



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Solkin, L. (2022). Journalism Education in the 21st century: A thematic analysis of the research literature. *Journalism*, 23(2), pp. 444-460. doi: 10.1177/1464884920977299

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/25746/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920977299>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Journalism Education in the 21st century – a thematic analysis of the research literature

Laurence Solkin

l.solkin@city.ac.uk

Abstract

In reviewing the academic literature of the past 20 years on Journalism education, this paper seeks to develop a thematic analysis of key debates and discourses. Based on a sample of over 300 separate published contributions (books, book chapters, journal articles and conference papers) this article explores more traditional debates, theory vs practice and profession vs craft, together with their development in to the 21st century. This article also focuses on newer additions to the literature including proposals for new topics, such as entrepreneurship and new models or metaphors such as the idea of the teaching hospital. The article then explores possible missing linkages to mainstream educational literature and concludes with some general recommendations regarding future research activity in this domain.

Key words. Journalism Education

Introduction

In answering the question “Where will journalism be over the next 100 years?” Barbie Zelizer came to the conclusion “nowhere pleasant, if we don’t do something about the way we study and teach journalism in the contemporary era” (Zelizer 2000. p9). It is now 20 years since her pronouncement and a useful moment to reflect on progress made through the lens of the published research. This article examines the key themes and issues presented by authors in the wealth of works published since 2000. Clearly many of these items draw on, and develop, pre-existing published works. This study seeks to examine these to distinguish between discourses primarily situated in earlier work (referred to as the standard model) and newer developments in the 21st century. It also seeks to build on a methodological analysis (conducted in parallel) by highlighting some of the research methods which have been used to develop each claim, offering some insights into the relationship between the development of the argument and the data on which it is based. A more detailed

discussion of the research process, methodology and research methods can be found in a forthcoming paper by this author.

Old arguments restated? Theory vs practice, Profession vs craft

Deuze makes the point that “Most of the literature on journalism education starts at the curriculum” (Deuze. 2006. p28). Historically, issues of theory and practice, profession and craft were considered on the basis of what does or what should constitute a valid curriculum for journalists. Typically conducted at the level of course or module titles, the contributions often focused on the directness of their relationship to practice or their ability to inform (or occasionally critique) professional practices. This discussion of theory and practice is often characterised as a dualism within which the two components are expressed as independent and, occasionally, mutually exclusive entities. Notions of knowledge generation or praxis are thus omitted in what can become a dualistic and often partisan discourse based around preferred orientations (see Turner 2000). This debate may tell us as much about the professional identity of the educators as of the curriculum itself and, were it not for the large number of authors involved, it might even be safe to relegate it to that status. It would, however, be unfair not to acknowledge the significance of some of the survey activity undertaken as a source of information about the relative preferences of different groups (see Hanusch and Millado 2014 for examples). Surveys are central to this debate as they are the main mechanisms by which the views of the industry are explicitly gathered so that they can be translated into the curriculum. They form an important role in informing the academy and have largely (though not completely) replaced the reliance on the personal experience of educators. The views thus elicited provide a guide to industry preferences and the questions asked illuminate how educators interact with the industry and the forms of evidence they seek.

By way of contrast, the debate between profession and craft has developed considerably over the past 20 years, particularly through the creation of professional competences. Competences bridge the gap between knowledge and skills and effective performance (Westera 2001) and the use of

competences has enabled the debate to move away from the rather sterile discussion of inputs towards a consideration of effective professional performance. Professionalisation has been seen by Donsbach (2014) as a key component in the development of journalism education with the development of competency frameworks globally (Model curricula for journalism education. UNESCO 2007) and specifically in Europe (the Tartu declaration EJTA, 2013). In the absence of recognised professional bodies or standards of conduct (ethical frameworks), the significance of qualifications cannot be under-estimated. Whilst the debate over content remains, with Baines and Kennedy (2010) pointing to those who wish to retain the craft component, the idea of a profession supported by education has now become part of the conventional wisdom amongst educators. This is not to suggest that there is absolute clarity over what is meant, and Gou identifies that the issues “largely revolve around who is defining professionalism, for what purpose and by what criteria.... leading to conceptual ambiguities for the academia, contradictory interpretations amongst educators and comprehension confusion amongst students” (Gou 2010.p 29)

New developments, enterprise and the metaphor of the teaching hospital

The discourse of professionalism within journalism education has also informed by the education of other professionals and the metaphor of the “teaching hospital” (Donsbach 2014, Creech and Mendelson, 2015) has emerged, partially as an attempt to overcome the theory practice disjoint. The term “teaching hospital” has been applied to a large number of industry-academy collaborations (Schaffer, 2012). These vary considerably in scope and ambition but represent an attempt to reform journalism education by providing additional resources for creating practical products. The reference to medical education is largely by analogy, with Newton utilising the metaphor as a means of extending opportunities, rather than emulating other educational regimes “Law students can file legal briefs. *Medical students can cure patients.* Why can’t journalism students report for the public? (Newton 2012, p 2670 my italics). Creech and Mendelson, (2015) argue that “The teaching hospital model offers a mix of technical skill and conceptual and ethical acuity by offering journalism

students a curriculum that integrates them and their coursework into a working newsroom staffed by professional journalists but housed in a university” (Creech and Mendelson, 2015. p 153). A number of major institutions in the US have engaged in collaboration (Francisco, Lenhoff and Schudson, 2012.), the main benefit being expressed in terms of authenticity, “students who learn to shoot with live ammunition “ (Newton 2012 p 2671.) and the approach clearly has supporters amongst educators in many locations. When Newton remarks that “Faculty members who are pure scholars with no professional experience are at a tremendous disadvantage in trying to run such real-world laboratories” (Newton 2012 p 2671) he is implicitly promoting the identity of the practitioner educator. Like their UK counterpart of “Newsdays”, the teaching hospital can be seen as a model of delivery which privileges professional experience over scholarship and thus appeals to those who may regard themselves as “Extraordinary professionals,” (Newton 2012. p 2673) whose efforts and expertise are required to enact this type of activity. Where these two approaches differ is the extent to which students are engaged with producing “real” news for external (non-campus) consumption, both models represent forms of simulation of professional practices but. If we are to take the teaching hospital to its logical conclusion, student operating in this mode would be directly engaged in the production of commercial media through a collaboration with industry itself.

