephen D. "The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education: Recasting the Academic versus Professional Debate" in *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics* 4, No. 4 (1999), p. 75.
[6] Skinner et al., p. 345
[7] Reese "The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education," p. 72.

into journalism education, ranging from supplementing the existing curriculum to "more radical measures."[8] Stephen D. Reese and Jeremy Cohen call for "a broader educational commitment to the professionalism of scholarship, as opposed to the more conventional view of media 'professionalism' in the academy increasingly promoted by the media industry," and argue for a view of academic professionalism that is based on a broader social responsibility.[9] Highlighting journalism's rejection by both the industry and the more traditional liberal arts disciplines, the authors propose a move from the occupation of an academic 'no man's land' to the consideration of these margins as a "fruitful academic intersection" instead.[10] Peter Parisi draws attention to journalism education's disregard for its own larger historical and cultural dimensions, thus logically failing to reinforce a liberal arts curriculum.[11] Parisi therefore proposes a shift from this liberal arts emphasis to one including critical, cultural, or qualitative studies, for they provide clearer focus and greater coherence for journalism education.[12] Dennis M. Wilkins also proposes journalistic coursework "that instills in journalists-to-be a sense of membership in a social process that leads to such reflective public judgment" as a necessary element in journalism education, and all undergraduate education for that matter.[13] Les Switzer, John McNamara and Michael Ryan identify key issues and implications for mass communication research and teaching, and we suggest ways in which educators can apply

[8] Skinner et al., p. 345.
[9] Reese and Cohen, p. 213.
[10] Ibid., p 213.
[11] Peter Parisi, "Critical Studies, the Liberal Arts, and Journalism Education," *Journalism Educator* 46, no. 4 (Winter 1992), p. 7.
[12] Skinner et al., p. 347.
[13] Dennis M. Wilkins, "Recommendations for curricula that stress reflective thinking," *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 53, no. 1 (Spring 1998), p. 73.

critical-cultural approaches to the teaching of mass communication.[14] Warren G. Bovée argues that the consideration of what one is doing lies at the very core of any professional education.[15] Bovée calls for an education perspective that keeps the practice of journalism at the centre of its curriculum, while drawing heavily on the liberal arts which, in his view, allows for the development of what can be truly described as knowledge, as judgment: as seen primarily in the powers of judgment that it provides.[16] Finally, Skinner et al. highlight the self-reflexivity among reporters advocated by Jay Rosen and Davis Merritt, who they deem "the principal proponents of public or civic journalism," and salute for championing the need to bring theory and practice closer together. Rosen and Davis demand journalists question their role as impartial presenters of facts and shift their attention to, instead, the narrative structures which produce 'facts' and their signification. Skinner, Gasher and Crompton conclude that

> Clearly, however, the aim of developing a more critical curriculum should not be to undermine the practical elements of journalism education. Rather, the point is to enhance students' understanding of their professional practice, encourage them to develop more incisive powers of observation and description and give them a sense of the power they wield.[17]

This idea should be at the core of the pedagogy of journalism: an approach that imbues journalism courses with a multidisciplinary theoretical framework that accompanies the professional practice in order to equip students with a vital set of analytical, critical, and research skills. If our mandate, as journalists, is to serve a reader, as journalism educators, it is to provide our students with the necessary skills to engage in this mandate in a critical fashion. How do we operate within the limitations of

---

[14] Les Switzer, John McNamara, and Michael Ryan, "Critical-Cultural Studies in Research and Instruction," *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 54, no. 3 (1999), p. 23.
[15] Warren G. Bovée, *Discovering Journalism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 170.
[16] Ibid., p. 178.
[17] Skinner et al, pp. 347-8.

objectivity, fairness, balance? What other ideals could be useful when it comes to informing a reader? And how *do* we inform a reader? How do we decide what s/he needs to know? How do we 'produce' and 'deliver' news?

Following this dissertation's study of how the journalism profession comes to be defined and institutionalized; I would like to propose a look at John Hartley's idea of journalism in a *redactional* society. Hartley notes that "as Antonio Gramsci once pointed out, the fact that anyone can think, cook an egg or sew on a button doesn't make them intellectuals, chefs or tailors: there's a difference between personal capacities and social functions. This social function of the journalist may be termed redactional."[18] Referring to a redactional society as one in which editorial practices determine what is understood to be true, along with the policies and beliefs that follow from that, Hartley proceeds to ask:

> Is it possible to tell a society by how it edits? Is redaction a symptom of the social? Can a period be identified by how it brings 'matter into a certain form'; how it reduces '(a person or thing) to a certain state, condition or action'? Are we in a period where it is not information, knowledge or culture as such that determine the age but how they are handled? If so, then a redactional society is one where such processes are primary, where matter is reduced, revised, prepared, published, edited, adapted, shortened, abridged to produce, in turn, the new(s).[19]

More questions and arguments follow:

> In such a society, the journalist is well placed indeed, not as an original writer, but as a professional *redactor*. Such a model of journalism emphasizes the knowledge-processing skills of research, précis, editing, organizing, presenting. Reporting is the reprocessing of existing discourse. But redactional journalism is not dedicated to the same ends as public-sphere journalism inherited from previous media; it doesn't have the same agenda-setting function for public affairs and decision-making as does traditional editing by editors (which is why I am avoiding the more familiar term).[20]

---

[18] John Hartley, "Communicative democracy in a redactional society: the future of journalism studies" in *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism* 1, No. 1 (2000), p. 43.
[19] Ibid., p. 44.
[20] Ibid., p. 44.

A discussion around redactional versus public-sphere journalism, agenda-setting media, the age of information, knowledge, culture, 'mattering' and 'reduction' to a state, condition or action (to borrow just a few concept used and mentioned in Hartley's debate of the social function of the journalist) would take the original question I posed in the introduction of this dissertation – how is journalism to be taken seriously? – and the contributions of writers as Gabriel García Márquez to a whole other level. A vast number of (new) concepts and concerns around the treatment of journalism, and the professional organization of journalism itself, have emerged in the past decades: public journalism, citizen journalism, participatory journalism, civic journalism, development(al) journalism, peace journalism, 'green'/eco journalism, social responsibility journalism, to name but a few. Barbie Zelizer points out that her work "suggests that the reigning definition of journalism may not be the most inclusive way of defining who counts as a journalist. For as the practices, forms, and technologies for news gathering and news presentation increase in variety, demeanor, and number, the existing body of scholarly material shrinks in relevance.[21] She argues that we should currently consider a repertoire of candidates that would not currently merit membership under the narrowed definition of journalism: *A Current Affair,* MTV's *This Week in Rock*, internet listservs, Jon Stewart, www.nakednews.com, reporters for the Weather Channel, and rap music being a few that come to mind.[22]

There is no question that shifts in the definition of journalism have produced shifts in all aspects of journalism education, as anticipated. The academy has responded to this trend via the formation of new journalism programs, many of them at the master's level,

[21] Zelizer, *Taking Journalism Seriously*, p. 6
[22] Ibid., p. 6

new departments, and master's in journalism studies in universities and colleges, on one hand. The recent creation of two new international journals in the field – *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism* (Sage) and *Journalism Studies* (Routledge) – arguably helps to promote journalism theory, journalism research and professional education in journalism with a critical perspective on its specific functions, structures and practice.

This brings us to the central point of this dissertation on the institutionalization of journalism, and the central questions that have yet to be addressed by scholars working under the assumption that "journalism is becoming an increasingly autonomous field of study."[23] Defined by the rhetorics of expansion and renewal, the field of journalism studies must be deconstructed by mapping the following debates: Is there a field of journalism studies? Is there 'something' that can be called journalism studies? Where does it come from? What makes it a 'new' or 'emerging' field? How do different traditions of journalism studies construct "news" and "journalism" as objects of study? How does a wide array of theoretical, epistemological and methodological approaches, "all of which are united around an interest in journalism and that share the aim of enhancing existing understandings of how journalism works,"[24] address the claim of working across temporal and geographic contexts? How do different traditions of "journalism studies" differ from one national-cultural context to another? In the case of journalism education, how do academics handle the difficulties of offering a "critical" approach to phenomena while teaching students practical skills with some use to those seeking professional careers? If it does not belong in the social sciences, or the

[23] Please refer to Appendices E and F in this dissertation.
[24] Please refer to Appendix E in this dissertation.

humanities, where is its place? What about its marriage of convenience to communication studies?

One of the potential solutions to the questions posed in the literature on the future of journalism education is G. Stuart Adam's call for the reorganization of the fields of journalism ("neatly divided into professional practices, ethics, communication and society, communication theory, communication law, and so on" but "they are not linked in a manner which makes them seem like elements in a single body of knowledge" and seem to have an independence, one from another, connected neither by method nor object of inquiry") into a single field of Journalism Studies.[25] This field would contain five sub-fields: *the philosophy of journalism* (including the history of the idea of freedom of expression, the moral claims of journalists, the 'meaning' of journalistic work and analysis of journalism's intentions and goals); *the range of professional practices and methods employed by journalists* (including newsgathering, writing, editing, layout and design, and radio, television and film techniques); the social and political context (locating "communications systems in the landscape of power, social structure, culture and behavior"), criticism ("the thoughtful reflections on the moral, technical, intellectual and artistic achievements of journalists"); and methodology ("the self-conscious development and evaluation of the methods by which we create knowledge").[26]

I shall conclude my dissertation with Adam's description/definition of Journalism Studies: "A branch of the humanities and the social sciences [that] shares with them the methodological dilemmas, curiosities and disputes of other disciplines."[27] This definition locates the place ideal of Journalism Studies in the academy, where I believe imminent

[25] Adam, "Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice," p. 77.
[26] Skinner et al., p. 348.
[27] Adam, p. 77.

ideas, scholarship, critiques, research, and ultimately education in the field will be produced. The treatment of Journalism Studies as a field is arguably the path to embark on in other to produce critical journalism scholarship – and journalists who approach and practice the profession critically.

Appendices

Appendix A

The Hosmer Pamphlet: The Making of a Journalist

Why a Technical and a Professional School is Needed
An article by Dr. George W. Hosmer[1]

Newspapers are a necessary part of the life of the time in civilized countries. No city is without one; all great cities have many, and their prevalence is in proportion to the enlightenment of countries and cities. Indeed, the existence of a public opinion and its activity as a political and moral force are indicated by the number and quality of the newspapers the nation supports.

With us the newspapers are the bread of life, and it is difficult to say whether they are more a cause or a consequence; for while one can definitely trace the influence upon public profess and events of their enormous fertility of suggestion, argument illustration, and evidence we must realize that they amplify the product and expression of the mind of the community in which they flourish. One cannot imagine an American city without its great dailies; one cannot imagine these dailies in the cities of any other country; and the reason is that in the various countries the newspaper responds to the qualities of the people.

There are from fifteen to twenty million families in this country. There are certainly many which seldom see a newspaper, but we may safely assume that the newspapers reach ten million firesides every day. For if we count half the total number of papers as circulating only one thousand copies each, and the other half as varying between five and fifty thousand each, and with a small number having one hundred thousand daily, and still a smaller number running far above this, we may compute that no less than 20,000,000 copies of newspapers reach the people every day, each loaded with its budget of news from all the world, and with its chronicle of local stories, and each one also vivid with arguments that appeal to the people as taking one side or another in the great issues of the day, making each man a party to the common public debate which is the life of the time, and inspiring each atom individually with the passion and energy of that life.

---

[1] In 1903 Joseph Pulitzer set in motion a series of events that raised journalism education from just an idea to a full-fledged movement. Pulitzer directed his personal secretary, Dr. George W. Hosmer, to author a pamphlet entitled "The Making of a Journalist: Why a Technical and a Professional School is Needed." Hosmer was to present the pamphlet to Harvard University President Charles Eliot and new Columbia University President Nicholas Murray Butler, asking each rector if he found the pamphlet's main idea acceptable, and informing them that an anonymous friend was interested in making a large donation to establish a school of journalism on his campus. Both presidents gave their enthusiastic support.

This pamphlet was secured from the library of the late Joseph Pulitzer by Columbia doctoral candidate De Forest O'Dell, who included it as an appendix in his own dissertation, *The history of journalism education in the United States* (Columbia University, 1935), acknowledging Ralph Pulitzer, Joseph Pulitzer's son, for access to this material.

From these printed sheets many millions of men and women obtain all the knowledge they possess of human affairs outside their own narrow life. The common school, which taught each one to read, and perhaps taught but little more, had this enormous consequence – that it opened for them all this immense storehouse of information. They have the activities of the world set before them. They are "the heirs of all the ages"; and one may read in any little cabin on the Mississippi the story of all that has happened from Lapland to Peru for a day, and men are so accustomed to this miracle of news that it is commonplace to them. But the paper feeds their minds. They read it again and again; they think it over; they reason upon it; they care the chronicle with them from day to day; they live in a greater world than their own; their minds acquire a larger scope and capacity. They form opinions, shaped more or less by their paper.

