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Female politicians in the British press: The exception to the ‘masculine’ norm?

Deirdre O’Neill Leeds Trinity University and Heather Savigny, Bournemouth University

As educators of journalists we are concerned with some of the most fundamental questions about the relationship between the media and democracy, and this we argue, is gendered. Through content analysis and interviews we look at the ways in which women MPs are represented in the British Press. We show that the way in which they are reported (or ignored) positions them as different from the ‘male norm’ and this in turn has consequences for

1 We would like to thank the AJE for their generosity in funding this project and would like to thank Tori Cann for her work in data gathering. Thanks are also due to the anonymous referees for their helpful comments.
the ways in which democratic politics is written about by journalists and experienced by female MPs. A press representation of women that sometimes serves to suggest politics is a ‘man’s game’, where women are regarded as the aberrant, exception to the rule, can alienate women representatives and likely future candidates. This in turn may have negative consequences for the democratic process, whereby women voters feel unrepresented in Parliament and turn away from political engagement.

Introduction

Is ‘Blair’s Babes’ a good headline? That headline (coined by The Sun in 1997) has given us pause to reflect on the kind of media coverage we want our students to produce.

This headline invokes and reinforces the standard tropes about the ways in which women are re-presented in the media: women are objectified and adjuncts of men, rather than independent autonomous entities in their own right. But then this headline was in 1997. Surely things have changed? The many newspaper references since then to ‘Cameron’s Cuties’ (for example, Daily Mail, 10 August 2012) suggests that maybe little has.

For us, these and similar headlines prompted us to consider carrying out a systematic analysis of the way in which women politicians are represented in the press, the amount of coverage they receive, and the focus of this coverage. As we teach our students to challenge and negotiate the structures of power that they find themselves operating in, we argue that the way in which female politicians are represented helps us to understand some of the ways in which media and politics interact in a democratic society, and how this relationship is gendered. We argue that the way in which women politicians are currently constructed within the press serves to discourage women from taking part in politics, where women are constructed as the ‘other’ to the masculine ‘norm’ of what it means to be a politician. This, we argue, can only serve to undermine democratic ideals, producing a narrow construction of what politics is, and what it can be. Ultimately this type of gendered construction serves to reinforce hegemonic masculine discourses (which tend to characterise male dominated contexts). We believe it is important as educators, citizens and journalists to recognise that gender matters in the ways in which we talk about politics in the pages of our media. And if all citizens in a democracy are to be enfranchised, then all interests need representation in their own right (and while not the focus of this article, this argument can also be extended across other categories including race, class, sexuality).

In the project that we undertook, supported by the Association for Journalism (AJE), we looked at the way in which female politicians were represented in the British press. In the first part of the project, we looked at the amount of coverage they received and whether...
the type of coverage was primarily related to political issues, or wider society and events, or personal issues (O’Neill et al., submitted for publication). The focus of this second stage of the study is how this plays out within coverage of the three main political parties. We know that the British press is partisan (Curran and Seaton, 2009, pp.69-73). But does this partisan bias have a gendered dimension? We explore the ways in which female politicians are represented in the British press, and how this relates to their proportional representation of women in Parliament. With knowledge of the partisan bias of the British press, we therefore asked: is the descriptive representation of women in Parliament reflected or undermined in media coverage? Has this changed over time? Does the positive or negative representation of women in the media have a partisan bias?

**Pedagogical rationale**

Research into the representation of women provides journalism educators with an arena where some key concepts about the role of journalism in society come together: it allows educators and students to interrogate the relationship between journalism and democracy, and to ask how well the news media is performing its role as the fourth estate, in being a central conduit, providing access to and information about politics, politicians – regardless of their sex or party- and the parliamentary process. The fourth estate role of the news media underpins the claims made by the news media themselves to justify freedom of expression and to negate state interference. This is particularly relevant at a time when research by the Hansard Society (2012) has shown political engagement with parliamentary democracy to be at an all-time low. An Ipsos-MORI survey has shown that there is a gendered element to this lack of participation. In the 2010 election, where people did actually vote, in the 18-24 age group category, while 50% of the male population voted, only 39% of the female population cast their ballot (Ipsos-MORI, 2010).

In addition, studies such as this can contribute to students’ understanding of how news is a manufactured and selective process, whereby journalists are at risk of adhering to a set of news values imbued with their own prejudices, ideologies and values, as well as the wider cultural values and dominant hegemony of the society in which they operate (O’Neill and Harcup, 2008). It can demonstrate how female politicians are constructed and re-presented to news consumers and citizens, in an arena which is densely gendered (Van Zoonen, 1994) and can encourage us to question whether the focus of any media attention is reductive and stereotyped and, if so, what damage might this do to the health of our democracy.

Finally, this research can feed into debates about the use of sources and access to the news agenda. ‘Who the sources are bear a close relationship to who is news.’ (Sigal, 1986, p.25). It has been demonstrated that certain groups are very often denied a voice in the media, for instance, asylum seekers (Philo et al, 2013), Muslims (Petley and Richardson, 2011) and trade unionists (O’Neill, 2007). While women are not a minority in the population as a whole, a number of studies have found that they are not given a proportional voice (Ross and Carter, 2011; Women in Journalism, 2012). So when women are in a minority, as they are in Parliament, do they receive their fair share of coverage in relation to their numbers as our elected representatives? This was the first stage of our research (O’Neill et al, submitted for publication) and provides a useful context for what we go on to investigate in the second half of our research, presented here. Our initial findings showed that female politicians were covered broadly in proportion to their numbers in Parliament in 1992 (9% of coverage and 9.2% in Parliament) and 2002 (17% of coverage...
and 17.9% in Parliament), but there was a trend towards under-representation in terms of press coverage by 2012 (16% of coverage while 22% in parliament). Investigating gendered representations in politics can contribute to wider discussions about how certain groups are depicted in the media, and help encourage best practice for widening source diversity. These concepts and debates are central to any critique of the press underpinning journalism degree programmes. It is also hoped that research into some of the ways that female politicians are depicted in the press can provide a model for some investigations by journalism students as part of their own independent studies.

The broader research context

As already mentioned, fewer women in the 18 to 24 age category voted in the 2010 General Election than men (Ipsos-MORI, 2010), while research from the Economic and Social Research Council reveals that in so-called advanced democracies like the UK, women know less about politics than men (Newman, 2013). As Newman points out:

‘Assuming women are every bit as capable of grasping complicated political news as men [.......] it all comes down to that old problem – the absence of women interviewed or quoted in the media, which in turn impacts on how political information is communicated and received. Professor Curran [one of the authors] suggests this is because across the 10 nations, women were only interviewed or cited in 30 per cent of TV news stories. “Politics is projected as a man’s world and that encourages a sense of disconnection,” he adds.’

In other words, the lack of females appearing in the media – particularly with regards to politics – is having a negative impact on the knowledge and engagement of the female electorate.

Women in Parliament

Currently, women make up 22% of Parliament. Advances were made under New Labour: from 1992, under a Conservative government, to 1997 when New Labour came to power, female representation increased from 9.2% to 18.2%. Nevertheless, with women making up just over half of the population, progress remains painfully slow. As Table One below demonstrates, Labour has been consistently ahead in the numbers of women in Parliament. In 1992, of the 9.2% total number of women elected, 62% were Labour, 33% Conservative and 3% were Liberal. In 2001, of the 17.9% women elected, 81% were Labour, 12% Conservative and 4% Liberal Democrat and 3% other. In 2010, of the 22% of women elected to Parliament, 57% were Labour, 34% Conservative, 5% Liberal Democrat and 4% other.

The numbers of Labour women decreased in 2010, although it would seem that women disproportionately lost their seats. The numbers of Conservative and Lib Democrat female MPs have steadily increased, although they remain some considerable way behind Labour.
Table 1: Women elected in general elections since 1992

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election year</th>
<th>Female MPs</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Con</th>
<th>Lab</th>
<th>Lib</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Candidates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: House of Commons Research Papers 01/75, 05/33 & 10/36.

A Hansard Society briefing paper to mark International Women’s Day, ‘Women at the Top 2011’ highlighted disappointing statistics about women’s representation in politics and public life (Hansard Society, 2011). It found that ‘there were no women on the new Coalition Committee or the Coalition Operation and Strategic Planning Group; of 184 Cabinet Committee and Sub-Committee seats, just 32 were occupied by women; there were no women at all on the Economic Affairs Committee, the Banking Reform Committee and the Public Expenditure Committee.’

Senior Women in Politics

The numbers of women in senior political posts is particularly important, since senior figures are most likely to attract the most press attention. Figures from a report for the House of Commons on Women in Parliament and Government (Duckworth and Cracknell, updated 2013) demonstrate that in terms of women in government (not necessarily in the Cabinet), we have actually gone backwards. Perhaps surprisingly, the highest percentage of women MPs appointed as ministers came during the Labour Government of 1966-70 (38%), followed by the 2005-10 Labour Government (37%). There were seven women ministers (including three baronesses) in 1992 under the Conservative administration. While this is not many, the 1992-97 Conservative Government had one of the highest percentages of their female MPs appointed as ministers (although out of a relatively small pool of Conservative female MPs to start with), equalled only by the 1966-70 Labour Government (53% of their female MPs under both administrations).

So what is the current situation under the Coalition government? In fact, women have gone backwards in terms of government. In the Cabinet, four out of 22 Cabinet posts (18%) are held by women. This compares to five Cabinet ministers immediately before the September 2012 reshuffle. (To put this in context, there were four women in Gordon Brown’s Cabinet after 2009 and eight in Tony Blair’s final Cabinet.) Of 119 Government Ministers, including the Cabinet, whips, Lords in waiting and unpaid positions, 23 (or 19%) are women. Prior to the 2010 election, 30% of Ministers were women.

With regards to the 2010 General Election, the Hansard briefing paper noted that:

‘women were not involved in the TV leaders’ debates (although all the main party leaders were male, Caroline Lucas and other minority party leaders were also not represented); the interviewing journalists were all male and there were just a few women on the advisory panels drawing up the question plan for each debate. More damning, however, was the fact that although there were nine BBC Daily Politics show debates held during the course of the campaign, of the 29 participants just two were women – Harriet Harman
Investigating newspaper coverage

What we wanted to investigate was whether this descriptive representation in parliament and in Government was reflected, reinforced or challenged in the amount and tone of national newspaper coverage. And has this changed over time? Our study, carried out in two stages, of which this is the second phase, focused on a sample from 1992, 2002 and 2012 under three different governments. Given the broad trends uncovered in the initial stage of research - with female politicians as a whole becoming less visible and heard less over time in proportion to their numbers in Parliament (O’Neill et al, submitted for publication) - the aim in the second stage of the study was to analyse some of this data in more detail to discover the interplay of gender and political parties.