On the other hand, Mensing and Ryle, see this approach as simply a recasting of current content “The teaching hospital metaphor forecasts a future for journalism that is infused with the practices of the past” (Mensing, and Ryle. 2013 p30). Picard also cautions against a model which exploits students as unpaid labour suggesting that “the hospital model must be approached with caution” (Picard 2015 p 8). Given that quality placements are in decline (Thornton 2011, Mensing and Ryle 2013), partially due to contractions in the industry and, partially, because they may require the development or maintenance of a complex eco system (Foote 2017) , it makes sense for journalism educators to look for alternatives. Simulations of professional environments have always played a part in the education process and the metaphor of the teaching hospital can be seen as an example of these, one which may also benefit from the comparison with the status of other professionals and

their training. Clearly journalism education needs to respond to changes in the media landscape, whether the development of authentic environments represents a step forward or not may depend on whose authenticity is being simulated and the extent to which it anticipates the future, rather than simply replicating the past. This question, in terms of current research, remains unanswered, as Benedetti et al (2015), remark, despite the volume of activity, there remain very few serious attempts at meaningful evaluation. As a result, whether these initiatives represent a new direction or simply an extension of current practice is unclear. Newton suggests that we should gather data on student satisfaction and, whilst this is always of value, it is not only current satisfaction, but also future utility, which need to be examined. As Young and Giltrow suggest “this situated, authentic experience may be good for replicating current journalistic practice, but is it good for generating innovation and an understanding of what students will be able to do on graduation as vectors by which new knowledge – rather than replicated practice – enters the profession? (Young and Giltrow 2015 p47-48)

Mensing and Ryle (2013) contrast the emphasis on replication associated with the teaching hospital with the opportunities for innovation which become available through entrepreneurial journalism education. For them, the decline of the traditional news environment is accompanied by new social contexts based on networks and , as such, “Teaching students to develop their own networks of experts, mentors, collaborators, and peers would enable them to be independent, resourceful, and successful in a communications environment structured more by networks than the one-way mass media” (Mensing and Ryle 2013 p 34). The concept of teaching entrepreneurship has many attractions, some quite practical, others bordering on the messianic. Schaich and Klein (2013) argue that ““entrepreneurship skills will enable graduates to create their own jobs and create value in new and transforming legacy media organizations” (Schaich and Klein 2013 p186), whilst Gillmor (2016) goes on to suggest that “we can save journalism with 500,000 small enterprises and a few big ones.

We'll need people with entrepreneurial spirit for all of them." (Gillmor 2016 p 817). This transformation both responds to current needs, and seeks to anticipate, future change. Baines and Kennedy 2010 recommend that "we should develop strategies to help students to turn their ideas into viable, independent enterprises which might rival rather than serve the needs of media organisations" (Baines and Kennedy 2010 p 98). Entrepreneurial journalism seems to have found great favour amongst teachers and students (Baines and Kennedy 2010, Hunter and Nel 2011, Gillmor 2016, Casero-Ripollés, et al 2016) but it is unclear as to what specifically is being endorsed in terms of teaching content

This lack of clarity is evidenced across several authors. Hunter and Nel (2011) come to the conclusion that "the students have a greater understanding of the enterprising role that the freelancer plays in promoting his or her own work as a saleable commodity." (Hunter and Nel 2011 p 21) On the other hand, survey evidence presented by Casero Ripollés et al (2016), indicates that the roles of entrepreneur and freelancer remain separate, at least in the minds of students "The data indicate that students do not clearly identify the figure of the entrepreneur, as they associate it with freelancing Additionally, a significant number of students link entrepreneurship to the universe of unpaid work by associating it with a lack of job security or the world of hobbies." (Casero Ripollés et al 2016 p 13), Similarly, Elmore and Massey's 2012 study with data from freelancers themselves suggested that "While more than two-thirds (71.7 per cent) of respondents said they would support moves by college journalism programmes to add more instruction in freelance journalism skills, 60.6 per cent also 'disagreed' or 'strongly disagreed' that self-employment is a feasible path for a newly-minted college graduate." (Elmore and Massey 2012 p 118) with less than 14 per cent 'supporting the idea that fresh graduates should take up freelancing. Levine suggests that the "Most disturbing and confounding is the tendency among educators to rebrand underpaid, precarious freelance journalists as independent entrepreneurs" (Levine 2015 p 89). This confusion is referred to by Vos and Singer's, in their analysis of the various discourses in operation, noting the presentation of the entrepreneurial journalist as "a founder, an innovator, a trailblazer, a business creator, and a

freelancer; one 2014 article used the term “journopreneur”, they conclude that the “descriptions offered in our sample say little about what entrepreneurial journalists do that makes them entrepreneurial— or, for that matter, that makes them journalists” (Vos and Singer 2016 p 51)