II

The great institutions of learning and their annual output of boys and girls are an immense force; but those institutions teach ten per cent of the population, and the newspapers are read by that ten per cent, and in addition by nearly all the other ninety per cent. Every newspaper is a unit in this system.

There are 2,000 daily papers in the United States, and not so many in all the rest of the world together. Ours is preeminently the country where the whole people have kept that rational curiosity which is the beginning of knowledge, and where the appetite for news is always keen and universal. And it is also the country where an enlightened public is more powerful than any other single force; and the newspapers are the organs of the common mind in developing, shaping, and declaring that opinion. In no other country has the press the absolute freedom which is essential to this function, for with us the press is free from every restraint except that of public opinion itself.

By whom is this immense force wielded? What sort of men are they who control this aggregate influence of 2,000 daily papers? These men are, in the average communities, certainly above the average of the people for information, for energy and enterprise, for intellectual alertness, for readiness, for common sense, often for some peculiar talent, and in short for all the qualities that are likely to count for success in life, because they gain their positions in a practical competition in which the possessor of such qualities is commonly the winner. In the discharge of their daily duties they are required to possess general, almost universal information, a great store of special technical knowledge, and the habit of laboring in difficult circumstances, by exercising a calm judgment in moments of excitement, and of sudden and certain decision.

III

How and where to they acquire the instruction that prepares them for these duties? They have acquired it as all "arts and mysteries" were acquired hundreds of thousands of years ago – that is to say, by a system virtually equivalent to the old-fashioned apprenticeship to any mechanical operation. Just as a shoemaker learns his trade in a shoemaker's shop, working at shoes under the eye of an old shoemaker, so the newspaper man obtains that special knowledge of this craft or pursuit only in establishments where newspapers are made, working under the direction of men whose knowledge was

acquired in the same way. And this one of the professions, in some points of view more important to society than all the others, is the only one upon which men may enter without any previous special preparation. This seems a small foundation for so great an edifice.

In over other pursuit where men are under an equal moral responsibility to the public for the proper discharge of their duties they are prepared for those duties by years of careful and conscientious study. The lawyer, who may imperil your fortune by ten lines of erroneous legal advice, the doctor, in whose opinion, good or bad, may repose all the possibilities of life and death for those whom you may love – from these men the State exacts, as a rule, from eight to ten years of arduous preparation; but the newspaper men, who are in some respects the instructors of the nation, who convey the intelligence of every want and interpret the meaning of every event to seventy millions of people – they are supposed to require no preparation whatsoever for their delicate and important duties.

There are special schools of instruction for lawyers, doctors, theologians, soldiers, teachers, engineers, artists; yet there is not one who undertakes to instruct students in the correct principles and practices of journalism. Yet it is over a hundred years since Thomas Jefferson said: "The basis of our Government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that opinion right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a Government without newspapers or newspapers without a Government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter."

IV

All other high pursuits have become learned professions; but journalism lingers in the primitive condition. The time is not remote when the old-fashioned doctor or lawyer in the countries of Western Europe laughed to scorn the notion that his art or science could be taught in a school, just as certain men now smile with scorn at the notion that journalism can be taught. But the prejudice is now no longer against the school, but against the practitioner in a learned profession who endeavors to get on without special training.

V

How was the great change to which the world owes the development for the learned professions accomplished against all the prejudices of the old system?

It was contemporary with the rise of the universities; the universities did not produce the change. On the contrary, the universities themselves were the product of the professional schools. Bologna was probably the earliest of the universities, but its foundation was a law school. It was primarily a seat of instruction in the civil war. Men went to Bologna from all the countries of Europe first to study law as a science, and from this concourse arose the university; the university organization began about fifty years later than the establishment there of a scientific school of medicine. Therefore two professional schools were the foundations upon which the university arose, and the general educational course was a consequence, not a cause.

Thus the universities responded to the need of the time. Men were just opening their eyes to the truth that all the facts they knew about several great pursuits could be grouped and classified under the head of certain great principles.

Dr. James Stuart in his rectorial address at St. Andrew's in 1898, said very happily: "Universities arose because certain callings of numbers of men, up to that time without order, had become capable of scientific exposition, had ceased to be a mere piling up of rule-of-thumb particulars, and had become intelligibly and recognizably based on certain leading principles."

Professional studies did not, therefore, force their way into the universities, but the universities increased their power and usefulness partly because they adopted and systematized professional studies; the university thrives as it provides what the age demands.

VI

The engineer who has not been properly equipped by technical study no longer holds the first place in great enterprises and the supervision of the magnificent edifices that are going up in all our cities today would never be intrusted to men who had not learned all that is to be learned in the schools of architecture. Even music is no longer thumped into a boy's head by his father's knuckles, as it was thumped into the head of Beethoven; and in France, the one country that possesses a living drama, the stage is accessible only to men and women who have passed through years of arduous preliminary preparation.

Armed force, the potential agency in the history of states and dynasties, is now taught in professional schools, and this change has been of immense advantage to mankind in removing the overwhelming influence of the individual conqueror. For a conqueror became supreme in other days because he alone of his generation had the genius to perceive and to apply to given cases the very few and very simple principles of the art of war, whereas every year military colleges of the present time produce youngsters who would be fit to meet Hannibal himself.

VII

It is not creditable to newspaper men that they have in great part ridiculed the idea that true journalism should be founded on fixed principles, and that the profession should be taught as all the higher professions are. It is often said that "you cannot by teaching make an editor"; that is to say, that there are qualities called for in the newspaper profession that are superior to the possibilities of instruction, and without which, as inborn attributes of the man, success is impossible.

This may be true. Let us suppose that it is. Is there any reason to assume that there will come into the profession from a school fewer men with these inborn attributes than now come into it from the wayside? And is it not probable that the preliminary instruction would be an advantage even to the man of genius? Napoleon Bonaparte brought to the practice of the art of war personal qualities phenomenally exceptional. Was his success less splendid because he had gone through a military school? We may recognize that all the military schools in the world could not have made a Bonaparte out

of a commonplace fellow; but for the school Bonaparte himself might have been one of the many clever men who perished early in the Revolution, before a good chance came to him; but with the man and the school the great result was inevitable.

Even if there are men to whom instruction of any sort is a superfluity, how large a part of the profession do these men constitute? Should we because of the phenomenal men, of whom there may be only two or three in a generation, deprive of a great advantage an army of men who are not phenomenal, but only clever, intelligent, perspicacious, industrious, and earnest?

VIII

Professional instruction does not aim to produce the exceptional man in any sphere, for he produces himself, and is commonly independent of instruction. But the aim is to give to the man of good min, ample intelligence, and a settled purpose that equipment in knowledge and training which will qualify him to perform certain special duties to which, in the absence of professional schools, men come practically destitute of such equipment. In a professional school men are taught their duties from the standpoint of the experience of many generations, including the experience of the man of genius as well; and thus because "everybody knows more than anybody," the good student, though not a genius himself, may come to stand up on a level made by men who had brought to the solution of the problems of that profession all the resources of the greatest intellects.

In law, in medicine, in every professional there come forward year by year and generation by generation men possessed of the peculiar qualifications that make them great in their pursuits in quite as large a proportion as similar men appear in the newspaper world, and yet nobody says that you cannot make a great doctor or lawyer in the regular course of professional study. One the contrary, nobody imagines that these can be produced in any other way. What is the reason for this difference? Is it not entirely due to the fact that men have grown used to the idea that a course of professional study is a necessary introduction to all the other intellectual pursuits save that of journalism?

IX

In considering a professional course for newspaper men the inquiry will obviously arise; What are the bases of this instruction? What will you teach? If a newspaper man is asked, What does a journalist need to know? His answer will be, Everything. Two thousand years ago Cicero gave the same answer to the question concerning the knowledge required by an orator; and every physician will recognize today that the possibilities of his own science are limited by the fact that he does not yet know everything about the human body. Nobody, however, does know everything, and yet several professions go on and are practiced successfully everywhere. Consequently, it is possible to get on with less than universal knowledge; and we need to define what this smaller quantity is – what is the absolutely essential without which to go on is impossible, for upon that as a foundation, growth toward a large knowledge will inevitably follow.

The newspaper man must be qualified for his higher profession, first, by ample information, much of which is already included in collegiate courses as history,

geography, political science, international relations, economics, and particularly the study of the English language; second, by acquiring much special information that is at present not taught outside the newspaper offices. This knowledge must be analyzed, classified, and systematized, so that it may be conveyed by oral instruction, preferably by newspaper men themselves, as none others are likely to know those things, at least in the beginning.

There is much more to learn that there used to be, because the business has become so great, so complex, and so specialized in separate departments, in recent years. From every climate under the sun, from every scene of great activity, from every battlefield, from great cities and small towns, from strike regions and from centers of fashionable frivolity, there pour into a great newspaper office every night the innumerable small currents of a story that make up the vast stream of human history; and all this must pass through the hands of a little army of men widely and variously instructed, in order that it may be prepared and printed with amazing rapidity that the description of a battle in the middle of Europe or Asia is read in well-digested from at the breakfast table in New York the next morning. All this is done well if the men who do it are properly qualified, and not otherwise. The reporter with whom originates the first account of what has happened must be a trained and accurate observer, with the capacity to write a clear account of what he sees or hears, and with the practiced intelligence that almost instinctively seizes the critical act or word. He is the world's witness for the history of great occasions. He is not born. He must be made. In his best phase he is the rare product of experience; but every part of his function can be taught, and is taught today in hard and painful and wasteful ways in the actual performance of duty. Some few years spent in studies derived from the experience of others would be greatly helpful to him; and the same is true of all the men through whose hands his news report must pass before it figures in the graceful and effective "make-up" in which it reaches at least the eye of the reader.

Is it not plain that the journalist needs, more than most men, to be trained in the best methods of ascertaining the truth? To know the facts about contemporary life, to discover and to record what is happening of public importance is the first duty of the journalist; ignorance of the facts and indifference to truth is the commonest, as well as the surest, sign of incompetence in the journalist. Surely there is need of special schooling on this point, and the principle lies at the very foundation of the successful and honorably practice of journalism.

X

In any course of special instruction due importance should be given to that division in the life of the newspaper in virtue of which it is on one side a chronicle and on the other side an instrument of enlightened opinion – the vehicle by which the intelligence of any given time may exercise its proper function upon the minds and acts of men, always too much swayed by passion and prejudice.

What can be taught as to the editorial page? Perhaps very little. And yet a professional school could not honestly discharge its duty if it did not show that no editorial page not honestly standing for the right has ever had any value or any influence; that mean motives, the narrow partisan spirit, the endeavor to utilize credit for the

exploitation of financial projects necessarily make the page worthless as a propagator of opinion by destroying public faith in its honesty.

XI

In this proposition there lies, we believe, the possibility of great advantage to the profession itself, to the individual newspaper man and to the state. If the newspaper press is, as Jefferson held, of more certain advantage to the public welfare than government itself, if it is the one most effective agency through which the mind of the people may be reached by its best intelligence – all this implies great obligations, and we ought to endeavor to give the newspaper a standing in the world on the level with those obligations. There is a change which would tend to its more favorable development; would raise the press to a higher plan by providing a superior equipment for the men engaged in the profession; would attract men whose capacity and character would do much to overcome a general prejudice; would, in short, put it side by side with the other great professions in public esteem.

It would perhaps be the most energetic corrective of that bad side of newspaper progress which tends to exaggerate its merely commercial aspect and to postpone all other considerations to those of finance. Developed too much in that direction, the newspaper press will certainly disappoint all hopes for its future; and it is the encouragement of its growth upon the lines of its moral, political and intellectual relation to the public mind that alone can overcome that tendency.

XII

The newspaper press has grown to its present status very much at random and in great part upon ideas that had no relations to what may be perceived now are its impossibilities. It has grown like some great force in nature that never contemplates consequences.

Representation of the people was at first the device of the tyranny. Delegates were called only to facilitate the schemes of kinds in forcing the purse strings of the people. But the people were not slow to perceive that such assemblies could serve other purposes. Courts were formed to declare the will of princes, and became the strongholds of opposition to princes. And the press, at first a mere chronicle of small events, has grown to us to be an institution more potent than congresses, courts, or armies in government of the nation. For the United States public opinion is sovereign and the newspapers focus and culminate public opinion. Is it not time that this institution, of such vast power in the life of the nation, should be developed on the higher plane of enlarged and enlightened study?