The specific questions we asked in stage 2 of the study were:
Q1. When politicians of different sexes are referred to, what parties do they represent?
Q2. What is the tone of the coverage for male and female politicians (i.e., favourable or hostile?)
Q3. Is gender a factor in how women in the three main political parties are represented? Is there likely to be a more negative story of a Labour female MP than a Tory or vice versa? And what of the Liberal Democrats? And are there any trends for parties and genders over time?

Methodology

To answer these two questions we constructed sample news weeks for the years 1992, 2002 and 2012. These years were chosen as they represented a temporal gap, but also because there were different governments in office (1992, Conservative; 2002, Labour; 2012, Conservative/Liberal Democrats) – would the government in office make a difference to the kind of coverage?

Seven UK national newspapers (dailies and their Sunday equivalents where appropriate) were used in this study: red-top titles the Sun and the Daily Mirror; mid-market titles the Daily Express and the Daily Mail; and quality titles, the Guardian, the Times and the Daily Telegraph. As well as representing the main sections of the newspaper market, the chosen newspapers cover the political spectrum in the mainstream press, although it is fair to say there are no strongly left-wing views represented in the national UK mainstream press. While some newspapers have switched allegiances in the past, particularly as the centre ground shifted to the right under Tony Blair’s New Labour, most British newspapers support the Conservative Party; this does not mean they are never critical of that party, but usually they report within a right-wing hegemonic agenda. However, the Mirror supports the Labour Party and the Guardian embodies liberal values with its readership split between Labour and Liberal Democrat supporters. Despite the rise of online journalism and blogging, ‘the commercial organizations that professional journalists work for are mostly driven by the same imperatives of profit and power as before.’ (Curran and Seaton, 2009, p.96). Original newspapers were examined, or microfilms of the originals, from the British Newspaper Library in London.

For each year, a randomised ‘newsweek’ sample was analysed, moving from May
through to November, with data from each day of the week being recorded once over the seven month period. So, for example, the Times from Monday 8th June was used in 1992, and the Daily Mirror on Tuesday 7th July 1992, and so on. The order of newspapers was randomly chosen. In 2002 the Sunday Times was used on Sunday 12th May, the Daily Mirror on Monday 10th June and so on. We examined all articles that mentioned a politician but only included those where the politician was the main actor, so they do not add up to 100%.

The categorisations coded and recorded included the gender and party of the politician mentioned in the article (in this study we focussed on the three main parties, the Conservatives, Labour and the Liberal Democrats); whether the politician(s) portrayed in a story was represented in a positive, negative or neutral way, and how this divided on gender and party grounds. Implicitly, does the partisan bias of the press have a gendered effect?

Politicians were deemed to have appeared in articles with a positive tone if the article contained words or phrases that stated support for a politician or their actions or policies, or attributed positive qualities to the individual: for instance, ‘winning formula’, ‘confident performance’, ‘gaining support’, ‘ground breaking’. An example of such a story is from the Daily Express in 1992, which reported that ‘The conference was electrified’ [our emphasis]…by the performance of a female politician. A negative story was one that contained negative words or phrases about actions, roles or policies of a politician and, for instance, contained words like ‘embarrassment’, ‘humiliation’, ‘snubbed’, ‘crushing defeat’, ‘faced warnings/criticisms’, ‘no confidence’ or where the politician was subjected to negative personal descriptions. An example of this was Harriet Harman being called a ‘tit’ and ‘snooty’ in an article in the Sun in 2012. A neutral story would mention actions, roles, policies or individuals without any charged or judgmental language in the article, usually quoting a politician or reporting a policy without any comment and in a factual and straightforward way.

In addition, we interviewed ten female politicians from all parties about our quantitative findings and their perceptions about gender, politics and the press (all interviews were carried out in January 2014 and conducted by email or telephone, mostly the latter, and

Figure 1a: Coverage of MALE politicians by political party over time (expressed as a percentage of all male politicians mentioned in each year’s sample)
the interviewees are anonymised). We include their comments in the Discussion section.

Findings

Q1. When politicians of different sexes are referred to, what parties do they represent?  

(NB: The charts presented here (Figures 1a and 1b) refer to Table 2 in the Appendix).

What we are seeing here (see Table 2 in Appendix) is that on average, both Conservative males and females get most of the coverage, with the press appearing to support the government of the day. When particular years are examined, predictably the party in power tends to get the most coverage – so the Conservatives (male and female) get most coverage in 1992, while Labour politicians (male and female) get the greatest proportion of coverage in 2002. With the Conservatives as the senior partners in the Coalition of 2012, they again get the largest proportion of coverage (males and females) out of any party. Interestingly, in 1992, a higher proportion of Conservative female politicians feature in press stories (84.6%), out of all female politicians mentioned in the press, compared with a proportion of 73.8% for Conservative male politicians. In 2002, female Labour politicians get a similar proportion of coverage (72.7%) as male Labour politicians (71.6%), while Conservative women continue to get a higher proportion of coverage (27.3%) than male Conservatives (18%) in 2002, as in 1992. But by 2012, the situation for Conservative female politicians has reversed, with just a 37.5% proportion of coverage, compared to a 60.5% proportion of coverage for male Conservatives. Is this to do with the small proportion of women appointed to Government and Cabinet by the Cameron? Or is the press, which seems to have traditionally favoured Conservative women over Conservative men, beginning to change its stance? This is explored in the Discussion (below).

Back in 1992, while the Liberal Democrats, as the third party, received a lower propor-
dition of coverage as a whole, female Liberal Democrat politicians did at least as well as female Labour politicians at 7.7% each. And they received more proportional coverage than their male counterparts at just 2.2%. In 2002, Liberal Democrat coverage as a whole had not improved much (4.2% for males, 0 for women), and only rose to 8.8% for males in 2012, with no coverage for women. The real losers here are Liberal Democrat women:

Q2. What is the tone of the coverage for male and female politicians (i.e. favourable, hostile or neutral?) (NB: Figure 2 refers to Table 3 in the Appendix).

With regards to trends in tone over the years (see Figure 2 above and Table 3 in Appendix), in 1992, women received a greater proportion of positive coverage than male politicians, and more positive coverage than negative coverage. And like male politicians, the greatest proportion of stories featuring women presented them in a neutral light. This was broadly true of 2002, though we now see a greater proportion of negative stories at the expense of neutral and positive stories. By 2012, however, the situation has reversed. The proportion of positive stories have roughly equalised - 10% for males and 9.4% for females - in 2012. By far the biggest proportion of stories about female politicians are negative and the smallest proportion are positive. While this is also true of male politicians in 2012, the proportion of negative stories is greater for women in this year (40.6% for women compared with 34.7% for men). Nor have males undergone such a reversal trend over the years: in 2012 there are more than double the proportion of negative stories for women than in 2002 (40.6% in 2012 compared to 18.2% in 2002).

Figure 2: The percentage of positive, negative or neutral stories for each gender in each sample year

def they do not receive any coverage in 2002, nor do they feature at all in our 2012 sample (despite being part of the Coalition Government of the day). Overall, female Conservative and Labour politicians get a similar proportion of coverage when averaged over the three years sampled (44.9% and 41%, relatively). It is female Liberal Democrats who seriously lose out (1.3%).
It is fair to say that the press appears to be becoming more critical of politicians as a whole. One of the biggest shakeups to confidence and trust by the public in those that represent us was the MPs’ expenses scandal of 2009 and this is likely to have had a profound effect on the tone of coverage; we return to this point in our Discussion (below).

The increased negativity shown towards female politicians in 2012 can be seen as an unwelcome or welcome trend, depending on how the results are interpreted. It could be argued that hostile stories are a negative trend, or it could be argued that women are being increasingly treated in the same way as men by 2012, when the figures for positive, negative and neutral stories are beginning to equalise between the sexes. In other words, we must ask, are women starting to be viewed as the norm? Is this an inevitable result of being put in positions of power? But as we have discussed earlier, there are fewer women in Government in 2012 (19%) than in 2002 (30%) (Duckworth and Cracknell, updated 2013). So their numbers are still relatively low, with the Coalition having been criticised for not promoting women. Prime Minster David Cameron is nowhere near fulfilling his pledge that a third of ministerial jobs would go to women by the end of his first term. Are the political parties doing a poor job of raising the profile of women in terms of media relations? Or is there an inherent problem with the media and the way it views politicians as a whole, and women in particular? Some of these points are reinforced in the findings about gender and political party (see below) and, again, are further explored in the Discussion.

Q3. Is gender a factor in how women in the three main political parties are represented? Is there likely to be a more negative story of a Labour female MP than a Conservative one or vice versa?

First, it is important to point out that the Liberal Democrats have not been included in Tables 4B and 4C (in Appendix) and Figs. 3 because female Liberal Democrat politicians were only referred to in our samples once in 1992, and males very few times as well.

Over the years, Conservative and Labour female politicians are mentioned as main actors a similar number of times. Unsurprisingly, most female Labour politicians are mentioned in 2002 when Labour was in power and the party had boosted the numbers of female MPs.

With reference to Tone, (see also Table 4B: Appendix), Conservative women receive more positive coverage in each of the three years sampled (45.5% in 1992 compared to 0% for Labour women; 33% in 2002 compared to 12.5% for Labour women; and 33% in 2012 compared to 0% for Labour women).

However, Conservative women receive more negative coverage than Labour women in 2012. No female Labour politicians were positively referred to in 1992 or 2012 and just a small amount of positive coverage (at 12.5%) in 2002, a year when Labour politicians as a whole received the greatest proportion of coverage. By 2012, the category in which both female Labour politicians and female Conservative politicians feature most is negative.

And while Conservative women proportionally get far more positive coverage in relation to the number of times they are mentioned than Labour, it is fascinating to see that where women do feature in their own right as the main actors in stories, they are increasingly attracting negative coverage and this is true of the Conservatives as well as Labour. As more Conservative women are promoted in the coalition government in 2012, we see them depicted negatively in 83% of stories that feature Conservative women (see Table 4B: Appendix).