The conflation of entrepreneurship, freelancing and innovation and creativity (often bundled together as part of the identity of journalism entrepreneurs) is reflected in Hunter and Nel when they refer to a distinctly entrepreneurial mindset which emerges when “students see their work as a marketable commodity, they also take principal responsibility for undertaking that marketing” (Hunter and Nel 2011 p 21). Entrepreneurial mindsets, orientations and the entrepreneurial spirit combine with notions of creativity and innovation to construct a heroic depiction of the new journalist. The qualities required however, or the educational inputs to enable these, remain confused. Drok’s 2012 survey of professionals provides an example of this, finding that “showing initiative” (often linked by educators to entrepreneurship) was supported by over 63% of his sample whilst “knowing market conditions” considered by many as an essential component in any enterprise, received support from less than half this number. Claussen (2011) echoes this dichotomy between innovation and the skills required to operate effectively when he indicates that “student demand for anything business-related continues to be underwhelming, as it apparently always was, and this is true at almost all, if not all, j-schools”(Claussen 2011 P 6) adding as a caution that teaching of entrepreneurship could leave students “knowing just enough to be dangerous and too little to be competent((Claussen 2011, p6). This scepticism is shared by Deuze (2017) who, whilst welcoming innovation argues that “any class or curricular entrepreneurial intervention should come with a mode of instruction and pedagogical materials that would inspire critical engagement with a way of being in the world beyond *just* a way of setting up shop” (Deuze 2017 p 322).

New representations - Global profession vs local environment

Much of the argument for professionalism rests upon the idea of a single set of professional skills or occupational competences which are required to practice effectively and this has been linked to

attempts to develop a universal or global curriculum based around a common set of curricular requirements. (Holm 2001). This view of the universal or global journalist is, however, deeply contested and several authors argue that the assumptions upon which it is based (representative government and press freedom) are inappropriate to the contexts in which they teach and those in which their graduates will operate. For them this is not simply a case of maturity (in which the global / western model is the desired end state), but rather one of legitimate diversity. Some of the strongest arguments have emerged from scholars working in Africa. Alongside concerns about colonialism and de-westernisation in practice, come challenges to the transmissive nature of Journalism education as “an outdated, didactic model of learning” (Skjerdal and Ngugi 2007). Hochheimer (2011) recommends that “We must also then consider what we mean by education, for whose benefit it has been structured in the way that it has, and how this type of pedagogy fits with the realities of the many peoples, cultures and historical experiences of this vast continent” (Hocheimer 2011 p 98) . Ullah (2014) echoes this questioning when he argues that “ the emergence of ‘Ubuntu’ in Africa, and ‘Development journalism’ in Asia (watchtower/ social change agent) shows that the Western notion of journalism education is not the only ideal and the rest of the world, therefore, should not accept that notion without demur” (Ullah 2014 p 22)

It is important here to distinguish between global journalism as a specific approach based on a global awareness (Berglez 2008) and the global curriculum, based on a global profession, which suggests a single approach to education and practice (UNESCO 2007). The work of Berglez does not promote a standardised curriculum but rather a level of awareness of global linkages which he seeks to develop, partially through the use of technologies such as aggregation. It is this “global consciousness”, as referred to by Densing, which is significant. The global curriculum on the other hand derives from the attempt to standardise education and the subsequent export of this model across the globe. This idea of globalisation, exemplified by the UNESCO curriculum, draws on the

notion of development towards democracy and is evident in many of the analyses of non-western and post-soviet states. It also features within some of the cross-country comparisons where legitimate diversity is undermined by the use of terms such as “regional biases” or “idiosyncrasies” (Goodman and Steyn 2017 p 3). Descriptors such as “mature” continue to be applied to journalism education in the “Global North” and whilst the term “developing” has given way, in some accounts to, “in transition” (Napoli 2002, Esser 2003) in connection with other locations, the assumption of a hierarchy remains. In this context, the role of journalism education seems to be to assist in the process of transition by providing newly qualified staff with values or ideals drawn from the mature economies. Josephi (2010), perhaps inadvertently, exemplifies this dualism when she argues that the issue of ownership and control are central to education in these locations and that “Any purely nominative discourse about journalism education, in countries with partly free or not free media, which does not take this power relationship into account, misses an absolutely essential point of the discussion” (Josephi 2010 p 258). The implication here being that consideration of the same issue of power is somehow more relevant to these contexts and, by extension, may not be so significant to learners operating in media systems which are designated as “free”. Her focus on power, contrasts with the absence of this factor in many other author’s accounts of journalism education in “free” or “democratic” contexts.

Questioning the reasoning behind the global model highlights many of the assumptions being made regarding the role of journalism education in diverse contexts. Banda et al combine de-westernisation with a more critical approach to education, arguing that, “A less instrumentalist approach and a more critical-paradigmatic approach towards journalism education is needed” (Banda 2007, p 157) . Horcheimer (2001) argues that “it needs to be stressed that the values of Western journalism, especially the mainstream journalism now dominant in the United States, are ill suited to serve the needs of people living there. If these current news values don’t serve Americans well, there seems to be no way they can serve African journalists, African students, or African

readers/listeners/viewers well either.” (Horscheimer 2001, p 101) This notion of service and community is reflected in the work of Mensing (2010) when she calls for “Community-centered education (which) could explore ideas such as this more fully, experiment with alternatives, and share the results of research to add to the collective understanding of ethical journalism practices. These conversations and experiments could provide students with ideas and insights applicable in multiple contexts.” (Mensing 2010 Pp 517-518)

The convergence versus valid diversity debate is further complicated by the tendency to perceive these developments in terms of monolithic blocks. Systems are, it seems, either moving towards x or not. The idea that different parts of a system may be moving at different rates or in different directions is obscured by an approach which, whilst more holistic, can serve to exclude the operation of key components. Elements of change derived from technologies are just such an example. Having recognised the diversity of national landscapes, as key determinants of journalism education, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha go on to assert that “the challenges that come along with the new technologies are the same” (Fröhlich, R. and Holtz-Bacha 2003, p 320) without any mention that the responses to these will, of course, vary depending on, amongst other things, a range of local factors.