Appendix B

A Blueprint for a School of Journalism

With fourteen recommendations for the Iowa School
By Wilbur Schramm, September 1942[2]

I am going to draw a blueprint for a different kind of School of Journalism.

In one sense it is a very old kind, and in another sense, very new. It is different chiefly because it begins with different answers to a basic question: Where does the study of journalism belong in a university?

Schools of journalism have been considerably bothered by that question. Searching for the particular corner of the academic system which might be called the peculiar and individual property of journalism, they have turned the subject in upon itself, and established course after course in techniques. The theory has seemed to be that to prove its responsibility a School of Journalism must be complete in itself – it must be able to offer as complete a series of technical courses as a law school or medical school, and the journalism graduate must be a scientific specialist even as a young dental graduate is a specialist.

I should like to suggest a reversal of that pattern. I should like to propose a school of Journalism that would be inclusive, not exclusive; that would not try to be complete in itself, but would draw upon all the resources or the university of its completion; that would be shamelessly say, <u>the most important things that a university has to give a young journalist are outside the pattern of technical journalist</u>. (underlined original)

I should like to see the kind of School of Journalism that would be not as weak as itself, but as strong as the university. Not a group of teachers and students sitting on the periphery of the university, playing with their toys, putting together the picture puzzles of who, what, where, and when in the first paragraph – not that, but a School that would be in the very heart of the university, which would begin with the assumption that the students it wants to produce will be the students in the whole university best equipped to understand and talk about the world they live in, a School that would not be regarded apologetically as a concession to demands for vocational training, a School that would be doing exactly what the university is set up to do – prepare awakened, inquiring, balanced, articulate minds.

Let us see whether we can draw a policy for such a school.

The craft of journalism is best learned under actual working conditions, as the craft of baseball is best learned by playing with good players. Therefore, one duty of the

[2] Original in University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City. Reproduced with permission.

School of Journalism is to give the student a chance to learn by doing. The university can concentrate and distill the journalist's apprenticeship in the same way a medical internship concentrates and distills the experience of medicine. In order to accomplish this at Iowa, I would suggest:

1. That the technical training in residence be handled in a system of workshop classes in connection with *The Daily Iowan,* the radio station, and other laboratories of communication – these classes to be conceived as a kind of rotating internship.
2. That arrangements be made with such newspapers as the *Des Moines Register* to take students for short periods of apprenticeship, and that not student be allowed to graduate without serving such an apprenticeship in some field of communication.

But that is merely a substitute for something which can be learned as well, though not always as quickly, off the campus. The particular service a university has to give a young journalist is to offer him an opportunity to become an educated man. A university can open windows for him on the past, the present, and the future. It can offer him a wealth of knowledge about things and men and ideas which will help him to write with the understanding and penetration of the world he lives in. It can awaken his mind, broaden his vision, and at the same time make him a specialist in some field of his choice. The university can train a skilled hack only as well as a city room can train him; but it can help a young journalist to become an intelligent and informed journalist in a way no city room can possibly do. It can train a police court reporter only as well as a newspaper city room can train him; but a city room cannot train a Walter Lippmann.

Therefore, I suggest:

3. That the student of journalism be encouraged to seek the broadest possible program in science, the social sciences, and the humanities, and that whenever possible these departments be encouraged to offer small discussion courses for journalists, and that there be a few lecture courses as possible for journalism students.
4. That every student of journalism be expected to complete the equivalent of 24 hours, including freshman work, in a subject outside journalism – the subject to be conceived in a broad sense.

Furthermore, this School of Journalism must be intensely concerned with what is new in journalism and thought, and it must be at the van of the procession. As the world changes, journalism changes with it. In the last few years we have seen a new journalism growing up on the heels of technological and social changes; spot news coverage by radio replacing spot news coverage by newspapers; the radio news flash reducing the newspaper's power to break news; the newspaper driven more and more to commentary, review, and documentation, thus entering territory chiefly occupied by magazines; the newspaper driven to the commissioned long narrative (such as the *Chicago Tribune*'s Story of the Coral Sea Battle) and thus entering the territory of magazines and books;

such experiments as the news magazine *Time* suggesting considerable notification in the traditional news style; such experiences as PM casting doubts on the former balance of advertiser-appeal and reader-appeal; developments in television and reproduction by radio opening up challenging possibilities in news coverage and transmission. In the face of such commanding changes, the School cannot remain static. It must be sensitive to the new, and still critical. It must ally itself with the most successful practitioners of and the most vigorous and liberal thinkers about writing, editing, and publishing – and to good thinking and good writing in general.

Therefore, I suggest:

5. That radio news coverage be considered to be a legitimate and important part of modern journalism, that it be given a place or appropriate importance in the curriculum of the School, and that in order to effect this a very close alliance be formed with the university radio station.
6. That everything possible be done to encourage good – as opposed to adequate technical – writing in journalists and that, as means of implementing this, a very close alliance be formed with the Writers Workshop.
7. That an Advisory Committee of national scope – for example, Lipmann, Luce, Cowles, Daniels, Waynack, Harcourt, Weeks – be created.
8. That frequent visits by the livest thinkers and most successful practitioners in the journalist field be made possible in order to bring the students into touch with all that is best and newest in the profession.

This School of Journalism will not interpret the word "Journalism" narrowly to refer only to newspapers. It will recognize the important relation of journalism to radio. It will recognize also its relation to "journalism" in general, and to good writing of all kinds. It will be concerned with the problems of magazine and book editing and publishing, with the problems of design, lay-out, and printing, with the problems of advertising and public relations which are so large a part of all publishing. Above all, this School of Journalism will be concerned with the publishing program of its own university.

Therefore, I suggest:

9. That as soon as national conditions are propitious, a magazine of modern problems and modern writing, corresponding to the *Virginia Quarterly Review,* be founded and published by the School of Journalism in cooperation with the School of Letters and other departments of the university. This magazine should replace certain other journals now published on the campus.
10. That students be afforded an opportunity to prepare themselves for a career in editing and publishing magazines and books. This work is much asked for, and only one college in the country makes any pretense at meeting the demand.
11. That the university editorship reside in the School of Journalism.

12. That work be offered in advertising and public relations in cooperation with the College of Commerce and the Department of Psychology.
13. That work be offered in printing and design in cooperation with the Department of Art, that a small hand-pres be provided, that students be encouraged to set up and print student writing, and that every student of journalism be urged to set some type, design and print something before he graduates, in order that he may fully understand his business.
14. That the School of Journalism be very closely connected with the university service of publicity and the university Department of Publications.

There is no School of Journalism like this in existence. This School will take a few years to build; the plant must be retolled before it can produce. But given is fair share of raw materials it will produce richly. And its production, I confidently believe, will make an answer to the disturbing accusation so often flung at American university: that the leading journalistic writers have not graduated from Schools of Journalism.

Wilbur Schramm
September 1942

Appendix C

Journalist's Creed
by Walter Williams[3]

I believe in the profession of journalism.

I believe that the public journal is a public trust; that all connected with it are, to the full measure of their responsibility, trustees for the public; that acceptance of a lesser service than the public service is betrayal of this trust.

I believe that clear thinking and clear statement, accuracy and fairness are fundamental to good journalism.

I believe that a journalist should write only what he holds in his heart to be true.

I believe that suppression of the news, for any consideration other than the welfare of society, is indefensible.

I believe that no one should write as a journalist what he would not say as a gentleman; that bribery by one's own pocketbook is as much to be avoided as bribery by the pocketbook of another; that individual responsibility may not be escaped by pleading another's instructions or another's dividends.

I believe that advertising, news and editorial columns should alike serve the best interests of readers; that a single standard of helpful truth and cleanness should prevail for all; that the supreme test of good journalism is the measure of its public service.

I believe that the journalism which succeeds best – and best deserves success – fears God and honors Man; is stoutly independent, unmoved by pride of opinion or greed of power, constructive, tolerant but never careless, self-controlled, patient, always respectful of its readers but always unafraid, is quickly indignant at injustice; is unswayed by the appeal of privilege or the clamor of the mob; seeks to give every man a chance and, as far as law and honest wage and recognition of human brotherhood can make it so, an equal chance; is profoundly patriotic while sincerely promoting international good will and cementing world-comradeship; is a journalism of humanity, of and for today's world.

[3] The Creed as it appeared in 2008 in the Missouri School of Journalism website, with the following introduction: "The Journalist's Creed was written by the first dean of the Missouri School of Journalism, Walter Williams. One century later, his declaration remains one of the clearest statements of the principles, values and standards of journalists throughout the world. The plaque bearing the creed is located on the main stairway to the second floor of Neff Hall."
Source: http://journalism.missouri.edu/about/creed.html

Appendix D

The early days of journalism education in the United States –
A timeline of key events, people and places

1869 – Establishment of the first **journalism course** at **Washington College** (now Washington and Lee University) as part of a program of scholarships to printers in the South by General Robert E. Lee

1871 – Yale University offers the study and discussion of journalistic trends in literature and history on a regular schedule
1873 – Kansas State College offers a course in printing
1878 – University of Missouri sets up a course in news writing
1884 – University of Missouri sets up a course entitled "Materials of Journalism"
1892 – Iowa State University begins to offer journalism courses
1893 – Indiana University begins to offer journalism courses
1894 – University of Kansas begins to offer journalism courses
1895 – University of Michigan begins to offer journalism courses
1898 – University of Nebraska begins to offer journalism courses

1875 – First **degree in journalism** is offered by **Cornell University** by **President Andrew White**

1893 – Development of the first **organized curriculum in journalism** by the **University of Pennsylvania**, offering courses including journalism history, law and management, reporting and editing, current topics, and special lectures by visiting journalists

1901 – *The Daily Iowan* is first published at the **University of Iowa** following the merger of two existing campus newspapers

1903 – Publication in *The New York World* detailing **Joseph Pulitzer**'s plans for the operation of a proposed school of journalism at **Columbia University**, and his two-million dollar endowment

1908 – Establishment of the **School of Journalism** at the **University of Missouri** (the **first school of journalism in the United States,** and in the world), under University President A. Ross Hill and the work of **Walter Williams**

1912 – Establishment of the School of Journalism at the University of Wisconsin by **Willard Grosvenor Bleyer** (creator of the **first doctoral research program in journalism**)

Appendix E

Petition to the ICA for the establishment of a Journalism Studies Division

To: Michael Haley
Executive Director
International Communication Association

We, the undersigned, hereby petition the Executive Director of the International Communication Association (ICA) for authorization to form a Journalism Studies Interest Group in accordance to the ICA Bylaws, Article VII.

A large and growing number of scholars recognize and take part in the development of theory and research on journalism. As a result, journalism is becoming an increasingly autonomous field of study. Universities and colleges have responded to this trend with the formation of schools and departments dedicated to journalism. At the same time, the scientific community has created two new international journals in the field – *Journalism* (Sage) and *Journalism Studies* (Routledge) – along with several journals devoted to the inquiry of journalism at the national level.

These changes in professional organization match changes in journalism itself. Journalism has come to rival interpersonal communication as primary source of social co-orientation. In a normative sense, it is regarded as an essential part in the processes of democracy and social change. That journalism has become crucial to such concerns is indicated by our use of concepts such as: *public journalism, civic journalism*, *development(al) journalism,* and *peace journalism*.

Journalism, as the term is used here, is not identical with *the media,* which are the carriers of mass communication. Mass communication serves as a *vehicle* for a broad range of content such as journalism, public relations, propaganda, entertainment, or advertising. Journalism generates specific content to be distributed by several channels, including traditional media and interactive media. Journalism operates as a highly autonomous, though not completely independent system. It is, therefore, essential to explore how journalism and the content it generates interacts with other systems in society, including the media.

The purpose of the Interest Group is to promote journalism theory, journalism research, and professional education in journalism as well as to provide a critical perspective on its specific functions, structures, and practice. The Interest Group invites a wide array of theoretical, epistemological and methodological approaches, all of which are united around an interest in journalism and that share the aim of enhancing existing understandings of how journalism works, across temporal and geographic contexts. Central to the mission of the interest group is to explicate what we recognize intuitively but has become increasingly vague within both the academy and the profession: What is news? An Interest Group organized around the concept of journalism itself would be in a better position to address this question than other existing venues within ICA.

The Interest Group is intended to facilitate empirical research and to bring more coherence to research paradigms, and in so doing, to further support the professionalization of journalism studies and journalism education. Furthermore, while journalism is presently studied across the field, often the individuals behind these different research endeavors do not have a place to speak with each other. Creating an interest group with journalism's study as its focus will create a setting in which scholars employing different kinds of academic approaches can engage in dialogue. It would be a clearinghouse of sorts, for the wide range of scholarship on journalism.