The real problem for Labour in 2012 is how few female Labour politicians are cov-
ered, despite the fact that Labour politicians get mentioned more often overall than any other party. The same is true of Liberal Democratic politicians, in particular women. One female Liberal Democrat is mentioned in a neutral category in 1992 (appearing as an inflated 25% since just four Liberal Democrats were mentioned in the sample) but no female Liberal Democrat politicians were mentioned in any category (positive, negative or neutral) thereafter. In particular, the lack of coverage of all Liberal Democrat politicians, regardless of gender – a party that makes up our government - is lamentable. What is left out of the news can be just as influential as what is included.

A comparison with male coverage reveals interesting trends over the years. In 1992, most proportional coverage is neutral for all male politicians (Labour and Conservatives – see Table 4C in Appendix). For males in 2002, Conservatives receive a similar proportion of positive, negative and neutral coverage, while for Labour the trend is different, with...
males receiving mostly neutral coverage and very little positive coverage.

By 2002, positive and negative coverage tends towards equalisation for all female politicians (Labour and Conservatives, Table 4B: Appendix), with neutral coverage the biggest category, a similar picture to males in 1992, 10 years previously. This is probably to be expected as Labour is the party of government and the party in power always attracts some criticism. However, by 2012 clear differences appear between the genders and parties. While there are 33% positive stories for Conservative females, there are no positive stories for female Labour politicians (Table 4B: Appendix). The biggest category for Labour females is negative (57%), then neutral (42.8%). It should be pointed out that male Labour politicians receive slightly more positive coverage than neutral or negative (at 22.2%), a surprising result, while the other two categories – negative and neutral - hover at around 15% (Table 4C: Appendix). As the party in power, all Conservative politicians receive mostly negative coverage, but women receive a proportion of negative coverage that is double that of their male counterparts (83% for female Conservatives compared to 41.7% for male Conservatives – Tables 4B and 4C respectively, Appendix). And proportionally, female Labour politicians are receiving negative coverage almost four times that of their male Labour counterparts (Tables 4B and 4C respectively, Appendix).

So we appear to be seeing a pattern by 2012 whereby female Liberal Democrats are not given any coverage in our sample, and Labour and Conservative female politicians are receiving much more negative coverage proportionally than in the past: indeed, by 2012, female Labour politicians receive no positive coverage.

Discussion

The issue of press coverage of politicians relies on a number of interplaying factors, not merely the press itself. Some of this lies with the political parties: the selection of female candidates in the first place and their subsequent promotion to more senior political roles, once elected - a politician with more responsibility has a greater chance of attracting press attention. Also important is the effectiveness of the media promotion of women by the party machinery. Finally, there is the structural, ideological and cultural complexion of media organisations, which affects what politicians and parties are deemed newsworthy, and what is the focus and treatment in terms of the subsequent coverage.

A senior Labour MP said that journalists too often adopted a ‘lazy mode of journalism’ when they focussed on women politicians, resorting to stereotypes and cliches. (Telephone interview).

One senior Conservative was clear about where she believed the problem lay:

‘Women are negatively stereotyped and often badly treated in the media. What really concerns me is that this can put women off applying to become members of Parliament. Contrary to what you might think, selection is not the issue for women in the Conservative Party, it’s getting them to apply in the first place; not enough women are putting themselves forward. There is a gender bias, perhaps unconscious, in the press, whereby the background narrative is that it is difficult to combine family life with a career in politics.’ (Telephone interview)

While Cameron has been criticised for failing to promote more women, she pointed out that he was promoting women to junior posts so that they could gain experience for more senior roles, and that change will take a little time. She was more concerned that the Prime Minister would have access to a pool of able women to promote in the first place. And a
female Labour MP (telephone interview) also pointed out that the Liberal Democrats have few women coming through: she believed the allegations of sexual harassment by Lord Rennard will not have helped.

One Labour MP said she thought the Conservative Party did a reasonable job of promoting women in the media, making effective use of backbenchers and women on select committees, not just female ministers, though not all the Conservative women agreed. Three Labour MPs said that their own party was remiss in this area, and that a ‘sexist filter’ was operating, whereby the same narrow group of people were nominated to speak to the media, and this group includes few women, and only younger ones: ‘only a select few are trusted’ (Labour MP, telephone interview). One Labour MP said that a TV producer told her he had difficulty getting a woman on to a programme, because he could not get the party press office to nominate one. A number of female Labour MPs pointed out that the party press office and the campaigns team for the next general election are comprised of men only.

Related to this is the importance of social networks and connections when trying to be heard in the media. Shadow Home Affairs Minister Diana Johnson has written about this issue in the Guardian. In response to an article telling female MPs to ‘man up’ on the Guardian’s website (Kite, 2013), Johnson commented, ‘In the world of politics, where you have to make and break alliances to further your own political career, there is also the issue of women being excluded from male social networks’ (Johnson, 2013).

The influence of broadcasting on newspapers cannot be ignored here, because different sections of the media feed off each other and gaining a media profile is a virtuous circle – attention from one part of the media leads to attention by other parts. ‘It is increasingly hard for women over 50 to be seen on TV,’ said one Labour MP (telephone interview). ‘No doubt in response to this agenda, the Labour press office appears to promote younger faces, irrespective of experience and knowledge. It takes time to gain experience, so this is an important issue.’ She also felt that TV producers did not help the situation if they placed older women besides glamorous young presenters, which only increased self-consciousness, inevitably leading to a lack of self-confidence.

With regards to the decreasing relative coverage of women suggested by our data, a Labour MP believed it could be due to the different style of political operation that women employ. ‘An important news value is conflict,’ she pointed out. ‘People who are loud get coverage. But women often go and make deals and sort things out behind the scenes. They are not likely to get media coverage for this work.’ And she was concerned that when women achieve change though applying persistent pressure, they can be portrayed as ‘nagging’. An interesting observation was made about the power structures of the press. ‘During the Leveson Inquiry, the male domination of newspaper management was striking. It was like journeying back 20 years. The tabloids decorate their pages with pictures of women’s bodies, and the quality press with comment pieces by women, but few women are in the actual driving seat’ (Labour MP, phone interview).

However, not all feedback was critical. Two female Labour MPs had perceived little difference in how they were treated by the press (email). However, one of these said she questioned why the press kept focussing on the number of women leaving Parliament. This focus was criticised by one Conservative MP:

‘When women like Laura Sandys have left Parliament through ill health, there has been lots of – quite negative - coverage about them leaving, along the lines “Conservative
"women can’t hack it”, but not the same level or type of coverage about the men leaving’
(telephone interview)

Interestingly, in interviews most women did not at first complain about a focus on appearance and family life by journalists. Most took it for granted that this happened all the time and they were used to putting up with it. Yet this ‘normalisation’ of double standards reminds us of the importance of continuing to challenge coverage that trivialises women and detracts from what they are doing and saying. Indeed, one Labour politician said she made a point of contacting any journalist she felt was trivialising politics, adding, ‘It is important to challenge this type of coverage, or it will never change. It only takes two minutes’ (telephone interview).

Others were more vociferous: ‘It’s hard getting national coverage and the only thing I ever seem to get asked is about my kids, or being a female MP, at least from national media’ (Liberal Democrat MP, email). And one Conservative MP summed up a view that many of the women raised: ‘I want the newspapers and media in general to stop focusing on shoes, clothes and hair and to report on my contribution to Parliament’ (telephone interview).

Another Labour MP said that women’s expertise tends to get pigeonholed, so they are interviewed about issues relating to care or motherhood. ‘There is a sloppiness in all political parties about finding out what women know and their expertise.’ Related to this, a number felt that, as a woman, their expertise was ignored or sidelined by the press, particularly with regards to ‘weighty’ issues, traditionally associated with men. As one Labour politician said:

‘I have 16 years of experience in the Treasury, dealing with the UK budget and the OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development). I have more Treasury experience than the Shadow Chancellor. Yet I have never been asked anything by a journalist on economic affairs or international issues’ (telephone interview)

But most of the women felt they were interviewed on a much wider range of issues in the regional/local press; they stressed that the regional press was markedly different than the national press and generally gave them better coverage.

In addition to gender politics, some of our findings appear to reflect the ideological complexion of the British press, which generally favours right-wing policies. This is likely to account for differences between female politicians of different parties, with Conservative females generally receiving more positive coverage than female Labour politicians, particularly in 2012, when female Labour politicians received no positive coverage and the Liberal Democrats were seriously neglected. Indeed, Conservative female politicians seemed to exude a sort of ‘Marmite effect’, whereby they seemed to be loved or loathed in terms of press coverage, since they also received a large proportion of negative stories in 2012.

There were two big stories about female Conservative MPs that might well have contributed to making coverage more negative than it might otherwise have been. First, Nadine Dorries MP was heavily criticised in the press for appearing on reality TV show ‘I’m A Celebrity; Get Me Out Of Here’, particularly for neglecting her parliamentary and constituency duties while on the programme. Second, former MP Louise Mensch broke with protocol by resigning mid-term from her seat; she attracted a great deal of negative coverage for not waiting to resign at the next election. Both events were widely covered and probably skewed the results to some extent.

With regards to the higher negative coverage for women in general, there was a feeling
by the MPs interviewed that anything negative was often hugely exaggerated by the press, particularly for women. Clearly the expenses scandal of 2009 was a huge and important story - and no doubt explains the overall increase in negative press coverage we found over time - but a number of women interviewed believed female politicians sometimes experienced more unwarranted flak as a result of the fallout from this. One claimed she had received negative coverage, despite her expenses being in order:

‘The press spun this as a negative story for me, despite the fact I was not required to pay any money back. It didn’t matter what good work I was doing – this usually came up in a newspaper article when I was Googled. And Jacqui Smith was held up as the “poster girl” of the expenses scandal – yet those who went to prison were all men’ (Female Labour MP, telephone interview)

Another felt that the press did not understand the unique position of mothers of young children with regards to expenses. ‘They question why you have a flat in London with more than one bedroom, or why your young child has to travel on the train with you’ (Labour MP, telephone interview). And a Conservative MP stated: ‘While there is a focus on the personal lives of all politicians, women come under even more scrutiny’ (telephone interview). Both Conservative and Labour women highlighted the Daily Mail as being particularly negative towards female politicians.

When asked about why women seemed to be receiving more negative coverage than their male colleagues, as indicated by our data and suggested by many of our interviewees, one Labour MP believed it could be because women were sometimes ‘going out on a limb’ with regards to the media: if they are being blocked within their own party, they may seek publicity in other ways, dealing with journalists directly, and they are then without the support and experience of a press office, which could make negative coverage more likely.

Another felt the political parties could do more to train women in dealing with the press and developing journalistic contacts. She pointed out that many women were by nature less willing to push themselves in the media, unless they had something valid to say: ‘yet broadcast journalists have told me they are bombarded by male MPs willing to appear. Women seem to wait to be asked’ (telephone interview).