Synthesis

The main issues across the literature can be summarised in terms of 3 broad approaches which are labelled here as the standard model, a reformist model (described as “J.Ed+”) and a more radical approach to these issues. They are characterised around the assumptions that they make about the profession, the way in which they position Journalism Education, their research focus (which can be seen as a product of their assumption and their perceptions of role of Journalism Education) and finally their explanations of change (to the extent that these are visible) .The model used here parallels that of Alan Fox (1971) in his seminal study of British Industrial Relations inasmuch as the three models represent positions which are fundamentally unitary, pluralistic or radical.

The standard model is largely derived from ideas about professionalism. It reflects the identity of journalism educators and foregrounds their views of industry (particularly in relation to content). In terms of research, it relies heavily on surveys and historical accounts (Brown and Collins 2010 provide a good example of this). The issue of change is rarely raised, and national differences are accounted for in terms of a progression towards a global approach under the heading of development. J.Ed+ shares with the standard model many of the assumptions about the role of journalists in society, but recognises the need to adapt to a new technological and financial context. In this sense. It reflects many of the issues current or emerging in Journalism practice and seeks to develop new content or new models to enable learners to navigate this new context. It is fundamentally a reformist agenda, open to certain types of change but operating with or within, rather than against, the standard model. Pavlik outlines the manifesto when he calls for “A media system (which) will once again be relevant and central to the democratic process and commercially viable”(Pavlik 2013 p 218). It reflects the comments by Deuze et al 2004 of “a journalistic culture that only embraces change wholeheartedly when it does not require a fundamental shift in existing and established ways of doing news work” (Deuze et al 2004 P9) “Radical models, on the other hand, do not accept the underlying assumptions of the standard model regarding democracy and the free market. They point to both constraints in terms of the environment, but also opportunities for new relationships with the audience. This orientation explicitly values diversity and draws upon a range of theoretical standpoints including anticolonialism (in various forms) learning theories and more critical media perspectives. What these approaches have in common is that they seek to develop new forms of journalism education to provide learners with critical perspectives which are designed to enable them to operate more effectively in a changing social and political (rather than simply financial and technological) environment.

These differences are summarised in Table 1 below

	Underlying	Role of	Change and	Research focus
--	------------	---------	------------	----------------

	assumptions	Journalism education	Diversity	
The standard model	A single unitary model of journalism as professional practice underpinned by a stable democratic free market system	To prepare practitioners to operate as objective observers whose primary mission is to support and hold to account democratic institutions	Is explained through national or regional journalistic cultures but also as a historic development towards the standard model	Refining and justifying existing approaches and structures
Derivatives or variants of the standard model J.Ed+	A pluralistic approach which recognises that Journalism is under threat and needs to develop especially in response to change in technology and the marketplace	To prepare practitioners to operate in changing circumstances and to adapt themselves to market demands	Is explained through changes in technologies (the web) or institutions financial models (advertising revenue)	Adding to or Improving existing structures and processes for delivery
Radical models - challenges to the standard	A more explicit rejection of the standard model of Journalism Education	To enable journalists to understand their relationship to	Diversity is endemic. changes in technology and	Developing new processes and understanding of learning

model	though the recognition that Journalism Education operates in many different ways depending upon context and can serve many different communities and their needs.	the communities they serve	employment practices operate differently in different contexts.	
-------	---	----------------------------	---	--

In terms of orientations towards the profession, the standard model is clearly “industry-led”, focusing on skills or competences which are derived from existing (recognised) practices. This discourse operates as a defence for Journalism Education against changes in the structure of employment (including technology). It relies heavily on notions of the universal or global profession, in pursuit (or defence) of democracy. Carey’s location of journalism education within the humanities “ which nurtures an understanding of democratic life and institutions” (Carey 2000 p11) is typical of this orientation, It is open to, and may, indeed, require data from current professionals about their core practices in order to justify itself (Tanner et al 2013, Ogenhaffen, et al 2013). Journalistic tools of the trade in Flanders: Is there a fit between journalism education and professional practice?. *Journalism Practice*, 7(2), pp.127-144) but, according to Frith and Meech, without the criticality required “their (students) accounts of the value and meaning of journalism replicated those of journalism tradition” (Frith and Meech 2007 p 21) In addition, it retains a clear, but often implicit, social purpose of enabling political accountability which is set in a western context of representative institutions, press freedom and the free market. Research in this area seeks to strengthen the linkage between education and current professional practice (Drok 2013) , as well as exporting both

of these to “less developed countries” often through the intervention of charitable foundations (Becker and Lowrey, 2000, Henry-Sanchez and Koob 2013 Hume 2004) The tone of the discourse is fundamentally conservative as reflected in Bronstein and Kirkpatrick “Our job as educators is to construct a profile of the successful contemporary practitioner and develop educational programs that reflect the current and future demands on such individuals” (Bronstein and Kirkpatrick 2014 p 80). It seeks to defend existing approaches to Journalism Education through professionalization, and by embracing and upholding the traditions of democratic journalism operating in a free market economy. These tried and trusted practices are also employed as part of a foreign policy agenda, and are thus exportable, through various forms of development aid. It is essentially a discourse *within* both historic and professional journalism from which it draws support and its key texts