_____	_____
Full name	Institution
_____	_____
Signature	Date

Appendix F – ICA Infosheet

NEW: Journalism Studies Interest Group at ICA

International Communication Association creates a section devoted to the study of journalism

A group of 100 active scholars concerned with the study of journalism has formed a Journalism Studies Interest Group at the International Communication Association's (ICA) annual conference in New Orleans this May. The initiators of the group reflect a wide range of scholars affiliated with academic institutions around the world who devote a great deal of research to journalism studies. The Interest Group will have program hours on its own allotted for the next ICA conference in New York, 26-30 May 2005.

Journalism studies: Growing in importance

Given the number of scholars engaging in the development of theory and research on journalism is growing, journalism is becoming an increasingly autonomous field of study. Universities and colleges, especially outside the USA, have responded to this trend with the formation of independent schools of journalism. The scientific community has created two new international journals in the field—*Journalism* and *Journalism Studies*—along with other journals devoted to the inquiry of journalism at the national level. These changes in professional organization reflect changes in journalism itself: Journalism has come to rival interpersonal communication as a primary source of social co-orientation. In a normative sense, it is regarded as an essential part in the processes of democracy and social change. That journalism has become crucial to such concerns is indicated by our use of concepts such as *public* and *civic journalism*, *development(al) journalism*, and *peace journalism*.

An interdisciplinary field

Journalism studies cuts across traditional academic boundaries. This is especially apparent by the rise of online communication, which to blurs the boundaries between mass communication and interpersonal communication. The study of journalism incorporates important issues with regard to technology (convergence and multimedia journalism), mass (media) communication, political communication, intercultural communication, health communication, popular communication (popular journalism), and gender studies (woman journalists). The new group emphasises the interdisciplinary nature of the field.

Academic dialogue needed

Certainly journalism is presently studied across the field; however, the individuals behind these different research endeavors often have no forum to communicate with one another. The first task for the Interest Group is, therefore, to create a platform with journalism's study as its foundation—from which scholars employing different kinds of theoretical and methodological approaches can engage in a dialogue. It will be a clearinghouse for the wide range of scholarship on journalism. Another important aim is to facilitate empirical research and bring more coherence to research paradigms. In so doing, the interest group would further support the professionalization of journalism studies and journalism education.

Promote theory, research and education

The overall purpose of the Interest Group is to promote journalism theory and research, and professional education in journalism—as well as to provide a critical perspective on its specific functions, structures, and practices. The group invites a wide array of theoretical, epistemological, and methodological approaches, all united around an interest in journalism and sharing the aim of enhancing existing understandings of how journalism works across temporal and geographic contexts. Central to the mission of the Interest Group are questions we recognize intuitively but whose answers have become increasingly vague within both the academy and the profession: What is news? What is journalism? Who are the people responsible for making decisions about what is news—and how do their backgrounds, education, attitudes, and beliefs influence these decisions?

Information:

Thomas Hanitzsch, Ilmenau University of Technology [thomas.hanitzsch@tu-ilmenau.de]

John Newhagen, University of Maryland [newhagen@umd.edu]

Mark Deuze, University of Amsterdam [m.j.p.deuze@uva.nl]

mailing-list: jsig@tu-ilmenau.de

Please see [www.icahdq.org] for membership information.

Appendix G

Of Printer's Devils

As I was going the other Day into *Lincolns-Inn*, (says a Writer in this Journal) under the great Gateway I met several Lads loaded with great Bundles of News-papers, which they brought from the Stamp Office. They were all exceeding black and dirty; from whence I inferr'd they were Printer's Devils, carrying from thence the Returns of unsold News-papers, after the Stamps had been cut off. They stopped under the Gateway, and there laid down their Loads; when one of them made the following Harange:
"Devils, Gentlemen, and Brethren, – Tho' I think we have no Reason to be ashamed on Account of the vulgar Opinion concerning the Origin of our Name, yet we ought to acknowledge ourselves obliged to the learned Herald, who, upon the Death of any Person of Title, constantly gives an exact Account of his ancient Family in my *London Evening Post*. He says, there was one Mons. Devile or DeVille, who came over with *William the Conqueror*, in Company with *De Laune*, *De Vic*, *De Val*, *D'Aspwood*, *D'Urfie*, *D'Umpling*, &c. One of the Sons of a Descendant of this Mons. *De Ville* was taken in by the famous *Caxton* in 1471, as an Errand Boy; was afterwards his Apprentice, and in Time an eminent Printer; from whom our Order took their Name – But suppose they took it from infernal Devils, 'twas not because they were Messengers frequently sent in Darkness, and appear'd very black, but upon a reputable Account: *viz*. *John Fust* or *Faustus*, of *Mentz* in *Germany*, was the Inventor of Printing; for which he was called a Conjurer, and his Art the *Black Art*. As he kept a constant Succession of Boys to run on Errands, who were always very black, these they called Devils: Some of whom being raised to be his Apprentices, he was said to have raised many a Devil. As to the inferior Order among us, called Flies, employ'd in taking News-papers off the Press, they are of latter Extraction, being no older than News-papers themselves. Mr. *Bailey* thinks, their original Name was *Lies*, taken from the Papers they so took off; and the Alteration occasion'd thus: To hasten these Boys, the Pressmen used to cry, *Flie*, *Lie*; which naturally naturally fell into one single word Lie. This Conjecture is confirmed by a like Corruption in the true Title of the Flying Post. – Since therefore we are both comprehended under the Title of *Devils*, let us discharge our Office with Diligence; so may we attain, as many of our Predecessors have done, to the Dignity of Printers, and to have an Opportunity of using others like poor Devils, as we have been used by them, or as they and Authors and used by Booksellers. These are an upstart Profession, who have engrossed the Business of Bookselling, which originally belong'd solely to our Masters. But let them remember, that, if we worship *Belial* and *Beelzebub* the God of *Flies*, all the World agrees, that their God is Mammon.

source: *Gentleman's Magazine* (October 1732), p. 102.

Appendix H

President Lee Bollinger's Statement on the Future of Journalism Education

(Columbia University, April 18, 2003)

At the beginning of the last century, Joseph Pulitzer bequeathed two major gifts to Columbia University: one to establish the premier school of journalism in the nation and the other to create a prize, sponsored by a great university and judged by great journalists, to honor the highest levels of journalistic achievement. These gifts came at a time of tremendous, destabilizing social change in America, a time in which the role of journalism was also changing rapidly. And they were motivated in part by Pulitzer's belief that journalism needed institutions that would help it adjust to a new role in a new era. There can be little doubt that together these have been significant contributions to the development of journalism over the last century.

As we enter another new century, at a time of similarly profound and destabilizing changes, the role of the media in America is even more critically important to society than it was a century ago and is again in the process of rapid change. And so it seems timely to review where we are and consider afresh how journalism education in a great university can contribute to the process by which the media adapt to a new world. To that end, I convened a group of people of extraordinary accomplishment in and about journalism and higher education to consider the question of what a model school of journalism for the Twenty-First Century should look like.

The Task Force was composed of members of the School of Journalism faculty, faculty from other departments and schools at Columbia, and practicing journalists from nearly every branch of the media. We met six times from October 2002 to March 2003. Attendance and participation were remarkable, attesting to the commitment of the members and the importance of the subject. I served as chair.

The conditions for discussion were the following: This was not to be a review of the Columbia School of Journalism, or of journalism schools in general. There would be no effort to conduct new research or an extensive review of the literature about journalism education. The reason for this was not to think about the issues behind a veil of ignorance, but rather to avoid the typical problem in such discussions of spending too little time in sustained discussion, reflection, and judgment. For our purposes, the expertise represented around the table was sufficient in itself. Lastly, I said from the outset that I did not expect the Task Force to issue a report, with members expected to sign on to or dissent from a final document. Consequently, the views below are my own --- judgments informed by a remarkable group of people to whom I am deeply indebted both individually and collectively.

I start from the premise that journalism and a free press are among the most important human institutions of the modern world. Democracy, civil society, and free markets cannot exist over time without them. The quality of life within these systems is closely

tied to the quality of thought and discussion in our journalism. This is truer today than it was a century ago, and it is likely to be truer still a century from now. And nothing demarcates the inexorable processes of globalization more than the growing reach of media into every city, hamlet, and home on the face of the earth. Journalism has an ascending importance in the modern world, and more than at any time in human history the character of the press is a key determinant shaping and defining national and global society.

Yet, there are concerns about the press, including a growing fear about how concentration of ownership narrows the scope of public debate and how commercial and technological forces increasingly drive the structure and behavior of the press. There is understandable anxiety that monetary pressures are threatening the quality and standards of journalism.

One of the best ways (and perhaps a necessary one) of dealing with these realities -- the growing importance of journalism and the concern about commercial and other interests becoming too dominant -- is for journalism to embrace a stronger sense of being a profession, with stronger standards and values that will provide its members with some innate resistance to other competing values that have the potential of undermining the public responsibilities of the press. There is nothing inherently inconsistent about good journalism operating in a market. Capitalism is a well-proven method of serving public needs and preferences, both for goods and services and for information. But like any system, its advantages turn into harms unless moderated by an internalized value system. Throughout much of the twentieth century, the electronic media were subject to congressionally and administratively mandated responsibilities to operate in the "public interest." In the current deregulatory climate, however, as the government has relaxed its "public interest" standards, this system does not provide the counterweight it once did. That puts more pressure than ever on what remains as the primary check on commercial excesses, namely the professional identity that insists that some things simply will not be done for money.

The real question is who will set the standard against which everything else can be compared and whether those who set the standard will have the imagination to set it as high as it might be. Our great universities have a crucial role to play in this process, similar to the role they have played in the professions of medicine, law, and engineering, for example. We must take up that responsibility more than we have, by devoting our energies to developing an appropriate curriculum, by increasing our research capacities, and by fulfilling our role of serving the public good in the ways that universities can beyond teaching and research. This will, of course, require greater investments in journalism education, and we ought to be ready to make those investments. A professional school should prepare students for performance within the profession at the highest levels.

A great journalism school within a great university should always stand at a certain distance from the profession itself. Its faculty should be made up of leading practitioners of the profession who, in the manner of other university faculty, both teach and actively explore, in their ongoing work, the greatest possibilities of journalism. The faculty should also reflect on the profession -- drawing our attention to important issues, engaging in

research to assist in their resolution, and communicating these findings to students, the profession, and the interested public. 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. A great university will also be able to offer knowledge and intellectual exchange with people in other fields related to the professional school, just as a professional school will contribute its knowledge and expertise to other parts of the university. Ideally, a professional school should make the university as a whole integral to its teaching and research missions.

More specifically, a professional school must instill certain basic capacities in its students. (l) Students must receive an introduction to the skills and craft of writing and reporting which are the foundation of the profession. This would include the skills of analyzing and organizing information for news stories of all lengths as well as for investigative reports. (2) Students must acquire an intellectual ability to deal with new situations, as knowledge and working conditions shift over time or as their own knowledge proves inadequate (in other words, students must learn how to "think like a journalist"). (3) Students ought to become familiar with how their profession developed. Who were the great figures and what were their contributions? How did the field evolve into what it is today, and what are the trends at work now and where are they leading the profession? (4) Students must acquire a sense of an identity as a professional, which includes the moral and ethical standards that should guide professional behavior.

My sense is that for a modern journalism school some new courses and programs to meet these objectives will need to be created. As these are conceived, it is important to remember that it often takes many years for materials and texts to be assembled. It may be possible, as one of many examples, to develop courses where students become immersed in reading and comparing significant journalistic pieces along with other materials about the same subject and then discuss what the authors tried to do, what alternative stories might have been written, and what this analysis reveals about the practice of journalism and about society. Students would be expected to articulate and defend their views in class, and then to write and produce a different story. These discussions would, of course, naturally invite considerations of journalistic ethics and norms. And, given the multiplicity of media forms through which journalists are expected to communicate, this kind of course would provide the opportunity to learn the techniques of various media and to see how structure and content change across them. While this kind of educational experience takes place now in journalism education, my sense is that it does not hold nearly the centrality nor the level of engagement that it might.

One of the most significant needs for journalists today is to have a high level of knowledge about the subject they are reporting and communicating. This raises a matter of enormous complexity and significance for a school of journalism. Of all the criticisms of the press, one of the most serious - and, happily, the most remediable - is the lack of context for stories. Journalism functions by reference to current events (just as law operates by cases and statutes and medicine by diseases). At its best, journalism mediates

between the worlds of expertise and general knowledge. To do that well -- to write for the present and to weave in broader meaning -- is remarkably difficult. A necessary element is substantive knowledge, the kind of knowledge you cannot just pick up in the course of doing a story. Having a foundation of general knowledge enhances one's capacity to deal with new areas and specific issues. Moreover, the deep sense of personal satisfaction in journalism, as in other parts of life, comes from probing into the heart of a matter. It is the superficial skipping from event to event that produces both sophomoric journalism and unfulfilled journalists.