Conclusion

The treatment of all Liberal Democrats in 2012 by our press – minimal coverage - is possibly an indictment of the partisan nature of our press, but some of the problem may lie within the party itself. Certainly, the lack of women – a party issue - is reflected in the coverage. In addition to receiving less coverage with regards to their numbers in Parliament, and their voices being heard less, these findings suggest that female politicians are experiencing more negative coverage than in the past, regardless of whether they represent Labour or the Conservatives, though Conservative women can expect to receive more positive coverage than Labour women, and women of both parties are now experiencing more negative coverage proportionally than their male colleagues. Female Labour politicians receive the least positive coverage over the years and received no positive coverage in our 2012 sample. This suggests there might be both a gender and ideological filter operating with regards to coverage of female Labour politicians, not particularly surprising in a right-wing dominated press.

How gender plays out in the press is clearly perceived by some female politicians as an
area of concern, whether the causes lie internally - within the political parties themselves or the political process - or externally, with the press. And it is worth noting that there were some similarities in the issues they raised, across parties, namely the focus of press attention, the underlying narratives that appear in the press about women in politics - such as women not being able to ‘hack’ politics - the trivialising of women’s contribution to the democratic process, and a more negative tone in general. This appears to suggest that the news values of (at least some) journalists are influenced by gendered stereotyping.

And a number of the politicians we interviewed pointed to the same, narrow range of sources that journalists seem to rely on, a trend pointed out as long ago as 1980 by Gans in his work on sources, and subsequently by Bell in 1991. Labour politicians also point to the role of their own press office in promoting a small select group in the media.

Within society, many factors already militate against women entering public life. The regressive trends highlighted by our findings, taken in context with other media developments, such as the rise of internet trolls churning out appalling misogynist abuse and rape and death threats to women who have aired views or campaigned publicly (notable examples being academic Mary Beard after she appeared on Question Time, and feminist campaigner Caroline Criado-Perez and MP Stella Creasy), creates a climate that makes it more difficult for women and which can put competent women off taking public office.

Added to this is a gender bias that can trivialise or humiliate and undermine women. Throughout 2013, the period immediately following our last data analysis, we saw examples of newspaper journalist and editors continuing to cling to an outdated gender bias that simply would not be tolerated in most businesses: whether it is Home Secretary Theresa May’s clothes (Gayle, 2013); a major newspaper offering a hefty sum in the hunt for Shadow Minister Gloria de Piero’s topless pictures (taken when she was 15) (Baxter, 2013); or the tweets of Tom Newton-Dunn, the political editor of the Sun, questioning MP Stella Creasy’s right to raise the issue of Page 3 while wearing a blue PVC skirt. Writing in the Guardian online on 12 December 2013, Nell Frizzell rightly ridiculed Newton-Dunn’s preposterous comments:

‘That’s the thing about us feminists – we are completely out of clothing control. We’ve thrown our sense of sartorial decorum to the wind. Giving neither a willy, nor a nilly, we have smashed the civilised link between the right to speak, and the precise consistency of fabric wrapped around our undercarriage.’

Back in 2001, a Guardian article highlighted research by The Guardian/Women in Journalism that suggested press coverage of female politicians was having a detrimental effect on the political process:

‘Most of the women MPs who won their seats at the last [1997] election believe that the way they have been portrayed in the press will deter other women from standing for parliament. They think that local parties will be less likely to choose them and they say their effectiveness was undermined by the continual presentation of them as “babes” and “Stepford Wives”’ (Perkins and Ward, 2001).

Thirteen years later, our quantitative and qualitative research suggests that little has changed.

It may be too simplistic to state that more women in Parliament, and better press coverage of female politicians - jettisoning gendered double standards and obtaining women’s views on a wider range of issues and debates - would automatically make for increased engagement by women voters. But it would certainly do no harm to the level of political discourse and debate – which would surely increase the chances of wider citizen involve-
ment, whatever their sex.

It is fair to say this research has only just begun to explore longitudinal trends in the representation of female politicians, and, with limited samples, can only point to possible trends.

Our central argument aim has been that news coverage has a gendered dimension to it. As educators of journalism students, our news makers of the future, we need to remind them that gender blindness does not equal gender neutrality. That is, an understanding of the gendered dimension of news coverage is essential if we are to make sense of the possible consequences for democracy. To marginalise women is to limit the diversity of democratic debate, rendering it representative only of a narrow range of views. Healthy democracy depends on healthy journalism; to have healthy journalism we argue, we need to educate our future journalists to reflect on their role within existing power structures, and the opportunities and responsibilities they have, in shaping democratic society. We have sought in these pages to contribute to the debate about the representation of women in the media, and the health of the relationship between journalism and democracy, provoking our journalism and media students to reflect on their own practice.
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Appendix

TABLE 2: Amount of coverage in relation to gender and political party

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>Labour/*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>73.8% (99/134)</td>
<td>18% (24/134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18% (30/166)</td>
<td>71.6% (119/166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>60.5% (103/170)</td>
<td>15.3% (27/170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49.3% (232/470) men referred to are Cons</td>
<td>36.2% (170/470) are Lab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 3: Tone of coverage presented in terms of gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>6% (8/134)</td>
<td>20.1% (27/134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(men are mentioned 134 times, women 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>12% (20/166)</td>
<td>13.3% (22/166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Men are mentioned 166 times, women 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10% (17/170)</td>
<td>34.7% (59/170)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Men are mentioned 170 times, women 32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male positive (45/470) = 9.5%</td>
<td>Male negative (108/470) =23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLES 4 (A, B&C) Tone of coverage presented in terms of gender and party

TABLE 4A shows all years, genders and parties are presented, expressed as percentages of the total amount of times each party is referred to in each year’s sample, and with
the original figures provided so that the number of times a party is mentioned in each
category may be understood in real terms. The latter is useful, because if a party is only
mentioned once, for example as a positive story, the percentage would be 100% positive
for a particular year, but we also need to know the results are skewed by the fact that this
party is largely ignored and rarely features in the mainstream press.

**TABLE 4A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PARTY</th>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th>NEUTRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>4.5% (5/110)</td>
<td>7.3% (8/110)</td>
<td>1.8% (2/110)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>2.9% (1/34)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.9% (2/34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib Dem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>7.7% (3/39)</td>
<td>25.6% (10/39)</td>
<td>5.1% (2/39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>2.1% (3/143)</td>
<td>5.6% (8/143)</td>
<td>2.1% (3/143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib Dem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Cons</td>
<td>3.5% (4/115)</td>
<td>7.8% (9/115)</td>
<td>8.7% (10/115)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lab</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17.6% (6/34)</td>
<td>11.8% (4/34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lib Dem</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13.3% (2/15)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Please note that the figures do not add up to 100%, since we only included stories where
the main actors were portrayed in a positive, negative or neutral way. For instance, in
some stories, the politician quoted is not the main focus of the story. Instead they are, for
example, briefing against another politician, or supporting another politician and it is this
other politician who is the main focus of the story. These stories about others were not
included.

TABLES 4B and 4C go on to divide the data into tables for each gender (and party) and
to present the percentages as a proportion of the number of times a particular gender from
each party is mentioned. **The Liberal Democrats were mentioned so rarely that they have not been included in TABLES 4B and 4C.**
TABLE 4B: Tone for Conservative and Labour FEMALE politicians expressed as a percentage of total amount of times females from a particular party are mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Female +</th>
<th>Female –</th>
<th>Female neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(11)</td>
<td>45.5% (5/11)</td>
<td>18.1% (2/11)</td>
<td>27.2% (3/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.7% (1/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>33% (3/9)</td>
<td>22% (2/9)</td>
<td>44.4% (4/9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>12.5% (3/24)</td>
<td>12.5% (3/24)</td>
<td>45.8% (11/24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(12)</td>
<td>33% (4/12)</td>
<td>83% (10/12)</td>
<td>33% (4/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>42.8% (3/7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4C: Tone for MALE Conservative and Labour politicians expressed as a percentage of amount of times males from a particular party are mentioned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Male +</th>
<th>Male –</th>
<th>Male neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td>8% (8/99)</td>
<td>25.3% (25/99)</td>
<td>58.6% (58/99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>4.8% (1/21)</td>
<td>9.5% (2/21)</td>
<td>61.9% (13/21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>33.3% (10/30)</td>
<td>26.7% (8/30)</td>
<td>30% (9/30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(119)</td>
<td>6.7% (8/119)</td>
<td>31.1% (37/119)</td>
<td>54.6% (65/119)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>(103)</td>
<td>8.7% (9/103)</td>
<td>41.7% (43/103)</td>
<td>22.3% (23/103)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>(27)</td>
<td>22.2% (6/27)</td>
<td>14.8% (4/27)</td>
<td>14.8% (4/27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Workplace not workshop: student reflections on the introduction of a work-based approach to the final year

John Mathews, Liverpool John Moores University and Kate Heathman, Liverpool John Moores University

Work-based or work-related learning is a cornerstone of most vocational degrees. Much evaluation of such teaching concentrates on the design and delivery of work-based learning opportunities, but what do the students think? This article describes the introduction of a new workplace simulation approach used to teach final year Journalism and International Journalism students at Liverpool John Moores University. A survey measured undergraduate responses to the ways in which students were directed in their studies as part of a live, seven-day publishing operation. The study reports on how students perceived their levels of confidence, skills, motivation, engagement and employability increased as a direct result of their involvement with the experiential learning programme. The field of research regarding work-based or work-related learning in the delivery of journalism is not extensive in a UK context and this study aims to expand the knowledge base of practical, simulated professional teaching methods at higher education level. More generally the study provides insight into students reactions to ‘authentic’ work-related learning approaches.
Much has been discussed about the need to ensure that degree programmes increase graduate employability and the need to connect degree curricula and employability by introducing work-based or work-related learning (Mason & Robinson, 2009).

Indeed, many would argue that a key role for the higher education sector is to equip graduates with more than purely academic skills in order to supply suitably skilled graduates to the workplace (e.g. Hills et al, 2003). The expansion of higher education has pushed employability to the top of the agenda for vocational degree courses and the sector has long been urged to place transferable and employability skills at the heart of the student experience (Atkins, 1999).