The reform approach or J.Ed+ retains many of the essential features of the standard model, in terms of assumptions about overall purpose, but recognises the need to adapt to current and potential future changes. This model could be term “industry-informed”, as seeks to extend the curriculum by anticipating the sorts of changes which might occur within the industry, particularly those around the uses of technology and employment practices. O’Donnel’s problem solving approach links pedagogic innovation with practices to “to prepare students to confidently negotiate the complex and competing ethical, legal, professional and commercial challenges they will encounter in the workplace, rather than simply acquiring knowledge and understanding about journalism ethics, media law or theoretical accounts of news processes and effects”. (O’Donnel 2001 p 63). It is future orientated, as it seeks to prepare learners ,in advance, for the challenges that they may face as practitioners. As reflected by Vos and Singer (2016) on entrepreneurship, it embodies a level of uncertainty and ambiguity which is not visible in the standard model. This approach remains open to the views of professional practitioners but seeks to focus on issues which may create tensions for them. It also recognises these tensions within Journalism education itself and seeks to develop new

learning models which are sustainable in a changing context. In more practical terms, it seeks to add elements or activities to the standard model rather than remove or modify, hence the use of the term J.Ed+. The tone of the reform agenda is often evangelical, in as much as it is preached by, and to, journalism educators. In responding to changes authors such as Gilmoor (2016), suggest that J Ed will be saved by these various reforms and J Ed+ will, in turn, save the profession. According to Macdonald “they propose a model of journalism education that bypasses an analysis of the powerful media industries, downplaying the significance of journalists’ working conditions and encouraging students to think idealistically about journalism. Their model also harks back to traditional journalistic ideals and notions of objectivity that some critics argue contribute to public apathy and damage prospects for participatory democracy”(Macdonald 2006 p 746) In this discourse educational practices are modified but traditional values, and, to some extent, relationships are preserved. It draws heavily on the discourse of entrepreneurship and seeks to align this with that of journalism as an agenda for change.

The third model is also concerned with improving the quality of journalism education, but rather than add to the existing provision, it seeks to develop new approaches and, in doing so, It overtly questions, and sometimes rejects, the standard model. According to Pinsloo “It is informed by Cultural Studies theories and critical pedagogy and seeks to foster an alternative programme to those that privilege skills in relation to a commercialized industry (Pinsloo 2020 p 194). Rather than be constrained by current practice and the current practitioners, as a source of expertise, it looks to provide learners with the ability to operate outside conventional structures and relationships. It does this in several ways; by looking at learning in more detail; by adopting experimental approaches to learning activities and by listening to the voices of learners as well as practitioners. In many cases, it engages with discourses outside journalism, both political and educational and seeks to bring in concepts and analytic methods from these domains. This model is more ambitious,

seeking to change the nature of journalism itself through education. In some ways, it points to a repositioning, and an implicit deprivileging, of the role of the journalist in society by moving the emphasis from the rather nebulous “in service to the public” to a more concrete relationship based on meeting the needs of specific communities.

The focus of the standard model has, historically, been that of content (what is taught) with some considerations of where it is taught and who teaches it. The reform approach is also partially curricular but with some consideration of how teaching takes place. The teaching hospital metaphor both modifies and seeks to enhance the role of the educator without significantly changing the purpose of education or the position of the learners, as recipients of practice-based knowledge. More radical approaches do not abandon the idea of public service but question the concept of a single public with a single interest. In research terms, (Westlund and Lewis 2017) they tend to focus on learning as well as teaching, students as well as educators, and the community, rather than the newsroom or the media organisation, as the source of legitimacy for their efforts. It is this focus on learning, as much as the questioning of assumptions, which represents a challenge to both the standard and the reform model. As a critical discourse, it explicitly challenges the values and assumptions of the traditional model. The tone is evaluative and inquiring, particularly around the public service orientation. It draws on both critical media (Clark, 2013) and emancipatory educational literatures, pointing to the emergence of new orientations towards the community. In part, it is a discourse of liberation, seeking a new approach by replacing the professional norms associated with service to a distant public (in the form of objectivity) as well as the legacy of the newsroom, in favour of developing new relationships with the community (Banda 2007, Mensing 2010)

Missing or incomplete discourses

Part of the process, and according to Andrews (2005), much of the value, of systematic reviews is derived from the identification of gaps in current research. Perhaps, not surprisingly, Journalism Education draws heavily on Journalism itself for both inspiration and theoretical frameworks. Following Deuze's (2000) exhortation, many writers have adapted methods and models drawn from mainstream journalism to the issue of education. Whilst this is to be applauded, in terms of increased rigour, it is also noticeable that very few authors draw on any recognised educational resources or research. Despite extensive references to professionalisation in the literature, the works reviewed here contain very few references to professional or experiential learning. Similarly, references to curriculum development and teaching and learning in higher education are also largely absent. This deficit becomes evident when exploring the topic of entrepreneurship (which has its own extensive educational research base in HE) and the analogy to medical education (the metaphor of the teaching hospital is seldom developed through an analysis of clinical education).