Journalism may be moving increasingly to a system in which reporters have an underlying expertise, and to the extent that is true, universities ought to provide opportunities for students to develop that expertise. Specialization has its risks, and we should be alert to them. Some argue that expertise impairs a journalist's ability to write for a non-expert audience, but that seems to me implausible. Not all experts are capable of writing for a general audience (it is, indeed, a special skill), but those who can are usually better explainers than are the best of those who do not have that expertise.

On the other hand, my guess is that it is far too early to declare the end of the generalist editor and reporter, who moves from the education beat to the Hong Kong desk and then on to national politics. For them, and for future general managers of news-gathering operations, we need to provide a knowledge base and intellectual approach that will serve journalists well over their whole careers. That achieving complete knowledge of every subject is impossible should not lead us to give up on developing any kind of deeper knowledge in a journalism school education. That a journalism school is located within a great university, which houses an extraordinary amount of expertise on virtually any subject, means that it would be an intellectual tragedy not to ensure that students partake of the feast. One way of doing so is simply to reserve space in the broader university curriculum for students to explore other fields. This requires a willingness on the part of faculty and departments outside the journalism school, which I have every reason to believe exists.

But my sense is that we can do better than that. The educational goal ought to be to develop a base of knowledge across relevant fields that is crafted specifically for what leading journalists need to know: for example, a functional knowledge of statistics, the basic concepts of economics, and an appreciation for the importance of history and for the fundamental debates in modern political theory and philosophy. To address this assignment would require joint efforts of experts from around the university working closely with faculty in the journalism school. In addition to core knowledge, the faculty might decide upon a few of the most important subject areas of our time (e.g., religion, politics, life sciences, and the forces of globalization) and develop specific materials and course work in these as well.

All professional schools devote a significant part of their educational programs to having students do what they will do as professionals. Medical students diagnose diseases; arts students draw and act, and law students analyze cases. The integration of action and thought is one of the most powerful learning devices and, when done well, one of the most exhilarating. It is to be expected, therefore, that a journalism school curriculum will

teach students how to be journalists by having them do some aspects of journalism. To pit the teaching of craft against the teaching of intellectual capacity is to pose a false choice. The questions are what part of doing journalism should be used for educational purposes and how should the integration with other forms of learning occur?

There are several things to keep in mind as one answers this. First, we must always be aware that we have precious little time with a student. No moment should be wasted, and everything we do should be evaluated against possible alternatives that might better prepare a student for his or her future. Second, we ought to think about what will best serve a student over the full course of his or her career. We will better serve the student, as well as the society, by laying the foundation for a professional lifetime. Third, we must beware of placing too much emphasis on the beguiling qualities of basic skills training. Students naturally seek out this training, often because they are eager to become professionals and it is enticing to perform that role right away, and sometimes also because getting a job is foremost in their minds and they think basic skills will enhance their immediate employment prospects. Although students should finish journalism school in possession of the skills required to work right away as daily print or broadcast reporters, they must acquire not only these foundational skills, but also a mastery of journalistic inquiry and expression at their highest, most sophisticated, level. This implies an educational environment where clear expression interacts with complex understanding. Fourth, there is an important relationship (one that people within a university are especially sensitive to) between the type of education offered and the kind of people we can attract as faculty members. If journalistic education is to place a greater emphasis on imparting a degree of expertise in subject matter, it will be essential to attract faculty who have demonstrably acquired such expertise themselves, in addition to their expertise in the craft of journalism.

In considering how to impart this combination of skills and capacities to students, we ought to explore ways outside of the classroom too. A major publication within the school could be edited and managed by students. It should also be possible to develop a system of one or two year clerkships with outstanding practitioners immediately following graduation.

This raises the question of the appropriate time to degree in a modern journalism school. The answer, to my mind, is that the minimum is the time it will take for students to absorb the distinctive qualities of mind that a university education can offer. It is very difficult, although not impossible, for this to occur in a year's duration or less. Over time our aim should be to extend the curriculum into a second year, as virtually every other masters degree program in the university has done. (Of course, the program -- its length and content - may vary depending upon the educational needs of particular groups of students, such as mid-career journalists returning to school). The question of duration is ultimately related both to the amount of material that a student should be expected to master and the emotional or psychological commitment he or she must have to the educational experience in order for the professional attitudes we want to instill to take hold.

The curriculum should not be constrained by the salary structure in the profession. If a two-year course of study is deemed necessary, and if the prospects of professional

compensation are so low (relative to tuition and other educational expenses) that there is a significant disincentive for the most talented young journalists to undertake a professional education, then universities ought to build a financial aid program that will change this socially dysfunctional incentive structure. That is what we have done in other fields, such as graduate studies in the arts, humanities, social sciences, and other sciences. (It is interesting to note that we have done precisely this in reverse, so to speak, in fields like law, where salaries in private practice are high relative to the costs of a legal education but also high relative to salaries paid in the public service sector. To encourage graduates to pursue careers in public service, leading law schools have created student loan forgiveness programs for graduates who promise to take public service jobs for a specified number of years.)

Finally, one might ask what would be a good measure of the success of a journalism education. One vital measure should be whether the most promising and talented people entering the profession choose to attend journalism school. As I indicated before, we will never have an official system of licensing of journalists, given our First Amendment, so that the possibility of becoming a journalist without having a degree in journalism will continue. Our aim should be to create educational programs that are so compelling that the most promising future leaders in journalism decide that a professional education is critical to a successful career and life.

I would like to thank the members of the Task Force. They have my deepest appreciation for the time, energy, and advice they provided as we explored the future of journalism education. It is an understatement to say that their expertise and insights helped my thinking evolve on this critically important issue. I am eager to work with the new Dean and the faculty to see how we might shape the education of journalists in the years ahead.

Source: *Columbia News*, April 18, 2003.

Bibliography

Abbott, Andrew. *The System of Professions.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988.

Adam, G. Stuart. "The Education of Journalists." *Journalism* 2, no. 3 (2001): 315-339.

———. "Jim Carey and the Problem of Journalism Education." *Cultural Studies* 23, no. 2 (March 2009): 157-166.

———. "Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice: The Problems of Curriculum and Research in University Schools of Journalism." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1988): 4-11.

———. "The New Curriculum at Carleton." *Nieman Reports* (September 1969): 15–19.

———. "The World Next Door: A Commonwealth Perspective," *Gannett Center Journal* 2, no. 2 (1988): 109–17.

Agger, Ben. *Cultural Studies as Critical Theory*. London & Washington, DC: Falmer Press, 1992.

Aldridge, Meryl and Julia Evetts. "Rethinking the concept of professionalism: the case of journalism." *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 4 (December 2003): 547-64.

Allan, Stuart, ed. *Journalism: Critical Issues*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2005. *Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1988): 70-80.

———. *News Culture.* Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press, 1999.

Allison, Marianne. "A Literature Review of Approaches to the Professionalism of Journalists." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 1, No. 2 (Spring/Summer 1986): 5-19.

Altschull, J. Herbert. *Agents of Power: The Role of the News Media in Human Affairs*. New York & London: Longman, 1984.

Althusser, Louis. & Etienne Balibar. *Reading Capital*. London: NLB, 1970.

Anderson, Chris. "Journalism: Expertise, authority, and power in democratic life" in *The media and social theory* (edited by D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee, pp. 248-64). New York: Routledge, 2008.

———. "Professionalization of journalism" in *International encyclopedia of communication*. (edited by W. Donsbach). London: Blackwell, 2008.

———. *Breaking journalism down: Work, authority, and networking local news, 1997-2009.* Dissertation, New York: Columbia University, 2009.

———. "The Deprofessionalization of Journalism? Notes Towards an Analysis of Online Journalism, Professionalism, and the Role of Expert Knowledge in the Collection of News," 2005.

Applegate, Edd. *Journalism in the United States: Concepts and Issues*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press, 2011.

Aspinall, Arthur. *Politics and the Press, 1780–1850*. London: Home and Van Thal, 1949.

Atherton, Ian. "The itch grown a disease: Manuscript transmission of news in the seventeenth century." *Prose Studies: History, Theory, Criticism* 21, no. 2 (August 1998): 39-65.

Bagdikian, Ben H. *The Information Machines: Their Impact on Men and the Media*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

Baker, Richard Terrill. *A History Of The Graduate School Of Journalism Of Columbia University*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 1954.

Baldasty, Gerald J. "The Economics of Working-class Journalism: the E. W. Scripps Newspaper Chain 1878-1908." *Journalism History* 25, no. 1 (1999): 3-12.

Banning, Stephen A. "The Professionalization of Journalism: A Nineteenth-Century Beginning." *Journalism History* 24, no. 4 (Winter 1998-1999): 157-63.

Bardoel, Jo. "Beyond Journalism: A Profession between Information Society and Civil Society" in Howard Tumber, ed., *News: A Reader.* Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Barney, Darin D. *The Network Society*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2004.

Barney, Ralph D. "Journalistic Code of Ethics and Conduct," in *Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications*, Vol. 2. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science, 2003.

Barry, John. *Opportunities in Journalism Careers*. New York: Vocational Guidance Manuals, 1967.

Bauman, Zygmunt. "On Writing: On Writing Sociology." *Theory, Culture & Society* 17, no. 1 (February 1, 2000): 79-90.

Beam, Randal A. "Journalism Professionalism as an Organizational-Level Concept." *Journalism Monographs* 121 (June 1990).

Becker, Lee B. and Graf, Joseph D. *Myths & Trends: What the Real Numbers Say About Journalism Education*. Arlington, VA: Freedom Forum, 1995.

Becker, Lee B., Gerald M. Kosicki, Wilson Lowrey, Joelle Prine, and Aswin Punathambekar. "Undergrad Enrollments Level Off, Graduate Education Declines." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 55, no. 3 (2000): 68–80.

Bennett, G. Vernon and Frank Older, eds. *Occupational Orientation*. Los Angeles, CA: Society for Occupational Research, 1931.

Bennett, W. Lance. *News: The Politics of Illusion*. London: Longman, 1988.

Bennett, W. Lance, Lynne A. Gressett, and William Halton, "Repairing the News: A Case Study of the News Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 35, no 2 (June 1985).

Benson, Rodney. "News Media as a 'Journalistic Field': What Bourdieu Adds to New Institutionalism, and Vice Versa." *Political Communication* 23, no. 2 (July 1, 2006): 187-202.

———. "Review: Field Theory in Comparative Context: A New Paradigm for Media Studies." *Theory and Society* 28, no. 3 (June 1999): 463-498.

Berkowitz, David Allen. "Doing double duty: Paradigm repair and the Princess Diana what-a-story." *Journalism* 1, no. 2 (August 1, 2000): 125-143.

Berkowitz, Dan, ed. *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader.* London: Sage, 1997.

Bessie, Simon Michael. *Jazz Journalism*. New York, NY: E. P. Dutton, 1938.

Birkhead, Herbert Douglas. "News media ethics and the management of professionals." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, Volume 1, Issue 2 (1986): 37-46.

———. "Presenting the Press: Journalism and the Professional Project," doctoral dissertation. University of Iowa, 1982, pp. 235-301.

Blanchard, Robert and William Christ. *Media Education and the Liberal Arts: A Blueprint for the New Professionalism.* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1993.

Blau, Judith R. "A Group Enmity and Accord: The Commercial Press in Three American Cities" in *Social Science History* 24, no. 2 (2000): 395-413.

Blankenburg, William B. and Ruth Walden, "Objectivity, Interpretation and Economy in Reporting." *Journalism Quarterly* 54, no. 3 (September 1977): 591-595.

Bledstein, Burton. *The Culture of Professionalism*. New York, NY: W. W. Norton, 1978.

Bleyer, Willard Grosvenor. "A Great Need of the Profession," in Lawrence L. Murphy, ed., *An Introduction to Journalism* (1930).

———. *How to write special feature articles: a handbook for reporters, correspondents and free-lance writers who desire to contribute to popular magazines and magazine sections of newspapers*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1920.

———. *Main currents in the history of American journalism*. Houghton Miffling Company, 1927.

———. *Newspaper Writing and Editing*. Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.

———. *The Profession of Journalism: A collection of articles on newspaper editing and publishing, taken from the Atlantic Monthly*. Boston, MA: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1918.

———. "What Schools of Journalism Are Trying to Do." *Journalism Quarterly* 8 (1931): 35-44.

Blondheim, Menahem. *News Over The Wires: The Telegraph and the Flow of Public Information in America, 1844-1897*. Harvard University Press, 1994.