More recently, perceptions of the ‘value’ of university education have gained prominence, particularly since the introduction of higher tuition fees and publication of Key Information Sets (www.unistats.direct.gov.uk). These enable swift comparisons of all degree courses in a range of categories, including employment rates and average salary six months after graduation. For many, ‘graduateness’ is seen as the most important personal outcome of higher education because, as Glover et al (2002) state, it is ‘concerned with the way in which those who have completed university courses can be assimilated into national and international employment’.

As the demand for workplace-ready graduates increases, so the need to shape teaching designs and assessment methods to replicate workplace practices also increases. Along with it comes a need for a range of creative and active learning approaches that engage students and enhance their understanding (Rao & Stupans, 2012). Such approaches can include role play – in which learners act out roles – or problem-based learning, using classroom simulations to enable students to tackle problems together, facilitated by academic staff there as guides (Ahlfeldt et al, 2007). Both methods may assist in the development of a simulated workplace environment in the classroom and it is a combination of the two – and the subsequent student response to their introduction - that will be explored in this paper.

Work-related learning and workplace simulations

Moreland (2005), in research undertaken on behalf of the UK’s Higher Education Academy, defines work-related learning as ‘involving students learning about themselves and the world of work in order to empower them to enter and succeed in the world of work and their wider lives’. He asserts that work-related learning therefore involves students in four interrelated areas of learning: learning about oneself – capabilities, confidence, life interests and career decisions (Efficacy and Metacognition); learning and practising skills of value in the world of work (Skilful Practices); experiencing the world of work (or facsimiles thereof) to provide insight (Understandings); and learning how to learn and manage oneself in a range of situations, including those to be found at work (Metacognition). For educators, this presents a challenge: how best to not only incorporate these four areas of learning into the curriculum, but also to find an appropriate, meaningful form of assessment that can measure such development.

Gray (2001) emphasises that work-related or work-based learning should include the acquisition of technical skills, but it must also involve reviewing and learning from the experience. The importance of such practical experience – and subsequent reflection
follows the model of Kolb’s learning cycle (1984) which identifies the four different abilities needed if learning is to be effective: concrete experience; reflective and observational ability; conceptualisation ability (thinking how the reflection will affect what they do); and active experimentation that applies this new-found understanding. Based on this conceptual model, a learning design that incorporates hands-on work in the newsroom, followed by formative feedback and the regular opportunity to apply learning week after week before a final summative self-assessment, should prove effective for the students.

Role play may be used effectively to model and reflect professional practice. Rao and Stupans (2012), in developing a typology and teacher guidelines for role play activities, identified three categories: ‘Role’ switch, involves learners taking on the role of another person to better understand their actions; ‘Acting’, in which learners act out their role; and finally, ‘Almost Real Life’, where students are provided with a role-playing experience that is as close to real life as possible and enables them to apply their skills in a simulated, but safe ‘work’ environment. To provide such an environment requires extensive planning, together with full feedback and debriefing opportunities, but has been shown to help foster teamwork (Beard et al, 1995) and improve communication skills (Nestel & Tierney, 2007). Therefore it can be very effective for vocational degrees.

A simulated work environment also enables students to undertake problem-based learning (PBL) by working as a group to tackle a common challenge. Highly regarded in several disciplines, and shown to result in learning with a longer ‘shelf-life’ (Dochy et al, 2003), PBL represents a shift to student-centred education with process-oriented methods of learning in which students have the opportunity to learn material in the context in which that knowledge will be used (Ahlfeldt et al, 2007). Long projects, spanning one or two semesters, are considered to be particularly useful since they require complete immersion in the problem and allow for enhanced assimilation of concepts, opportunities for fuller critical thinking and more comprehensive collaborative working (ibid.).

**Employability for Journalism**

For the profession of journalism, holding a journalism degree is a recent development. Studies by Delano & Henningham (1995) and Delano (2001) revealed that in 1995, 95% of news journalists in Britain held a bachelor’s degree of some kind, but only 1% had an undergraduate degree in journalism with 9% holding a postgraduate diploma. By 2001, 62% had a degree and 7% had an undergraduate degree in journalism (Skillset, 2006). This proportion has continued to increase and Hanna & Sanders (2007) note that a growing proportion of journalism graduates in newsrooms, despite residual industry concerns that journalism is not the best first degree subject for would-be journalists.

Numerous studies have concerned the teaching of journalism at higher education level, but only a small number have focused on student attitudes and responses to practical work that replicates a professional newsroom environment and industry standards.

Hanna & Sanders (op cit) explored findings after an extensive survey of British journalism undergraduates at the start and completion of their degree courses, on their motivation to become journalists, with questions such as: “Do you want to pursue a career in journalism?” Similar studies, such as Wu (2000) and Sparks and Splichal (1989), offer attitudinal and motivational responses by students questioned about their perceived expectations of the profession as a future career. But whilst these studies provide insight into aspects of motivation and career goals, they do not consider perceptions of their learning.
experiences while studying journalism.

More directly comparable research is offered by Carmichael et al (2007), in a study of a three-day ‘simulation’ at the Department of Journalism Studies at the University of Sheffield. The department became a real newsgathering operation covering the UK General Election, involving 50 postgraduate journalism students and eight postgraduate students of political communication. They produced two newspapers, a website, radio news bulletins, a three-hour ‘as live’ radio programme, and two television news programmes. In their evaluation, ten of the students (11% of the total cohort) were voluntarily interviewed to gain a reflective insight into their perceptions and experiences of the project. Among the findings, it was discovered that growth in student confidence was discernible, after a strong sense of initial anxiety stated by a number of participants. Students were more confident in their abilities as a result of the project and reported a positive experience in terms of how much they had learned.

Rhodes and Roessner (2008) investigated the teaching of magazine publishing through experiential learning, considering 16 magazine publishing courses in US universities where students worked together in simulated newsrooms to produce magazines from concept to publication. The study found that linking learning, thinking and doing by providing students with ‘real-life’ educational experiences in their workshops meant that the courses were answering the calls from industry and educators for more hands-on, real-world approaches in the classroom. They found that the students were initially anxious but this bred confidence as they began to understand more about working together and managing the pressure of professional deadlines.

Case study: A simulated newsroom

It was this desire to provide a meaningful realistic work-based experience for final year Journalism students at Liverpool John Moores University (LJMU) within a simulated newsroom environment that led to the redesign of a 48-credit Level 6 module, Advanced Journalism Practice (AJP). The Journalism degree is accredited by the Broadcast Journalism Training Council (BJTC) who state that: “Most employers want to see graduates with initiative and commitment and the professional skills to effectively gather information and to tell a story, whatever the medium” (BJTC, 2013). By adopting a work-related approach with final year studies, Advanced Journalism Practice was redesigned to combine the two elements of graduateness and employability, to prepare graduates successfully for a range of careers and, more specifically, equip them with the necessary skills to succeed in the media industry.

A Journalism departmental website - ‘JMU Journalism’ - (www.jmu-journalism.org.uk) was central to the delivery of the module (Figure 1: see also Appendix). First launched in May 2009 to provide a live, outward-facing platform to showcase student coursework, the website was primarily introduced for final year students specialising in online journalism. A student ‘website team’ was created, following interviews conducted with academic staff, before implementing a simulated professional environment and management structure among the student peer groups. This took the form of additional weekly meetings outside the regular timetable and students assuming responsibility for newsgathering throughout the week. Students not involved in the website team could still have work published, though the lion’s share of the 2,000-plus stories which were published over the next three years were written by those who had opted for the online specialist, or to be a part of the voluntary JMU Journalism student ‘workforce’. All of these stories were checked for factual/legal/grammatical errors and sub-edited before being published by academic staff. No additional university credits were available for this work as it did not
form part of the compulsory formal curriculum.

**Initial pilot (2011)**

In August 2011, a pilot evaluation study was conducted among 25 student volunteers...
working on the departmental website. This measured the students’ perceived motivational and attitudinal changes and recognised an increase in perceived confidence, belief in their abilities and a heightened sense of employability. These results will be discussed further combined with results of more recent evaluation.

**Module redesign**

Building on this experience, the Advanced Journalism Practice module was redesigned to integrate work-related learning and the newsroom simulation model. The website was redesigned and launched in June 2012 ahead of the academic year 2012/13 to allow for an increase in multimedia story production in order to incorporate a new teaching strategy. This extended the opportunities for having coursework published to every final year student in a fully-integrated, converged seven-day news operation, whereby students were aiming to have their stories made live to the public on one of three outlets: the JMU Journalism website, which also hosted a weekly online newspaper, ‘Liverpool Life’, plus a JMU Journalism TV channel on YouTube, which was launched at the time of the introduction of the original website in 2009.

For the academic year 2012/13, sixty students were enrolled on the programme, from the Journalism and International Journalism programmes. At the outset of the academic year students were encouraged to abandon preconceived notions of the university experience thus far and to adopt a new mind-set towards their studies; treating Advanced Journalism Practice as ‘going to work’ rather than simply attending a scheduled class. Lecturers should therefore be considered more as editorial line managers when work was being critiqued and published and every student would now be engaged in a year-long ‘work experience placement’. All students would attend a weekly eight-hour ‘newsday’, holding a morning and afternoon news conference with stories being produced and published throughout the working day. Although the ‘newsday’ was a scheduled activity, students were advised that continuous newsgathering and story production throughout the week would be a necessary requirement for them to fulfil the module requirements.

As a result of the new working model, 800-plus website stories were published in 2012/13, alongside 16 issues of the weekly Liverpool Life newspaper (a companion newspaper, published weekly, available online on the day of publication and in a printed format the following day) and clips on the JMU Journalism YouTube TV channel, many of which were incorporated into converged content on the site. This afforded all 60 final year students the opportunity to have the majority of their final year coursework portfolio appear on a live website, which would hopefully in turn become tangible and easily-accessible evidence of their journalism capabilities to future employers.

In addition to the work-based model introduced for Advanced Journalism Practice, Level 6 students spend one month of their final year on a work experience placement (or placements) in a professional newsroom, PR agency or other related institutions. Two voluntary opportunities were provided for students to gain extra-curricular experience in their final year – but for no additional university credits over and above their work on AJP:

Students could volunteer and apply for various editorial positions on the JMU Journalism website. Applicants underwent a brief but rigorous interview process with academic staff to gain these roles. Website team members attended a weekly two-hour meeting to help shape the upcoming news agenda on JMU Journalism, in collaboration with a member of staff.
The Liverpool Echo newspaper also conducted interviews with some volunteers to create a ‘Community News’ team. Students assumed responsibility for a ‘news patch’ to provide hyper-local journalism which was published by the Echo’s parent company Trinity Mirror North West in its various titles and on its websites. The lure of published work on a professional outlet proved popular, with around a quarter of the final year text cohort volunteering to take part.