One important area of practice which appears to be absent is that of assessment or evaluation. Whilst considerable attention has been focused on the inputs being delivered by educators, there has been very little examination of the work produced by students in order to demonstrate competence or the processes by which such work is judged. This "black-boxing" of the assessment process is problematic on a number of levels. Leaving aside issues of technical validity, assessment underpins the connection between education and the labour market. This relationship is often referred to but rarely analysed. Whilst several landscape studies note the requirement for a degree qualification, few explore the actual process of graduate recruitment or the competencies required by employers. Wenger's 2010, study of job advertisements provides some of the answer, inasmuch as it focuses on the published requirements of advertised roles, but how these are assessed, both at university and at work, may provide a further insight into the status of educational programmes with employers (Wenger et al 2010)

Journalism education is mostly positioned as initial training. As a result, little mention is made of subsequent learning and even those committed to the model of professionalism make scant reference to any continued development. This is particularly challenging given the significance of work experience. Learning on the job via internships is often prescribed as part of the process (Foote 2008, Bjørnsen 2009, Mensing, and Ryle, 2013), but with little indication of how this to be achieved or assessed. Fulton et al (2017) provide a helpful description of a structured delivery process in Australia but their narrative fails to provide any evidence of, or criteria for, evaluation. Thornton's study (Thornton 2012) based on interviews with students who have undertaken internships provides evidence of a more complex relationship with professionals which suggests that these activities may provide learning both by, and from, internees. Equally significant, is the absence of any analysis of learning at work amongst journalists, the focus on initial training (supplemented by the occasional short top-up course) seems to ignore the often-stated preference for learning through experience. An analysis of the newsroom as a learning environment is one that could provide helpful insights into both education and professional practice.

Although extensive consideration has been given to the motivation of students, and in particular their attitudes towards journalism practice, the dominant assumption is that students are treated as empty vessels into which journalism competences are poured (Skjerdal and Ngugi, 2007) or as "blank slates to be drawn upon" (Horcheimer 2001). From this perspective, studies of the curriculum as designed (or envisaged) take precedence over the any consideration of the curriculum as experienced by students. Put more simply, the content of the programme (and the process of curriculum design) receives considerably more attention than the teaching taking place, or the actual learning being achieved.

The lack of consideration of higher education as a context is also problematic. Altbach et al in their UNESCO review (Altbach et al 2009) highlight the impact of competition and internationalisation on

institutional strategies noting the growth of inequality “among national higher education systems as well as within countries has increased”. Little of this debate is visible in the journalism education literature. Finance is rarely mentioned and the question of how journalism education is funded (or how this may affect relationships with students or employers) is seldom addressed. Although references are made to the role of the state (Johansen et al.’s exploration of Canadian education being a good example) or the influence of charitable bodies, as agents of change in the developing world (Gross and Kenny 2008, Freedman 2007), the supply side of journalism education economics receives little attention. Horcheimer (2001) is one of the few to acknowledge the influence of movements in funding from the state to the individual, regarding this as a key factor in the growth of instrumental learning. Whist Desai (2017) notes the impact on fees on diversity and Frost (2016) their effects on the sustainability of postgraduate education in the UK, this recognition seems missing from many other accounts.

Conclusions

The struggle against the global model can be seen to represent a fundamental challenge to the dominance of the standard model of Journalism education. By recognising a different role to the external (objective) observer and foregrounding the relationship to the community, scholars call for a curriculum which is grounded in a separate social reality one of diversity, complexity and non-hierarchical forms of social accountability. Replacing the rather amorphous “service to the public” with the more concrete engagement with the community does not, however, solve the problem of relationships or identity. Exchanging one set of referents for another without critically exploring the consequences could be calamitous. Not least, because the potential abandonment of objectivity seriously challenges the dominant construction of being a journalist. De-privileging the journalist, through education, is at odds with both the industry standard model and the market-driven reformist approach, both of which rely on professionalism as a bulwark against the influence of others. Embracing the community, its values and its interests, poses important issues about whose truth may be told. Whilst there are significant differences in outcomes between the potentially

liberating stance of Ubuntu in Southern Africa (Botha and De Beer, 2007), and the more conservative tones of Ujamaa in Tanzania (Mfumbusa 2010), their ability to define the legitimacy of knowledge are similar. The question must be asked as to how journalism, as we understand it, might be conducted under such regimes and, as a consequence, how journalism education could be developed to support those operating as practitioners in these contexts. Equally, a recognition of the constraints imposed by the legitimacy of the market, may help us revise our understanding of Journalism education in the Global North.

Notes

1. This idea, that interns could influence professional practice based on their academic training, is worthy of further exploration, as it challenges the essentially transmissive approaches typical of universities (as well as the immersive models normally associated with learning at work).
2. The medical analogy is difficult to sustain and direct comparisons with other professional educational regimes are quite rare. Tumber and Prentoulis (2005) suggest one reason may be that journalism lacks the solid knowledge foundations of medical science and legal theory which underpin other forms of professional education. This is echoed by Anderson (2014) who suggests that whilst “the legal occupation can be thought of as a solid core of professionalism surrounded by a thin border zone, journalism might be viewed as almost entirely border zone” (Anderson 2014 p64).