Blythe, Samuel. *The Making of a Newspaper Man*. Philadelphia, PA: Henry Altemus, 1912.

Bonham-Carter, Victor. *Authors by Profession.* London: The Society of Authors, 1978.

Borden, Sandra L. *Journalism As Practice: MacIntyre, Virtue Ethics and the Press*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2007.

Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Political Field, the Social Science Field, and the Journalistic Field" in Benson, R. and Eric Neveu, eds., *Bourdieu and the Journalistic Field*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

———. "The Practice of Reflexive Sociology (The Paris Workshop)," in Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, eds., *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. The University of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. *On Television* (trans. Priscilla Parkhurst Ferguson). New York: New Press, 1998.

Bovée, Warren G. *Discovering Journalism.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.

Boylan, James. "Infancy of Objectivity" in *Columbia Journalism Review* 20, no. 3 (September/October 1981): 62-63

Brake, Laurel. "The Old Journalism and the New: Forms of Cultural Production in London in the 1880s" in Wiener, J.H. (ed.) *Papers for the Millions: The New Journalism in Britain, 1850s to 1914*. New York, London: Greenwood, 1988.

Brandt, William J. *The Shape of Medieval History: Studies in Modes of Perception.* New York: Schocken Books, 1973.

Brennen, Bonnie. "Cultural Discourse of Journalists" in Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, eds., *Newsworkers: Toward a History of the Rank and File*. University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Brewer, John M. *History of Vocational Guidance: Origins and Early Developments*. New York, NY: Harper, 1942.

Brewer, John M. and Edward Landy. *Occupations Today*. Boston, MA: Ginn, 1936.

Bromley, Michael. "The End of Journalism? Changes in Workplace Practices in the Press and Broadcasting in the 1990s" in Michael Bromley and Tom O'Malley (eds.) *A Journalism Reader*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Bromley, Michael, Howard Tumber, and Barbie Zelizer. "Journalism Education." *Journalism* 2, no. 3 (December 1, 2001): 251-254.

Bronstein, Carolyn and Stephen Vaughn. "Willard G. Bleyer and the Relevance of Journalism Education," *Journalism & Mass Communication Monographs* 166 (June 1998).

Brownlees, Nicholas. "Spoken Discourse in Early English Newspapers" in Joad Raymond, ed., *News networks in seventeenth century Britain and Europe*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge, 2006.

Burrage, Michael. "Introduction: The Professions in Sociology and History" in Burrage, M. and R. Torstendahl, *The Professions in Theory and History*. London: Sage, 1990.

Burton, Graeme. *Media and Society: Critical Perspectives*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press, 2005.

Calcutt, Andrew and Philip Hammond. *Journalism Studies: A Critical Introduction*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge: 2011.

Campbell, Laurence Randolph. *Careers in Journalism*. Quill and Scroll Foundation, Northwestern University, 1949.

Caplow, Theodore. *Sociology of Work*, Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1954.

Carey, James W. “A Plea for the University Tradition.” *Journalism Quarterly* 305 (1972): 298-305.

———. “The Communications Revolution and the Professional Communicator” (first published in 1969), in Eve Stryker Munson and Catherine A. Warren, eds., *James Carey: A Critical Reader*. University of Minnesota Press, 1997.

———. “Some Personal Notes on U.S. Journalism Education.” *Journalism* 1, no. 1 (April 2000): 12-23.

———. “Technology and Ideology: The Case of the Telegraph” in *Communications as Culture.* Winchester: Unwin-Hyman, 1989.

———. “The University Tradition in Journalism Education.” *Carleton Journalism Review* 2, no. 6 (Summer 1980): 3-7.

———. “Where Journalism Education Went Wrong,” conference paper for ‘Journalism Education, the First Amendment Imperative, and the Changing Media Marketplace,’ sponsored by the Seigenthaler Chair of Excellence in First Amendment Studies, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, 1996.

Carr-Saunders, Sir Alexander Morris and Paul Alexnader Wilson. *The Professions.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1933.

Chalaby, Jean K. “Beyond the Prison-House of Language: Discourse as a Sociological Concept,” *The British Journal of Sociology* 47, no. 4 (Dec. 1996): 684-98.

———. *The Invention of Journalism.* Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1998.

———. “Journalism as an Anglo-American Invention: A Comparison of the Development of French and Anglo-American Journalism,1830s-1920s.” *European Journal of Communication* 11, no. 3 (1996): 303-326.

———. “Journalism Studies in an Era of Transition in Public Communications.” *Journalism*, 1, no. 1 (2000): 33–38.

Christians, Clifford G. “Fifty Years of Scholarship in Media Ethics.” *Journal of Communication* 27, no. 4 (December 1977): 19-29.

Clayman, Steven and John Heritage. *The news interview: journalists and public figures on the air*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Cobden, Michael. “Getting beyond the basics : j-schools need to do more than teach students the practical tools of the trade.” *Media* 4, no. 3 (2011): 27.

Coggeshall, William Turner. *Five Black Arts: A Popular Account of the History, Processes of Manufacture, and Uses of Printing, Pottery, Glass, Gas-light, Iron*. Follett, Foster, 1861.

Conboy, Martin. *Journalism: A Critical History.* London: Sage, 2004.

Cook, Timothy E. *Governing With the News: The News Media as a Political Institution*. University of Chicago Press, 1998.

Cottle, Simon, ed. *Media Organisation and Production*. London: Sage, 2003.

———. "New(s) Times: Towards a 'Second Wave' of News Ethnography." *European Journal of Communication Research* 25, no. 1 (2000): 19–41.

Curran, James. "The Press as an Agency of Social Control: An Historical Perspective," in Boyce, G., Curran, J. and Wingate, P. (eds) *Newspaper History: From the 17th Century to the Present Day*. London: Constable, 1978.

Curran, James and Jean Seaton. *Power Without Responsibility: The Press and Broadcasting in Britain*. London: Routledge, 1977.

Cust, Richard. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 112, no. 1 (1986): 60-90.

———. "News and Politics in Early Seventeenth-Century England." *Past and Present* 112, no. 1 (1986): 60-90.

Czittrom, Daniel J. *Media and the American Mind: From Morse to McLuhan*. The University of North Carolina Press, 1982.

Dana, Charles. *The Art of Newspaper Making*. New York: D. Appleton, 1865.

Daniels, L. "Journalism/Communications Education." *Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications* 2. San Diego, CA: Elsevier Science, 2003.

Dennis, Everette E. *Commentaries on Journalism Education*. New York: Gannett Center for Media Studies, 1986.

———. "Whatever happened to Marse Robert's dream?" *Gannett Center Journal* 2 (1988): 1-22.

Dennis, Everette E. and Ellen Wartella, *American Communication Research: The Remembered History*. London: Routledge, 1996.

de Burgh, Hugh. *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues.* London: Routledge, 2005.

de Burgh, Hugh. “Skills are not Enough.” *Journalism* 4, no. 1 (2003): 95–112.

Dean, Ann C. “Court Culture and Political News in London’s Eighteenth-Century Newspapers.” *Elh* 73, no. 3 (2006): 631-649.

Desbarats, Peter. *Guide to Canadian News Media* (2nd edition). Toronto, ON: Harcourt, Brace, 1996.

Deuze, Mark. “Educating ‘New’ Journalists: Challenges to the Curriculum.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 56, no. 1 (2001): 4-17.

———. “Journalism in Liquid Modern Times.” *Journalism Studies* 18, no. 4 (2007): 671-679.

———. “What is journalism?: Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered.” *Journalism* 6, no. 4 (November 1, 2005): 442-464.

Dicken-García, Hazel. *Journalistic Standards in Nineteenth-Century America*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.

Dickson, Tom. *Mass Media Education in Transition: Preparing for the 21st Century*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2000.

Dickson, Tom, and Wanda Brandon. “The Gap Between Educators and Professional Journalists.” *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 55, no. 3 (Autumn 2000): 50-67.

Dingwall, Robert. “Introduction,” in *The Sociology of Professions: Lawyers, Doctors and Others* (edited by R. Dingwall and P. Lewis). London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1983.

Donsbach, Wolfgang and Bettina Klett, “Subjective Objectivity: How Journalists in Four Countries Define a Key Term of Their Profession.” *International Communication Gazette* 51 (1993): 53-83.

Dooley, Patricia L. *Taking Their Political Place: Journalists and the Making of an Occupation*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.

Dooley, Patricia L., and P. Grosswiler. “Turf Wars: Journalists, New Media and the Struggle for Control of Political News.” *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 2, no. 3 (June 1, 1997): 31-51.

Dow Jones Newspaper Fund. *Journalism Career and Scholarship Guide*. Princeton: Dow Jones Newspaper Fund, 1984.

Eaman, Ross. *Historical dictionary of journalism*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 2009.

Edge, Marc. "Balancing Academic and Corporate Interests in Canadian Journalism Education." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 59, no. 2 (2004).

———. "Journalism Education in Canada: Toward a Corporate Model?", 2004.

———. "Professional Education for the Media in the Digital Age," presented at the first JourNet International Conference in Newcastle, Australia, February 2004.

Eggleston, Wilfrid. *While I Still Remember: A Personal Record.* Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1968.

Eisenstein, Elizabeth L. *Divine Art, Infernal Machine: The Reception of Printing in the West From First Impressions to the Sense of an Ending*. University of Pennsylvania Press, 2010.

Elliott, Philip. "Professional Ideology and Organizational Change: The Journalist since 1800," in Boyce, G., Curran, J. and Wingate, P. (eds) *Newspaper History: From the 17th Century to the Present Day*. London: Constable, 1978.

Emery, Edwin and Joseph McKern. "AEJMC: 75 Years in the Making," *Journalism Monographs* (November 1987).

Fang, Irving E. *A History of Mass Communication: Six Information Revolutions*. Focal Press, 1997.

Farrar, Ronald T. *A Creed for My Profession: Walter Williams, Journalist to the World*. University of Missouri Press, 1998.

Fedler, Fred. Book Review. *Journalism Quarterly* 58, no. 3 (Autumn 1981): 482.

Fedler, Fred, Arlen Carey, and Tim Counts. "Journalism's Status In Academia: A Candidate For Elimination?" *Journalism Educator* 53, no. 2 (1998): 31-39.

Fowler, Nathaniel C. *Starting in Life*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1906.

———. *The Handbook of Journalism*. New York: Sully and Kleinteich, 1913.

Fox Bourne, H. R. *English Newspapers, Vols. 1 and 2*. London: Thommes/Routledge, 1998.

Frank, Joseph. *The Beginnings of the English Newspaper: 1620-1660*. Harvard University Press, 1961.

Franklin, Bob, Gerd G. Kopper, Elizabeth Toth, and Judy VanSlyke Turk. "Editorial." *Journalism Studies* 1, no. 1 (December 2000): 5-7.

Freidson, Eliot. "The Theory of Professions: State of the Art" in Dingwall, R. and Lewis, P. (eds) *The Sociology of Professions: Lawyers, Doctors and Others*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1983.

Frith, Simon and Peter Meech. "Becoming a Journalist: Journalism Education and Journalism Culture." *Journalism* 8, no. 2 (2007): 137-164.

Frost, Chris. *Media Ethics*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.

Gagnon, Lysiane. "Journalism and Ideologies in Quebec" in *The Journalists, research studies on the newspaper industry*, Vol. 2 (Royal Commission on Newspapers). Ottawa: Supply & Services Canada, 1981: 19–39.

Gans, Herbert J. *Deciding What's News: A study of CBS evening news, NBC nightly news, Newsweek, and Time*. Northwestern University Press, 1979.

Gasher, Mike. "It's Time to Redefine Journalism Education in Canada." *Journalism* 30 (2005): 665-672.

Gaunt, Philip. *Making the Newsmakers: International Handbook on Journalism Training*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992.

Gemmill, Henry and Bernard Kilgore. *Do You Belong in Journalism?* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Gieskes, Edward. *Representing the Professions: Administration, Law, and Theater in Early Modern England.* University of Delaware Press, 2006.

Giles, Frederick and Imogene Giles. *Vocational Civics*. New York: MacMillan, 1919.

Ginzberg, Eli, Sol W. Ginsburg, Sidney Axelrad and John L. Herna. *Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.

Gitlin, Todd. *The whole world is watching: mass media in the making & unmaking of the New Left*. University of California Press, 1980.

Given, John L. *Making a Newspaper*. New York: Henry Holt, 1907.

Glasser, Theodore L. and Lise Marken, "Can We Make Journalists Better?" in Hugh de Burgh, ed., *Making Journalists*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Gowin, Enoch Burton, William Alonzo Wheatley, and John Brewer. *Occupation*. Boston: Ginn, 1923.