New method of assessment

A new approach to teaching necessitates an innovative approach to assessment. Some traditional assessment practices may not equip students well for a lifetime of learning and the assessment challenges they may face in future (Boud, 2000). Graduates in the workforce will not usually be taking examinations or writing academic essays and so preparing students for lifelong learning means involving them in making complex judgements about their work and enabling them to make decisions in the unpredictable circumstances in which they could find themselves in the workplace (Boud & Falchikov, 2006).

Brown (2004) emphasises the need to consider what we are assessing, how we are doing it and why, as this will impact on the choice of assessment instruments. She proposed that this should include a wide diversity of methods rather than adherence to traditional, over-used methods, such as essays, reports and time-constrained exams. Brown argues for learner-centred assessment focusing on evidence of achievement and not the ability to regurgitate information. Effective assessment should be designed to be practice-orientated and should aim to measure how students can put into practice the learning they have achieved. Educators need to “keep abreast of new developments, evaluate tried and tested ones and experiment with our own initiatives”.

This was certainly the case for Advanced Journalism Practice where the ‘tried and tested’ method had been a portfolio of work collected over the course of two semesters. The shift in emphasis to a work-related learning model was deemed to require a new method of assessment in line with workplace practices; to provide a realistic experience for students, and with a foundation in sound assessment pedagogy.

Therefore, while the means of collecting evidence of achievement – the portfolio – was retained, this was assessed formatively throughout the year, with timely feedback being given week by week. Gibbs and Simpson (2004) claim that feedback is often inadequate because it follows the termination of an activity and often is then not applied to future work. For feedback to be entirely effective it should result in students taking subsequent action that involves further learning and it should be received by students while it still matters to them, in time for them to pay attention to further learning or receive further assistance. Therefore receiving regular feedback on work produced each week should contribute to an overall improvement in performance and allow students to refine their skills.

The summative assessment element now became focused on a viva (performance appraisal) at the end of semester two, which was weighted at 50% of the Advanced Journalism Practice module. The remainder was apportioned to an individual journalism artefact at 40% of the module weighting, with 10% assessed via a continuous self-reflective blog on their experience of learning in a true ‘world of work’ environment.

Each formal 30-minute appraisal was conducted with two academic staff and although the student’s portfolio of work formed the foundation for the viva discussion, the primary assessment and feedback method was to critically appraise the student’s personal and
teamwork performance throughout the year, as measured against professional standards in real working newsrooms. This was to be the students’ first experience of the viva, a form of oral assessment that has had a long and honourable history in disciplines such as medicine, law and architecture (Joughin & Collom, 2003) but had not been used in the teaching of Journalism at LJMU.

Students were given detailed guidance on how to prepare for the appraisal and were encouraged to reflect upon their own performance throughout the module so that they could explain and discuss aspects of their work with their tutors after it had been submitted but before a mark had been awarded. In line with Moreland’s (2005) four inter-related areas of learning the viva encourages efficacy and metacognition, skilful practices and understandings and further metacognition through experiencing and learning how to learn and manage oneself in a range of situations.

For Joughin and Collom (2003) one of the key benefits of oral assessment is authenticity, since oral communication skills dominate most areas of professional practice making it well suited to assessment tasks that reflect ‘real life’ teamwork.

The viva fosters a ‘deep’ approach to learning and encourages the students to think differently about their learning. Rather than perceiving assessment as something that requires the memorising and regurgitating of information, the viva moves students to a position whereby they are required to present ideas, explore concepts and relationships, reconstruct aspects of knowledge and move away from the notion that there is only one solution to a problem or one correct answer to a question (Lawson, 2012).

Second stage evaluation (2013)

A follow-up evaluation was undertaken at the end of the 2012/13 academic year to gain insight into the effects on students’ learning of introducing this initiative. This incorporated core elements of the 2011 survey and allows for comparison.

Again, the chosen methodology was a questionnaire, designed to allow the researchers to collect data quickly. Interviews were considered but rejected, since a risk of potential bias existed as the researchers were well known to the student participants. The questionnaire was made available online at the end of the second semester to all sixty students enrolled on the module. Students were asked to respond to a number of statements about their experience of the work-based learning approach. Respondents were requested to assess their levels of agreement or disagreement with the statements, on a five-item Likert scale (Strongly agree = 5; Agree = 4; No firm opinion = 3; Disagree = 2; Strongly disagree = 1).

Participants were also able to express longer, free-text responses providing more qualifying information to facilitate the understanding of their responses and to gather further qualitative data. Students were asked to offer their honestly-held views at all times.

The response rate was low, with only 14 of the cohort (23%) responding, so findings are only indicative but they did allow for comparison with the 2011 survey. The low response rate was primarily attributed to the voluntary participation being timed late on in the semester when students were also preoccupied with end-of-module assessments. Therefore, the results have limited reliability and may not represent views of the full cohort. However, the purpose here is mainly to gain a general assessment of the nature and direction of effects, rather than any rigorous quantitative assessment of the magnitude of learning gains.
The findings revealed there was an increase in levels of confidence and perceived ability at the end of the module (Table 1). Nine students (64%) felt they were lacking in confidence before the start of the module and ten (71%) believed they did not have sufficient skills as a student journalist. Open comments reflected these results:

“ ‘I wasn’t confident at all. I felt I had no reason to ask questions or interview people.’ ” (Participant 3)

“I felt that I was too young and inexperienced to act as a journalist - I’d only ever had one story published before this year in a magazine, so I didn’t think I’d be up to the task of getting stories published.” (Participant 11)

After involvement with the AJP module, comments reflected greater confidence:

“ ‘You get much more work done and get feedback right there and then, both on your story and your writing. The immediate feedback really boosts your confidence if you have done well.’ ” (Participant 5)

“I am now more confident with my writing and know what it takes to find a good story. I also have a portfolio of work to impress employers.” (Participant 9)

**Table 1: Perceptions of confidence and ability prior to and after involvement with the AJP module. Scores are means, with higher scores (i.e. nearer to 5) representing higher agreement rating.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BEFORE involvement with AJP/JMU Journalism</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>AFTER involvement with AJP/ JMU Journalism</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td>I was confident in myself as a student journalist.</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>I am more confident in myself as a direct result of my work on AJP/JMU Journalism.</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ability</strong></td>
<td>I believe I had sufficient skills as a student journalist.</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>I believe I have much greater skills as a student journalist as a direct result of my work on AJP/ JMU Journalism.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students were also asked about the motivation of having coursework published to a real audience, their preparation for work placement, their perception of their own ‘employability’ and their perception of their own performance (Table 2).
Table 2: Responses to statements related to motivation, preparation for work placement, employability and performance. Scores are means, with higher scores (i.e. nearer to 5) representing higher agreement rating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was more motivated because my work was being published live.</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My work experience placement was made easier/less daunting because of my involvement with AJP/JMU Journalism in a simulated newsroom/professional environment.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe I am more employable as a direct result of my involvement with AJP/JMU Journalism.</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my own performance during this module.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost all respondents (n=12, 86%) agreed that work experience was made easier by their experiential learning on the Advanced Journalism Practice module, with two students commenting:

“Deadline day was very similar to News Days and because of my participation in News Days I did not feel intimidated by the business of the office.” (Participant 2)

“On work experience, I went in with a really positive attitude which reflected to my fellow colleagues. This was due to the confidence that AJP/JMU Journalism had given me throughout the year.” (Participant 12)

All the respondents (n=14) perceived themselves to be more employable, with comments including:

“I feel the fact we have been working on a live product each week [means] employers will believe I am in a better stance to work for them as I will have had more experience.” (Participant 4)

“Yes, without a doubt. It is a professional environment and you are so much better prepared for what’s coming. If I had any criticism of the course, it would be that we didn’t do anything like this in the second year, so the difference from second to third year maybe was a bit too big.” (Participant 5)

“I have a portfolio of published work and a huge amount of skills as a direct result of the experience over the year. It is not always easy to get work experience but the course enables you to be guaranteed work experience on the website and newspaper and guarantees you published work to show employers.” (Participant 9)

Students were also asked to rate their ability in a number of skills and attributes, both personal and professional (Tables 3 & 4), with the question: ‘Assess to what extent you have increased your ability in the following skills/attributes as a direct result of your involvement with AJP/JMU Journalism in these personal and professional development areas. Students were asked to rate themselves on a scale of 0-10, where 0 = no improvement and 10 = vast improvement.
Table 3: Students’ rating of perceived improvement in personal skills after the AJP module

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiasm</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Skills</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-awareness</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Students’ rating of improvement in their professional skills after AJP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employability</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation/Pitching</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work under pressure</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviewing</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsgathering</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newswriting</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical skills</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a clear perceived increase in ability in all skills but the most marked improvement was in employability and confidence, followed by newsgathering and technical skills, the core professional abilities demanded in any newsroom.

Finally, students were asked to give their opinions on how they felt about the appraisal (viva) method of assessment and if there was anything they wished they had done differently. Nearly all respondents, (n=12, 86%) expressed positive views about the appraisal/viva method, with some suggestions for minor changes and just the one negative response.

Qualitative responses indicated a heightened degree of self-awareness, with eleven students stating “I wish I had tried harder… “, or similar.

Comments also indicated the assessment model was valuable in engaging students in focusing on improvements:

“I think the AJP appraisal was a great idea. It meant I could get honest feedback from my lecturers and find out where I needed to improve. I would have made more of an effort more consistently. At times my effort was great, at times it wasn’t.” (Participant 8)

“I feel the appraisal method was the best possible way to evaluate our work. It gave an accurate representation and there was nowhere to hide a bad performance. Other methods of assessment often mean that people who have put in less effort or left things to the last minute sometimes still get better marks than those who have put effort in all year.” (Participant 14)

The public nature of presenting the work was also recognised as valuable in terms of increasing feedback:

“The fact that the work was published online meant that more people could see it and have more direct feedback, from which you can learn.” (Participant 11)

“….you also get feedback from your boss, co-workers and readers. Seeing people sharing something you have written on social media such as Twitter gives you a massive confidence boost.” (Participant 5)

**Comparison with 2011 pilot study**

The 2013 study did not produce any significant discrepancies with the 2011 findings among the JMU Journalism website volunteers; results were broadly very similar. Taking the combined results into account where applicable, it may be said that the overall responses lend weight to the conclusions that can be drawn. Six of the questions were identical in the two studies, producing a total of 39 respondents overall.