References

- Altbach, P.G., Reisberg, L. and Rumbley, L.E., 2009. Trends in global higher education: Tracking an academic revolution. Available at http://www.academia.edu/download/30910755/Altbach__Reisberg__Rumbley_Tracking_an_Academic_Revolution__UNESCO_2009.pdf. (accessed 31.1.2020)
- Anderson, C.W., 2014. The sociology of the professions and the problem of journalism education. *Radical Teacher*, 99, pp.62-68.
- Andrews, R., 2005. The place of systematic reviews in education research. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 53(4), pp.399-416.
- Baines, D. and Kennedy, C., 2010. An education for independence: Should entrepreneurial skills be an essential part of the journalist's toolbox?. *Journalism Practice*, 4(1), pp.97-113.
- Banda, F., Beukes-Amiss, C.M., Bosch, T., Mano, W., McLean, P. and Steenveld, L., 2007. Contextualising journalism education and training in Southern Africa. *Ecquid Novi*, 28(1-2), pp.156-175.
- Becker, L.B. and Lowrey, W., 2000, July. Independent journalism training initiatives: Their impact on journalists and journalism education. In *Professional Education Section, International Association for Media and Communication Research, Singapore*.
- Benedetti, P., Levine, M. and Gasher, M., Selling Digital Dreams: "Entrepreneurial journalism," the Decline of Public Service Reporting, and the Role of Journalism Education. *New Directions in Journalism Education*, p.2020108.
- Bjørnsen, G., Hovden, J.F. and Ottosen, R., 2009. The Norwegian journalism education landscape. *Journalism Research*, 2, pp.123-137.
- Botha, N. and De Beer, A.S., 2007. South African journalism education: Working towards the future by looking back. *Ecquid Novi*, 28(1-2), pp.198-206.
- Brown, T. and Collins, S., 2010. What "They" Want From "Us" Industry Expectations of Journalism Graduates. *Electronic News*, 4(2), pp.68-82.
- Carey, J.W., 2000. Some personal notes on US journalism education. *Journalism*, 1(1), pp.12-23.
- Casero-Ripollés, A., Izquierdo-Castillo, J. and Doménech-Fabregat, H., 2016. The journalists of the future meet entrepreneurial journalism: Perceptions in the classroom. *Journalism practice*, 10(2), pp.286-303.
- Clark, L.S., 2013. Cultivating the media activist: How critical media literacy and critical service learning can reform journalism education. *Journalism*, 14(7), pp.885-903.
- Claussen, D. S. (2011), 'CUNY entrepreneurial journalism: Partially old wine in a new bottle, and not quite thirst-quenching, but still a good drink', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66: 1, pp. 3–6.
- Creech, B. and Mendelson, A.L., 2015. Imagining the journalist of the future: Technological visions of journalism education and newswork. *The Communication Review*, 18(2), pp.142-165.
- Desai, M.K., 2017. *Journalism education in India: Maze or mosaic. Global journalism education in the 21st century: Challenges and innovations*, pp.113-136.
- Deuze, M., 2000. Redirecting education: Considering theory and changes in contemporary journalism. *Ecquid Novi: African Journalism Studies*, 21(1), pp.137-152.
- Deuze, M., Neuberger, C. and Paulussen, S., 2004. Journalism education and online journalists in Belgium, Germany, and The Netherlands. *Journalism Studies*, 5(1), pp.19-29.
- Deuze, M., 2006. Global journalism education: A conceptual approach. *Journalism studies*, 7(1), pp.19-34.
- Deuze, M., 2017. On Media and Entrepreneurship as Ways of Being in the World: A Challenge to *Journalism Education*1. In the 21st Century, p.307.
- Donsbach, W., 2014. Journalism as the new knowledge profession and consequences for journalism education. *Journalism*, 15(6), pp.661-677.
- Drok, N., 2012. Towards new goals in European journalism education. *Journal of Applied Journalism & Media Studies*, 1(1), pp.55-68.

Drok, N., 2013. Beacons of reliability: European journalism students and professionals on future qualifications for journalists. *Journalism Practice*, 7(2), pp.145-162.

Elmore, C. and Massey, B., 2012. Need for instruction in entrepreneurial journalism: Perspective of full-time freelancers. *Journal of Media Practice*, 13(2), pp.109-124

Esser, F., 2003. Journalism Training in Great Britain: a system rich in tradition but currently in transition. *Journalism education in Europe and North America*, pp.209-236.

Foote, J., 2008. World journalism education congress. *Journalism Studies*, 9(1), pp.132-138.

Fox, A., 1971. *A sociology of work in industry*. Collier-Macmillan.

Francisco, T., Lenhoff, A. and Schudson, M., 2012. The classroom as newsroom: Leveraging university resources for public affairs reporting. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, p.21.

Freedman, E. and Shafer, R., 2010. Ambitious in theory but unlikely in practice: A critique of UNESCO's Model Curricula for Journalism Education for Developing Countries and Emerging Democracies. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 27(1), pp.135-153.

Foote, J., 2017. Journalism education's first century: Markers of progress. *In the 21st Century*, p.429.

Frith, S. and Meech, P., 2007. Becoming a journalist: Journalism education and journalism culture. *Journalism*, 8(2), pp.137-164.

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

Frost, C., 2016. The United Kingdom juggles training and education: Squeezed Between the newsroom and classroom. *Global journalism education In the 21st century: Challenges and innovations*, pp.199-218.

Gillmor, D., 2016. Towards a new model for journalism education. *Journalism Practice*, 10(7), pp.815-819.

Goodman, R.S. and Steyn, E., 2017. *Global journalism education in the 21st century: Challenges and innovations*. Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas.

Gou Zhongshi, 2010. Through barbed wires: Context, Content and Constraints For Journalism Education in China in Josephi, B.U. ed., 2010. *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom* (Vol. 1). Peter Lang.

Gross, P. and Kenny, T., 2008. The long journey ahead: Journalism education in Central Asia. *Problems of Post-Communism*, 55(6), pp.54-60.

Hanusch, F. and Mellado, C., 2014. Journalism students' professional views in eight countries: The role of motivations, education, and gender. *International Journal of Communication*, 8, pp.1156-1173.

Hochheimer, J.L., 2001. Journalism education in Africa: From critical pedagogical theory to meaning-based practice. *Critical Arts*, 15(1-2), pp.97-116.

Holm, H.H., 2001. The forgotten globalization of journalism education. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 56(4), pp.67-71.