Greenwood, Ernest. “Attributes of a Profession.” *Social Work* 2 (July 1957): 45–55.

Greenberg, Susan. “Theory and practice in journalism education.” *Journal of Media Practice* 8, no. 3 (2007): 289-303.

Grieves, Kevin. “Transnational Journalism Education.” *Journalism Studies* 12, no. 2 (April 2011): 239-254.

Habermas, Jürgen. “The public sphere” in Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit, eds., *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Anthology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1982.

———. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (trans. Thomas Burger). Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Hackett, Robert A. “Decline of a Paradigm? Bias and Objectivity in News Media Studies” in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 1, No. 3 (Sept. 1984): 229-59.

Hackett, Robert A. and Yuezhi Zhao. *Sustaining democracy? Journalism and the politics of objectivity.* Toronto: Broadview Press, 1998.

Halasz, Alexandra. *The Marketplace of Print. Pamphlets and the Public Sphere in Early Modern England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hall, Stuart M. et al. *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State and Law and Order.* New York: Holmes & Meier, 1978.

———. “The Work of Representation” in *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (ed. Stuart Hall), pp. 13-74. London: Sage Publications, 1974.

Hallin, Daniel. “Commercialism and Professionalism in the American News Media” in James Curran and Michael Gurevitch (eds). *Mass Media and Society,* 2nd edition, 1996.

———. “The Passing of the ‘High Modernism’ of American Journalism.” *Journal of Communication* 42, Issue 3 (1992): 14-25.

Hallin, Daniel and Paolo Mancini. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Hamilton, James. *All the news that's fit to sell: how the market transforms information into news.* Princeton University Press, 2004.

Hampton, Mark. “Understanding Media: Theories of the Press in Britain, 1850–1914.” *Media, Culture and Society* 23 (2001): 213–231.

Hanitzsch, Thomas and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, eds. *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Hardt, Hanno. *Critical Communication Studies: Communication, History and Theory in America*. London and New York: Routledge, 1992.

———. *Interactions: Critical Studies in Communication, Media, and Journalism*. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998.

Harger, Charles Moreau. "Journalism As A Career" in Willard Grosvenor Bleyer, ed., *The Profession of Journalism*. Boston, MA: The Atlantic Monthly Press, 1918.

Hartley, John. "Communicative Democracy in a Redactional Society: The Future of Journalism Studies." *Journalism* 1, no. 1 (2000): 39–48.

———. "Journalism as a Human Right: The Cultural Approach to Journalism" in Martin Löffelholz and David Weaver, eds., *Global Journalism Research: Theories, Methods, Findings, Future*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008.

Hazen, Edward. *The Panorama of Professions and Trades: or, Every Man's Book.* Philadelphia: Uriah Hunt, 1837.

Henningham, John. "Journalists and Professionalization." *Australian Journalism Review* (July 1979): 15–20.

Herd, Harold. *The March of Journalism: The Story of the British Press from 1622 to the Present Day*. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1952.

Herman, Edward S. *The Myth of the Liberal Media: An Edward Herman Reader*. New York: Peter Lang, 1999.

Herman, Edward S. and Noam Chomsky. *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon, 1988.

Higginbotham, A.L. "Foreign Language in Education for Journalism." *The Journalism Educator* 14, no. 1 (1959): 2-6, 31.

Hollis, Patricia. *The Pauper Press.* London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Hughes, Everett Cherrington. *Men and Their Work*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1958.

Institute for Research. *Your Occupation in Journalism as a News Reporter*. Chicago, IL: The Institute for Research, 1973.

Jacobs, Matthew F. "Professionalism in Journalism: Ongoing debate among journalists about benefits of 'profession' versus trade'" in *History of the Mass Media in the United States: An Encyclopedia.* Chicago: Fitzroy Dearborn, 1998.

Johansen, Peter and Christopher Dornan. "Journalism Education in Canada," in Romy Fröhlich and Christina Holtz-Bacha, eds., *Journalism Education in Europe and North America: An International Comparison*. Hampton Press, 2003.

Johansen, Peter, David H. Weaver, and Christopher Dornan. "Journalism Education in the United States and Canada: not merely clones." *Journalism Studies* 2, no. 4 (2001): 469-483.

Johnson, Terence J. *Professions and Power (Study in Sociology)*. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1972.

Johnston, Donald H., ed. *Encyclopedia of International Media and Communications*, Vol. 2. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 2003.

Josephi, Beate. "Journalism Education" in Thomas Hanitzsch and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, eds., *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Kaplan, Richard L. "The Origins of Objectivity in American Journalism" in *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2010.

———. *Politics and the American Press: The Rise of Objectivity*, 1865-1920. Cambridge University Press: 2002.

Kaul, Arthur J. "The Proletarian Journalist: A Critique of Professionalism" in *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1, no. 2 (1986): 47-55.

Kelly, Barbara M. "Professionalism, 1900-1950" in *Fair and Balanced: A History of Journalistic Objectivity* (edited by Steven R. Knowlton and Karen L. Freeman). Vision Press, 2005.

Kelley, Barbara. "Teaching Journalism." *Communication Research Trends* 26, no. 2 (January 1, 2007).

Khowy, Robert. "Demythologizing the Professions." *International Review of History and Political Science* 17 (1970): 57-70.

Kielbowicz, Richard B. "News Gathering by Mail in the Age of the Telegraph: Adapting to a New Technology." *Technology and Culture* 28, no. 1 (January 1987): 26-41.

———. *News in the Mail: The Press, Post Office, and Public Information, 1700-1860s*. New York: Greenwood Press, 1989.

Kimball, Penn. “Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?” in *The Professions in America* (ed. by Kenneth C. Lynn). Boston: Beacon, 1963.

Knight, Graham. “News and Ideology” in *Canadian Journal of Communication* 8, no. 4 (1982).

Knowlton, Steven R. and Karen L. Freeman, eds. *Fair & Balanced: A History of Journalistic Objectivity*. Northport, Alabama: 2005.

Knox, Paul and Abby Goodrum. “Journalism education in Canada: size and scope,” presented to World Journalism Education Congress in Singapore, June 2007.

Larson, Magali Sarfatti. *The Rise of Professionalism: A Sociological Analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1977.

Larue-Langlois, Jacques. “The Teaching of Journalism in French Québec: Where From? Where To?” in *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1989): 59–63.

Law, Gordon. “Practical Schooling of the Nineteenth Century: Prelude to the American Vocational Movement.” *Preparation for Life: The Paradox of Education in the Late Twentieth Century* (edited by Joan Burstyn). Philadelphia: Falmer, 1986.

Lawrence, Arthur. *Journalism as a Profession*. London: Hodder & Stoughtan, 1903.

Levy, Fritz. “The decorum of news.” *Prose Studies* 21, no. 2 (August 1998): 12-38.

Lord, Chester S. *The Young Man and Journalism*. New York: MacMillan, 1922.

Lichtenberg, Judith. “In Defence of Objectivity Revisited” in Curran, J. and Gurevitch, M. (eds) *Mass Media and Society.* London: Arnold, 2000.

Lindley, William R. *Journalism and Higher Education: The Search for Academic Purpose*. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Journalistic Services, 1975.

Lippmann, Walter. “The American Press.” *The Yale Review* 30 (1930-31): 432-441.

———. *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1922.

Lovell, Ron. “Triumph of the Chi-Squares: It’s a Hollow Victory.” *The Quill* (October 1987).

Lowrey, Wilson, and Jenn Burleson Mackay. “Journalism and Blogging.” *Journalism Practice* 2, no. 1 (February 2008): 64-81.

Macdonald, Isabel. “Teaching Journalists To Save the Profession.” *Journalism Studies* 7, no. 5 (October 2006): 745-764.

Marzolf, Marion Tuttle. *Civilizing Voices: American Press Criticism, 1880-1950*. New York: Longman, 1991.

Mays, Arthur B. *Principles and Practices of Vocational Education*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill, 1948.

McChesney, Robert W. *The Problem of the Media: U.S. communication politics in the twenty-first century.* New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004.

———. "September 11 and the Structural Limitations of US Journalism." *Journalism After September 11* (ed. Barbie Zelizer, Stuart Allan). New York: Routledge, 2003.

McEwan, Oliver. *A Press Career*. London: Charles J. A. Cox, 1888.

McKerns, Joseph P. "The Emergence of Modern Media, 1900-1945." *The Media in America* (edited by Wm. David Sloan, James G. Stovall, and James D. Startt). Worthington, OH: Publishing Horizons, 1989.

McNair, Brian. "What is Journalism?" in Hugh de Burgh, ed., *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues.* London: Routledge, 2005.

McLaughlin, Greg. *The War Correspondent.* London: Pluto, 2002.

McLeod, Jack & Searle E. Hawley. "Professionalization among newsmen," *Journalism Quarterly 41,* (1964): 529-588.

Mead, George H. "The Nature of Aesthetic Experience." *International Journal of Ethics* 36, no. 4 (2010): 382-393.

Merrill, John Calhoun. *The Dialectic in Journalism: Toward a Responsible Use of Press Freedom*. LSU Press, 1993.

———. *Existential Journalism*. New York: Hastings House, 1977.

Medsger, Betty. "The evolution of journalism education in the Unites States" in *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues* (edited by Hugh de Burgh). London: Routledge, 2005.

———. "Reconsidering those little questions: Who? What? When? Why? How?" Conference on Journalism Education. Ryerson University, Toronto, ON, November 8, 2003.

———. *Winds of Change: Challenges confronting journalism education.* Arlington, VA: The Freedom Forum, 1996.

Mensing, Donica. “Rethinking [Again] the Future of Journalism Education.” *Journalism Studies* 11, no. 4 (August 2010): 511-523.

Millerson, Geoffrey. *The Qualifying Associations: A Study of Professionalization.* London: Routledge and Paul, 1964.

Mindich, David T. Z. *Just the Facts: How “Objectivity” Came to Define American Journalism*. New York: New York University Press, 1998.

Mirando, Joseph A. “Embracing Objectivity Early On: Journalism Textbooks of the 1800s” in *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 16, no. 1 (Routledge, 2001): 23-32.

———. “Training and Education of Journalists” in *American Journalism: Histories, Principles, Practices* edited by W. David Sloan and Lisa Mullikin Parcell. McFarland, 2002.

Mogel, Leonard. *Making It in the Media Professions*. Chester, CT: Globe Pequot, 1988.

Molotch, Harvey and Marilyn Lester, “Accidents, Scandals and Routines: Resources for Insurgent Methodology” in Gaye Tuchman, ed., *The TV Establishment*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1974.

Muhlmann, Géraldine. *A Political History of Journalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008.

Munsterberg, Hugo. *Vocation and Learning*. St. Louis, MO: The Peoples University, 1912.

Murray, Michael D. and Roy L. Moore. *Mass Communication Education*. Iowa State Press, 2003.

Newton, Lisa H., Louis Hodges and Susan Keith. “Accountability in the Professions: Accountability in Journalism.” *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 19, no. 3 & 4 (2004): 166-190.

North, Simon N. D. *History and Present Condition of the Newspaper and Periodical Press of the United States*. Washington, DC: Census Office, 1884.

Norris, Pippa. “Global Communications and Cultural Identities.” *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics* 4, no. 4 (1999): 1–7.

Novick, Peter. *That Noble Dream: The “Objectivity Question” and the American Historical Profession*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

O’Boyle, Lenore. “The Image of the Journalist in France, Germany, and England, 1815-1848.” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 10, no. 3 (April 1968): 290-317.

O'Dell, De Forest. *The History of Journalism Education in the United States.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

Örnebring, Henrik. "The Two Professionalisms of Journalism: Journalism and the Changing Context of Work." *Journalism* (February 2009).

Parcell, Lisa Mullikin. "Early American Newswriting Style : Who, What, When, Where, Why, and How." *Journalism History* 37, no. 1 (2011).

Parisi, Peter. "Critical Studies, the Liberal Arts, and Journalism Education." *Journalism Educator* 46, no. 4 (Winter 1992): 4-13.

Peterson, Theodore. "The Press as a Social Institution" in *American Communication Research*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1996.

Poe, Edgar Allan. "The Daguerreotype" in *Alexander's Weekly Messenger* (Philadelphia, 15 January 1840).

Porwancher, Andrew. "Objectivity's Prophet: Adolph S. Ochs and the New York Times, 1896-1935." *Journalism History* 36, no. 4 (2011).

Postman, Neil. "The Information Age: A Blessing or a Curse?" *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 9, no. 2 (2004): 3-4.

Pray, Isaac Clark. *Memories of James Gordon Bennett and His Times*. New York: Stringer and Townsend, 1855.