Confidence levels before involvement with AJP/JMU Journalism were mixed though more than half (54%) felt they were not confident. However, 38 out of 39 respondents (97%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were more confident as a direct result of their work on AJP/JMU Journalism. Only 28% believed they had sufficient skills prior to engagement, but 37 out of 38 respondents (97%) expressed the view that that they had gained much greater skills as a student journalist as a direct result of working on AJP/JMU Journalism.

Over the two studies, 92% of the students (n=36) agreed or strongly agreed with the statement: “I was more motivated because my work was being published live.” Only one disagreed, while two had no firm opinion. Overall, 38 out of 39 students agreed or
strongly agreed with the statement: “I believe I am more employable as a direct result of my involvement.” One held no firm opinion.

**Summary and conclusions**

The decision to change the way in which Level 6 Journalism students were taught was born out of the need to provide an exciting, dynamic learning experience for all students and the desire to enhance their employability and “graduateness” to enable them to enter an increasingly competitive industry with confidence and the right blend of core skills.

At the start of the academic year the teaching team had no way of predicting the students’ response to this shift in emphasis to a work-based or experiential learning mode but the results from both the 2013 study and the pilot study of 2011 have been both very interesting and encouraging.

Enhanced employability and increased confidence were the two elements that were rated most highly by the students, in line with what Moreland (2005) categorises as one of four inter-related areas of learning: “efficacy and metacognition”, or learning about oneself, one’s capabilities and confidence.

The other three areas are similarly revealed in the questionnaire results. Firstly, skilful practices – evidenced by the professional skills the students felt they had acquired. Secondly, was the understanding that comes from experiencing the world of work (or facsimiles thereof). This was apparent in the responses regarding the way in which their studies had prepared them for life in a professional news environment.

“I was much more aware of the type of stories professional news environments wanted and I knew how to source them and the kind of interviews I needed to get to make a story strong and balanced.” (Participant 14)

Finally, Moreland cites Metacognition – or learning about managing oneself in a range of situations, including those to be found at work. As one student commented:

“I don’t see myself as a student as a result of AJP, when I am going out and getting stories and filming I have a totally different mentality. I now feel like I am a journalist and have the right to be out there with my camera, talking to people.” (Participant 13)

Another key finding was the increased motivation experienced by 86% of the students. With increased motivation comes increased engagement, mirroring the findings of Rhodes and Roessner (2008) who noticed a transformation in student attitudes as they began to accept responsibility for their work habits and take ownership of the publication they were working on: “The key idea is that the students are actively engaged for the purpose of learning.”

Although there was no correlation in this research with the expressions of initial anxiety in the studies of Rhodes and Roessner (2008), as well as Carmichael et al., (2007), it could be said that the JMU Journalism questionnaire did not lend itself to such conclusions. Anecdotal evidence and multiple entries in the assessed self-reflective student blogs would indeed indicate a high degree of collective anxiety at the outset of the final year, though this would appear to have dissipated relatively quickly.

Regarding the new viva/appraisal method of assessment for Advanced Journalism Practice, the strong approval rating (86%) among the students was clearly a welcome outcome, especially as the introduction of such a radically different approach had been adopted in comparison with previous years. As participant 14 noted, “there was nowhere to hide a
bad performance” and previous methods of assessment left an impression that students who had not put in consistent levels of performance could “still get better marks than those who have put effort in all year”.

It should be acknowledged that the questionnaire response rate of 23% from the Class of 2013 was slightly disappointing, and further research will be undertaken among future cohorts. Negative and critical comments were not entirely absent among the quantitative/qualitative responses though it can be said that such criticism appears to be somewhat isolated and inconsistent with the 2011 pilot study. However, participant 10 reports:

“I found it disheartening coming into a class where the atmosphere was intimidating and not helpful.”

While it is not clear if this relates to the teaching methods and/or the imposition of professional standards in a student learning environment, this is unlikely to be the only instance of such an experience among the total cohort. The pressure of continually producing original, publishable journalism of an acceptable standard was perceptibly intimidating on a weekly basis for a minority of students, whose views are perhaps not represented in this study. It may be posited that undergraduates who found themselves to some extent disenchanted with their learning experience arguably may have been less willing to complete the voluntary questionnaire, though this is pure conjecture.

It is anticipated that this study will be repeated in 2014 and 2015 among final year Journalism and International Journalism undergraduates to further establish the efficacy of the JMU Journalism work-based, experiential learning programme, which will continue to evolve and adapt to the demands of news story production and publication in the digital age.

As a footnote, the degree of difficulty experienced by the course tutors in the delivery of the JMU Journalism work-based model should not be understated. The demands of running a live news operation, with its accompanying office/newsroom-related issues and problems encountered in the real world of work, made this a particularly challenging academic year. However, the collective achievements and clear, demonstrable progression of the students, alongside the great progress made in publishing terms in 2012/13, also made this one of the most rewarding years of teaching and preparing journalism trainees for work in the industry.

One of the unintended consequences was the pleasure to be taken in the obvious increase in enthusiasm among the students. The pace of working in a busy newsroom and the desire to contribute to the success of a collective product certainly appeared to minimise the risk of boredom in the classroom, which can have damaging consequences for students (Mann & Robinson, 2009).

It may be challenging, and perhaps daunting, for academic staff to move away from didactic teaching methods and “traditional” forms of assessment but Lawson (2012) defines one of the main roles of any teacher as moving students towards “self-determined motivation”, in which they are committed to personal development, rather than merely earning marks.

The results from this study would appear to demonstrate that a work-based learning approach can assist in that change.
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Appendix:

JMU Journalism website statistics growth:

Although website traffic is not particularly meaningful in terms of AJP module aims/delivery, it is worth noting that prior to May 2009 student coursework was only seen by two tutors and an external examiner. These days, student stories are read in nearly 180 countries.
Someone to look up to: lessons to be learned from the reflections of female journalists on the value of role models and mentors for career development

Amanda Geary, University of the West of Scotland

The value of exposure to role models and mentors has long been regarded as worthwhile for fledgling employees working in many professions – particularly in business – however in journalism it is assumed such guidance occurs informally. This study assesses the recollections of women journalists, from recent graduates to those approaching retirement, about their experiences of role models and mentors in order to identify lessons that can be learned for those studying and teaching journalism. The results show that experiences of positive role models in the profession are few with any workplace mentoring occurring sporadically due to: a lack of women in management; changes in journalism education; and a culture of individualism that sits at odds to helping others. This paper argues for a concrete system of mentoring being established with young female journalists while they are still in higher education that could continue once they embark upon their careers.
Debate about the lack of women in journalism has prompted widespread discussion about the existence (or non-existence) of role models for female journalists – including pleas for recollections from women to engage in debate on this issue on Twitter (Bass 2011).

This paper examines the significance of role models for women in the profession and identifies that there is potential for a formal system of mentoring to be established to support young female journalists as they venture beyond the safe harbour of journalism education and embark upon their careers.

In order to establish the extent to which role models and mentoring have had on young women journalists, the issue of female role models in the profession is presented here in a historical context and is followed by an examination of the literature on role models and mentoring in journalism education. The research undertaken to address the question of whether young female journalists have had someone to look up to in the form of role models and mentors involved an extensive examination of the experiences of women working in journalism in the UK. The study gauged the experiences of women who have worked in the profession during a 45-year period, with the oldest having entered journalism in the late 1960s and the youngest as recently as 2012, through a survey and face-to-face interviews. Such a retrospective examination is regarded as worthwhile to assist in the pursuit of identifying benefits for young female journalists of the future. Furthermore, the paper suggests a more formalized mentoring programme that establishes links with senior female journalists has the potential to benefit young women while they are still studying journalism.

A Lack of Women Journalists - A Historical Legacy

It has been observed that since the early years of the twentieth century at least, women going into journalism have failed to have role models to look up to. This has led to a shortfall of female role models who could inspire and advise the next generation, let alone mentor young women in a more formal manner.

“Women generally faced opposition and prejudice and had few role models to guide them. Even though the number of women journalists increased during the early twentieth century, they consistently failed to break through to the front page – the ‘critical test’ that was generally agreed by the journalism world to be the heart of real journalism.”

(Belford 1986 cited in Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004, p27)

In the decades that followed it is widely regarded that journalism was predominately a ‘male domain’ prior to the Second World War (Kearney 2005). In newspapers, in particular, there was an “…overall invisibility of women journalists. Most of the elite press in Britain through the 1950s ignored women altogether” (Conboy 2011, p72) and this remained the case in some areas of the newspaper profession until the late twentieth century. It can be seen that this situation resulted in a work culture in which the existence of numerous successful female role models across the profession were in relatively short supply.

However by the end of the twentieth century, there was evidence that there were role models for young women coming through the ranks in some quarters of the profession with some commentators predicting that significant change was afoot in the media industry as a result of “the broad cultural impact of three decades of feminism” (McNair
1999, p18). Walter (1999) also observed at this time that budding journalists were starting to have female role models to emulate and saw women who embarked on their careers in the 1990s as being at an advantage when compared to previous generations of female journalists.

“Now that there is a generation above them who first broke the glass ceiling ... they do have vivid role models. Many young women identify that figure early on in their working lives... some younger journalists at newspapers said they semi-consciously imitated female senior editors in working practices...” (Walter 1999, p86)

Moreover any assessment of the number of role models around by the second decade of the twenty-first century is likely to be influenced by the wider debate about the experiences of women journalists and the challenges that they face during the duration of their careers. The view that the options open to females still involve different opportunities and choices to those of their male counterparts continues to be one of topical debate (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004; Franks 2013). In some areas of journalism – such as newspapers – there continues to be a lack of women journalists (Walter 2010; Press Gazette 2011; Counting Women In 2013). The situation has been found to be particularly acute at management level (Plunkett 2010; Gow 2013). In contrast the magazines sector is widely acknowledged to have women employed in large numbers (Christmas 1997 cited in Keeble 2001; Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004; Delano (2003 cited in Franks 2013). However, Williams (2010a) identified that the fact that women ‘cluster’ in magazines could be as a result of horizontal segregation in UK journalism. She argues that the presence of women in ‘softer’ subjects could be as a direct result of “a ‘strong hostility in areas dominated by men, such as political and sports journalism’ (Chambers et al. 2004:92)” (Williams 2010a, p214) rather than indicative that women have removed any barriers to the profession across the board. Furthermore in broadcast journalism, the number of female role models can be seen from a different perspective again. It is undoubtable that the number of women in radio and television journalism has improved (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004) – although Curran and Seaton (2010) argue that this has occurred only to a limited extent. Moreover broadcast journalism is not without controversy on the issue of the number of successful women who are potential role models for the next generation of female journalists. It has been found that once female journalists reach a certain age in broadcasting they can be disadvantaged (Plunkett 2009; Williams 2010b). These concerns emerge as a result of the emphasis upon a woman’s appearance (particularly in television) where this criterion appears not to be applied to their male colleagues. As Carter, Branstall, and Allan (1998) identified, a woman journalist’s appearance or ‘looks’ had long been regarded as relevant to her work and this issue has not faded over time in terms of its relevance to women in the profession.