Hume, E., 2004. *The Media Missionaries: American Support for Journalism Excellence and Press Freedom around the Globe*. John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Wachovia Financial Center, Suite 3300, 200 South Biscayne Boulevard, Miami, FL 33131-2349.

Hunter, A. and Nel, F.P., 2011. Equipping the entrepreneurial journalist: An exercise in creative enterprise. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 66(1), pp.9-24

Josephi, B., 2019. Journalism education in Wahl-Jorgensen, K. and Hanitzsch, T., 2019. *The handbook of journalism studies*. Routledge.

Josephi, B.U. ed., 2010. *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom* (Vol. 1). Peter Lang.

Levine, M., 2015. E is for Empirical: How Scholarly Business Texts, Blogs, and Trade Journals Conceptualize and Critique Entrepreneurism. *New Directions in Journalism Education*, p.85.

Macdonald, I., 2006. Teaching journalists to save the profession: A critical assessment of recent debates on the future of US and Canadian journalism education. *Journalism Studies*, 7(5), pp.745-764.

Mensing, D. and Ryfe, D., 2013. Blueprint for change: From the teaching hospital to the

entrepreneurial model of journalism education. In *ISOJ The Official Research Journal of the International Symposium on Online Journalism* (Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 26-44).

- Mensing, D., 2010. Rethinking [again] the future of journalism education. *Journalism Studies*, 11(4), pp.511-523.
- Mensing, D., 2017. *The curious case of US journalism education: Shrinking newsrooms, expanding classrooms. Global Journalism Education in the 21st Century: Challenges and Innovations. Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas, University of Texas at Austin, pp.219-242.*: Shrinking Newsrooms, Expanding classrooms
- Mfumbusa, B., 2010. Tanzania's journalism education at crossroads: Western models, local realities. In Josephi, B.U. ed., 2010. *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom* (Vol. 1). Peter Lang.
- Napoli, J.J., 2002. International journalism education at the end of history, starting in Albania. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 57(3), pp.260-270.
- Newton, E., 2012. Reply to Francisco, Lenhoff, Schudson | Promise, Peril of "Teaching Hospitals". *International Journal of Communication*, 6, p.4.
- O'Donnell, P., 2001. The odd couple? Academic research and journalism education. *Editorial 2 The politics of bias at the ABC*, p.58.
- Opgenhaffen, M., d'Haenens, L. and Corten, M., 2013. Journalistic tools of the trade in Flanders: Is there a fit between journalism education and professional practice?. *Journalism Practice*, 7(2), pp.127-144
- Pavlik, J.V., 2013. A vision for transformative leadership: Rethinking journalism and mass communication education for the twenty-first century. *Journalism & mass communication educator* (1077-6958), 68 (3), p. 211.
- Picard, R.G., 2015. Deficient tutelage: Challenges of contemporary journalism education. *Toward 2020*, pp.4-10.
- Prinsloo, J., 2010. Journalism education in South Africa: Shifts and dilemmas. *Communicatio: South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research*, 36(2), pp.185-199.
- Schaffer, J., 2012. Reply to Francisco, Lenhoff, Schudson | University News Sites: Investments in Civic Entrepreneurship. *International Journal of Communication*, 6, p.3.
- Schaich, M.J.V. and Klein, J.S., 2013. Entrepreneurial journalism education: where are we now?. *Observatorio (OBS*)*, 7(4), pp.185-211.
- Skjerdal, T.S. and Ngugi, C.M., 2007. Institutional and governmental challenges for journalism education in East Africa. *Ecquid Novi*, 28(1-2), pp.176-190.
- Thornton, L.J., 2011. The changing role of internships as newsrooms shrink and evolve: Collaboration and intern-as-teacher. *Journalism Education, training and employment*, pp.130-142.
- Tumber, H. and Prentoulis, M., 2005. Journalism and the making of a profession. *Making journalists: Diverse models, global issues*, 58, p.73.
- Turner, G., 2000. 'Media Wars' Journalism, cultural and media studies in Australia. *Journalism*, 1(3), pp.353-365.
- Ullah, M.S., 2014. De-westernization of media and journalism education in South Asia: In search of a new strategy. *China Media Research*, 10(2), pp.15-23.
- UNESCO (2007), Model curricula for journalism education, Available at unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001512/151209e.pdf. (Accessed 31.1.2020)
- Vos, T.P. and Singer, J.B., 2016. Media discourse about entrepreneurial journalism: Implications for journalistic capital. *Journalism Practice*, 10(2), pp.143-159.
- World Journalism Education Council Declaration of Principles Available at <https://wjec.net/about/declaration-of-principles/> (accessed 31.1.2020)
- World Journalism Education Council Paris Declaration on Freedom of Journalism Education Available at <https://www.wjec.paris/paris-declaration-on-freedom-of-journalism-education/> (accessed 31.1.2020)

- Westera, W., 2001. Competences in education: a confusion of tongues. *Journal of Curriculum studies*, 33(1), pp.75-88.
- Westlund, O. and Lewis, S.C., 2017. Reconsidering news production: How understanding the interplay of actors, actants, and audiences can improve journalism education. *Global Journalism Education: Challenges and Innovations in the 21st Century*. Austin, TX: The Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas at The University of Texas at Austin.
- Young, M.L. and Giltrow, J., 2015. A Mobile Responsive Expertise: Learning Outcomes, Journalism Education, and the "Teaching Hospital" Model. *Toward, 2020*, pp.46-63.
- Zelizer, B., 2000. What is journalism studies?. *Journalism*, 1(1), pp.9-12.