Raboy, Marc. "Journalism in Quebec." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1989): vi–vii.

Raudsepp, Enn. "Reinventing Journalism Education." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14, no. 2 (1989): 1–14.

Raymond, Joad. "Introduction: Newspapers, forgeries, and histories." *Prose Studies* 21, no. 2 (August 1998): 1-11.

———. *The Invention of the Newspaper: English Newsbooks,1641-1649*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

———. "The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere in the seventeenth century." *Prose Studies* 21, no. 2 (August 1998): 109-136.

———. "The newspaper, public opinion, and the public sphere in the seventeenth century," in Joad Raymond, ed., *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*. London: Frank Cass, 1999.

Reese, Stephen D. “The Progressive Potential of Journalism Education: Recasting the Academic versus Professional Debate.” *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics* 4, no. 4 (1999): 70-94.

Reese, Stephen D. and Jeremy Cohen. “Educating for Journalism: the professionalism of scholarship.” *Journalism Studies* 1, no. 2 (January 2000): 213-227.

Richards, Ian. “Trust me, I’m a journalist: Ethics and Journalism Education.” *Asia Pacific Media Educator* 14 (2003): 140-146.

Ringwalt, John Luther, ed. *American Encyclopaedia of Printing*. Menamin & Ringwalt, 1871.

Rivers, William L. “The Journalism Schools: The Media as Teacher.” *Change* 3, no. 2 (1971): 56-61.

Rogers, Everett M. *A History of Communication Study: A Biographical Approach*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Rollins, Hyder E. “The Black-Letter Broadside Ballad,” *PMLA* 34, no. 2 (1919): 267–70.

Rucker, Frank Warren. *Walter Williams*. Missourian Publication Association, 1964.

Said, Edward. *Representations of the Intellectual*. New York: Pantheon, 1994.

Salcetti, Marianne. “The Emergence of the Reporter,” in Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, eds., *Newsworkers: Toward a History of the Rank and File*. University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Scanlon, T. Joseph. “Journalism Education in Canada.” *International Communication Gazette* 15, no. 2 (January 1, 1969): 159-165.

Schiller, Dan. “An Historical Approach to Objectivity and Professionalism in American News Reporting.” *Journal of Communication* 29, no. 4 (December 1979): 46-57.

———. *Objectivity and the News: The Public and the Rise of Commercial Journalism.* University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981.

Schramm, Wilbur. “The Master Teachers” in Everette E. Dennis and Ellen Wartella, eds., *American Communication Research: The Remembered History*. London: Routledge, 1996.

Schudson, Michael. *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*. New York: Basic Books, 1978.

Schudson, Michael. "The objectivity norm in American journalism" in *Journalism* 2, no. 2 (2001): 149–170.

———. *Origins of the ideal of objectivity in the professions: studies in the history of American journalism and American law, 1830-1940.* New York: Garland Pub, 1990.

———. *The Power of News.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995.

———. "The Sociology of News Revisited" in James Curran and Michael Gurevitch (editors). *Mass Media and Society,* 2nd edition, 1996.

Schudson, Michael and Chris Anderson. "Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism" in Thomas Hanitzsch and Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, eds., *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Schultz, Tanjev. "Does Education Matter?" *Journalism* 3, no. 2 (2002): 223–238.

Shamir, Ronen. *Managing Legal Uncertainty: Elite Lawyers in the New Deal*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995.

Shaw, Donald L. "News Bias and the Telegraph: A Study of Historical Change." *Journalism Quarterly* 44 (Spring 1967): 3-12, 31.

Siebert, Fred S. *Freedom of the Press in England, 1476-1776: The Rise and Fall of Government Control*. Urbana: IL: Urbana University Press, 1965.

Siebert, Fred S., Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm. *Four Theories of the Press: The Authoritarian, Libertarian, Social Responsibility, and Soviet Communist Concepts of What the Press Should Be and Do*. Urbana and Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Skinner, David, James R. Compton, and Michael Gasher (editors). *Converging media, diverging politics: a political economy of news media in the United States and Canada*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2005.

Skinner, David, Mike Gasher and James Crompton. "Putting Theory to Practice: A Critical Approach to Journalism Studies" in *Journalism* 2, no. 3 (2001): 341-360.

Sloan, William David, ed. *Makers of the Media Mind: Journalism Educators and Their Ideas*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990.

Sloan, William David and Lisa Mullikin Parcell. *American Journalism: History, Principles, Practices*. McFarland, 2002.

Smith, Anthony. *The Geopolitics of Information: How Western Culture Dominates the World.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Smythe, Ted Curtis. *The Gilded Age Press, 1865-1900*. Westport, CT: Praeger, 2003.

Solomon, William S. "The Site of Newsroom Labor: The Division of Editorial Practices" in Hanno Hardt and Bonnie Brennen, eds., *Newsworkers: Toward a History of the Rank and File*. University of Minnesota Press, 1995.

Soloski, John. "News Reporting and Professionalism: Some Constraints on the Reporting of the News" in Dan Berkowitz, ed., *Social Meanings of News: A Text-Reader*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997.

Sommerville, C. John. *The News Revolution in England: Cultural Dynamics of Daily Information.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Sparrow, Bartholomew H. *Uncertain Guardians: The New Media as a Political Institution*. JHU Press, 1999).

Starck, Kenneth, and Anantha Sudhaker. "Reconceptualizing the Notion of Journalistic Professionalism Across Differing Press Systems." *Journal of Communication Inquiry* 4 (January 1, 1979): 33-52

Steiner, Linda. "Construction of Gender in Newsreporting Textbooks: 1890-1990," *Journalism Monographs* 135. Charleston, SC: Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, 1992.

Stensaas, Harlan S. "Development of the objectivity ethic in US. daily newspapers." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 2, no. 1. (1986-1987): 50-60.

Stephens, Mitchell. *A History of News*. New York: Penguin: 1988.

Steward, Gillian. "A prescription for success: perhaps it's time for J-schools to retrench , go back to the roots of journalism as well as the roots of the communities that spawned them." *Media* 10, no. 2 (2011): 14-15.

Straw, Will. "Teaching Critical Media Studies." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 11, no. 1 (1985).

Strong, P.M. "The Rivals: an Essay on the Sociological Trades," in *The Sociology of Professions: Lawyers, Doctors and Others* (edited by R. Dingwall and P. Lewis). London and Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1983.

Sumpter, Randall S. "Core Knowledge: Early Reporting Textbooks and the Formation of Professional Identity." *Journalism History* 35, no. 1 (2009).

Sutton, Albert A. *Education for Journalism in the United States from Its Beginning to 1940*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1945.

Switzer, Les, John McNamara, and Michael Ryan, "Critical-Cultural Studies in Research and Instruction." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 54, no. 3 (1999).

Tankard Jr., James W. "The Theorists" in William David Sloan, ed., *Makers of the Media Mind: Journalism Educators and Their Ideas*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1990.

Terdiman, Richard. *Discourse/Counter-Discourse*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1985.

Tocqueville, Alexis de. *Democracy in America*, Vol. 1. New York: Knopf, 1945.

Tomaselli, Keyan G, and Marc Caldwell. "Journalism education: bridging media and cultural studies." *Communicatio* 28, no. 1 (January 2002): 22-28.

Touraine, Alain. "Post-Industrial Classes." *Rethinking the Subject: An Anthology of Contemporary European Social Thought*. Ed. James D. Faubion. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1995.

Trice, Harrison Miller. *Occupational Subcultures in the Workplace.* New York: ILR Press, 1993.

Tucher, Andie. "Notes on a Cultural History of Reporting." *Cultural Studies* 23, no. 2 (2009): 289-98.

———. "Reporting for Duty: The Bohemian Brigade, the Civil War, and the Social Construction of the Reporter." *Book History* 9 (2006): 131-157.

Tuchman, Gaye. *Making News: A Study of the Construction of Reality*. New York, London: The Free Press, 1978.

———. "Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected." *American Journal of Sociology* 79, no. 1 (July 1973): 110.

———. "Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity." *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 4 (1972): 660-679.

———. "The Production of News." *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*. Ed. Klaus Bruhn Jensen. London: Routledge, 2002.

Tumber, Howard. "Democracy in the Information Age: The Role of the Fourth Estate in Cyberspace." *Information, Communication & Society* 4, no 1 (2001): 95–112.

Tumber, Howard and Marina Prentoulis. "Journalism and the Making of a Profession" in Hugh de Brugh, ed., *Making Journalists: Diverse Models, Global Issues.* London: Routledge, 2005.

Tumber, Howard and Michael Bromley. "Virtual Soundbites: Political Communication in Cyberspace." *Media Culture & Society* 20 (1998): 159–167.

Tumber, Howard, Michael Bromley and Barbie Zelizer (editors). *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism* 1, no. 1, (2000).

Tunstall, Jeremy. *Journalists at Work*. London: Constable, 1971.

———. "Journalism as an Occupation." *The Medico-Legal Journal*, Part Three (1973), 87–101.

Upshaw, Jim. "Characteristics of Journalists" in W. David Sloan and Lisa Mullikin Parcell, eds., *American Journalism: Histories, Principles, Practices*. McFarland, 2002.

Waisbord, Silvio Ricardo. *Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability and Democracy*. Columbia University Press, 2000.

Ward, Stephen J. A. *The Invention of Journalism Ethics: The Path to Objectivity and Beyond.* Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.

Warner, Michael. *The Letters of the Republic: Publication and the Public Sphere in Eighteenth-Century America*. Harvard University Press, 1990.

———. "Mass Public and the Mass Subject" in Craig Calhoun (editor), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Boston: The MIT Press, 1992.

———. *Publics and Counterpublics*. Zone Books, 2005.

———. "The Public Sphere and the Cultural Mediation of Print" in William Solomon and Robert W. McChesney (editors), *Ruthless Criticism: New Perspectives in U.S. Communication History.* University of Minnesota Press, 1993.

Wasserman, Herman. "Journalism Education as Transformative Praxis," *Ecquid Novi* 26, no. 3 (2005).

Watt, Tessa. *Cheap Print and Popular Piety, 1550-1640*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History,1991.

Weaver, David H., and Maxwell E. McCombs. "Journalism and Social Science: A New Relationship?" *Public Opinion Quarterly* 44, no. 4 (January 1980): 477-494.

Weaver, David H. and G. Clifford Wilhoit. *The American Journalist: A Portrait of U.S. News People and Their Work.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1986.

———. *The American Journalist in the 1990s.* New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1996.

Weaver, Paul H. *News and the Culture of Lying*. New York: The Free Press, 1994.

Westerståhl, Jörgen. "Objective News Reporting." *Communication Research* 10 (1983): 403-24.

White, David Manning. "The Gatekeeper: A Case Study in the Selection of News," *Journalism Quarterly* 27, no. 4 (1950).

Wien, Charlotte. "Defining Objectivity Within Journalism: An Overview." *Nordicom Review* 6, no. 2 (2005): 3-15.

Wiener, Joel H. "How New Was the New Journalism?" in *Papers for the Millions: The New Journalism in Britain, 1850s to 1914* (edited by J. H. Wiener). New York, London: Greenwood, 1998.

Wilcox, Walter (July 1959). "Historical ends in Journalism Education." *The Journalism Educator* 14, no. 3 (July 1959): 2-7, 32.

Wilkins, Dennis M. "Recommendations for curricula that stress reflective thinking." *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 53, no. 1 (Spring 1998).

Wilensky, Harold L. "The Professionalism of Everyone?" *American Journal of Sociology* 70, no. 2 (1964): 137–158.

Williams, Sara Lockwood. *Twenty Years of Education for Journalism: A History of the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri*. Columbia, Missouri: The E. W. Stephens Publishing Company, 1929.

Wilson, Christopher. *The Labor of Words: Literary Professionalism in the Progressive Era*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1985.

Winfield, Betty Houchin, ed. "Emerging Professionalism and Modernity," *Journalism, 1908: Birth of a Profession.* Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

Woolf, D. R. "Genre into Artifact: The Decline of the English Chronicle in the Sixteenth Century." *Sixteenth Century Journal* 19, no. 3 (1988): 321-354.

Wright, Donald K. "An analysis of the level of professionalism among Canadian journalists, *Gazette* 20, no. 2 (1974): 133-144.

Zelizer, Barbie. “Achieving Journalistic Authority through Narrative” in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 7, no. 4 (1990): 366-376.

———. *Covering the Body: the Kennedy Assassination, the Media, and the Shaping of Collective Memory.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

———. “Journalists as Interpretive Communities” in *Critical Studies in Mass Communication* 10, no. 3 (1993): 219-237.

———. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.

———. “When facts, truth, and reality are god-terms: On journalism's uneasy place in cultural studies.” *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004), 100-119.