“Over the past few years the issue of older women disappearing from TV screens has become something of a cause célèbre in the UK. A series of high-profile female news presenters (Moira Stewart, Anna Ford, Selina Scott, Julia Somerville) all assert that they have been pushed aside because of their advancing years.” (Franks 2013, p16)

More recent research on the number of older women journalists across the profession – who are the very people who would make suitable role models and mentors for the younger women working their way through the profession – found that data was amiss and where it was available it was evident that the women were gone. The Commission on Older Women (2013) found that actual figures of those employed by newspapers was not available and that in television women were leaving their jobs by their mid-thirties and therefore they were potentially missing out on opportunities that arose for experienced
staff at the top level of the profession.

“...when looking for women on our screens over the age of 50 – they disappear. The Creative Diversity Network conducted research for the BBC which found that 54 per cent of women on TV were in the 16-39 age bracket compared with just over a third of men. 60 per cent of the men appearing on TV were therefore over 40. In 2010, Channel 4 found that only 4 in every 10 women on-screen were aged over 40 whilst for men it was 6 in every 10. And when older women do appear – as presenters and in story-lines – research has shown that it tends to be in daytime TV and not in key prime-time slots.” (Commission on Older Women 2013, pp34-35)

It can be concluded that the legacy of low numbers of women in journalism remains to some extent and is particularly evident in regards to women in senior roles. This issue therefore has the potential to impact the existence of positive role models for younger women across all levels of the profession and in all sections of the media.

The Significance of Role Models and Mentors to Journalism Education

The terms ‘role model’ and mentor’ are both beneficial to the learning process of becoming a journalist and also to further professional development. However a ‘role model’ can be defined as one who demonstrates positive behaviour that is ‘observed’ and is one that that an onlooker would wish to emulate. According to Owen (2013) good role models exhibit the following functions: exceptional behaviour in how they achieve their goals and do things; success through integrity; enjoyment of their work and achievements; knowledge and understanding of the organization; and influence several people.

“Mentoring, on the other hand, is more structured, on a one-to-one basis, whereby each has a clear expectation of the other. However the mentor also has a function as a role model. Mentoring is person-centred. This means: the mentee generates their goals; the mentor has a genuine desire to help people; the learning is transformational. The litmus paper test for mentoring is that there is a real change at a cognitive, behavioural, learning and practice level.” (Owen 2013, p12)

The role of the mentor can therefore be broad and a useful benchmark for exploring the benefits of a mentor in academia. The criteria outlined by the Higher Education Academy (2009) provides a definition of mentoring that it regards as relevant whether it is mentoring between younger and more advanced students, between existing staff working with new staff, as well as industry professionals working with students.

“Mentoring means to support and encourage people to manage their own learning in order that they may maximise their potential, develop their skills, improve their performance and become the person they want to be.” (Parsloe 2009, cited in Higher Education Academy 2009)

The value of both role models and of mentors is therefore widely recognized as being of value in higher education pedagogical practice (Ramsden 2003; Biggs and Tang 2011).

With regards to the specific needs of women in journalism, it is acknowledged that young journalists of both sexes could benefit from mentoring. However research has shown that the issue of gender equality remains an unresolved problem for the profession in the UK (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004; Franks 2013) and therefore this is an area that could potentially benefit from positive efforts to redress the balance. Mentoring programmes have the potential to be a valuable tool in supporting and developing women to advance into senior roles in journalism by “working with someone who has walked the path they wish to take” (Gray 2013) and are particularly seen as beneficial among mil-
lennials. However the existence of formal mentoring schemes for young journalists that bridge the later stages of their time in higher education with the start of their first posts in journalism, there is potentially a void not being filled that could be a process commenced while they are still in the higher education environment. Cramer, Salomone and Walshe (2011) undertook an extensive literature review of research into assessing mentoring for women in journalism education in the USA. Their findings suggest a strong link between mentoring and organizational success that exists in business but not for women in journalism and furthermore not for those studying the media in higher education.

“The research literature in business and management is plentiful and strongly suggests that mentoring is integral to the success of any individual manager and to the organization to which he or she works. The literature suggests that most mentoring in higher education and in journalism and mass communication programs occurs informally and is therefore difficult to study.” (ibid pp365-6)

Research by Fulton (2013) explored the experiences of print journalists in Australia and found that mentoring was key in a journalist’s development.

“...mentoring is an important way a journalist learns about the rules, procedures, guides, laws, etc. of the domain as well as the preferences of the field and journalists who have discussed mentoring found it a valuable way to learn how to work effectively and efficiently.” (ibid)

While Huang (2012) identified that there are benefits for both the mentor and the mentee and that it is important for journalists after they have finished their studies and find themselves as journalists in the workplace.

“I’ve never believed that you can fully learn how to be a journalist in school. Journalism is still one of those trades where you learn through doing and you grow through apprenticeship.” (ibid)

In terms of research conducted into mentoring for journalists in the UK, Delano (2003) recalled advice given to journalism students in the late 1990s that acknowledged the significance and value of a mentor in a succinct fashion alongside perhaps more unexpected advice about office relations.

“Make sure you get yourself a mentor. It’s essential. And don’t sleep with more than one person in the office at a time. (Celia Haddon recalling for London College of Printing journalism students in 1998 her 1959 arrival in the Daily Mail newsroom straight from Cambridge University).” (ibid p273)

What can be concluded from this is that the onus of responsibility for finding a mentor remained to be on the individual in the late 1990s much in the same way as it had been in the late 1950s. Additionally it can be deduced that engagement with mentoring for young journalists has long been regarded (at best) as ad hoc, rather than being provided in a more formal fashion. Harcup (2011) assessed hackademics’ views of their requirements when embarking on academic research in journalism. Amongst its findings was the outcome that journalism educators saw value themselves in mentoring arrangements for their own professional development. One can presume therefore that – in principle at least – journalism educators would be willing to extend such support to their students and help them bridge the gap between university and the workplace.

Examples of successful mentoring projects in higher education in the UK are scarce. Choudhury and Baines (2012) piloted a mentoring project aimed at TV Journalism students and also recent graduates, however during the process of planning the initiative the researchers discovered that examples of similar schemes were elusive.
“A large body of research into mentoring has found it to bring benefits such as increased job satisfaction, higher pay and more promotions (see for example Allen, Eby et al 2008; Underhill 2006). But research in this field has focused predominantly on mentoring projects and relationships established within an organisation or workplace (Haggard et al 2010: 291; Forbes 2009).” (ibid)

Their mentoring project aimed to assist journalism undergraduates and early-career media workers extend their “weak links” in the field. Given the nature of the recent timing of this project, it is presumed that it is too early to assess its benefits in a longitudinal manner.

It can also be argued that the shift in journalism education in the UK, from one which existed in an apprenticeship format under the umbrella of the NCTJ, to one which is much more diverse and is widely hosted in universities, maybe a factor of note when examining the question of the existence of role models and mentors for young people going into journalism. The culture of ‘educating’ journalists as opposed to ‘training’ them (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004) arose as a result of the emergence of journalism postgraduate programmes, followed by the emergence of degree courses with graduate entrants, which had become standard by the 1990s (Tunstall 1996, cited in Frith and Meech 2007). It has been estimated that more than 50 UK institutions now offer journalism at undergraduate level (Frost 2012). Journalism education in the UK therefore has undergone a major cultural transition from an industry-based in-house style of training, which was first established by the NCTJ in the 1950s (Frost 2011), to one where external bodies (universities and colleges) provide higher and further education qualifications in the field (Wahl-Jorgensen and Hanitzsch 2009). By the early years of the twenty-first century, professional accrediting bodies for journalism – such as the NCTJ and the BJTC – have been offering qualifications that sit on top of these educational qualifications (Phillips 2005) and this has resulted in a diversification of the market and a range of accredited and non-accredited courses (Aldridge 2007). The emergence of journalism as an academic subject therefore has been relatively recent in the UK when compared to, for example, that which exists in the United States of America (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004) with the UK having a tradition where “journalists were trained through apprenticeships and skills-based short courses” (Wahl-Jorgensen and Hanitzsch 2009, p5). It is apparent from training documents developed by the NCTJ almost 50 years ago that there was a heavy emphasis on “guided experience” and upon the responsibilities of the “training adviser” and similarities can be seen in these functions akin to modern understandings of mentorship.

“In each office one person should be responsible for and supervise the training. ... The Training Adviser cannot usually do all of the actual training himself. His main purpose is to act as a liaison between the junior and those sources of knowledge (such as the members of staff, experts from outside the office, books and reference material) which the junior needs to find and to consult.” (NCTJ 1964, p21)

It is argued that there is potentially a gap that has occurred as a result of the cultural shift in journalism education, with any formal requirement for mentoring in the workplace disappearing and becoming a luxury.

In terms of the subjects of this study – young women journalists – the demographic of journalism education in the UK enhances the significance of this issue. As outlined, there is a lack of women at all levels of the profession, however there is an anomaly that exists between the culture in the workplace and that which exists in journalism education – while there are more women going into journalism higher education than men in the United Kingdom (Cole cited in Franklin 2006; Marshall cited in Ross and Carter 2011; Franks 2013) there are less women working in journalism than men. It can be argued that there is
an even stronger rationale for encouraging the promotion of role models and establishing mentoring schemes for women in order to address this situation i.e. to encourage the high number of female journalism graduates to remain in the profession for the long haul and so they too can become role models of the future.

Methodology

The aim of the research was to gauge the experiences to date of female journalists with regards to role models and mentors. The research methods used to gather the data involved a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data gathered through an online survey completed by 176 women journalists who worked across the UK. The questionnaire was followed up by a further face-to-face interviews conducted with 29 journalists who volunteered to be further involved with the study following completion of the survey.

The data analysis involved statistical analysis of the quantitative elements of the results and content analysis of the qualitative findings. The lengths of the women’s careers were gauged according to the decade that they had commenced their careers. The women had begun their careers between 1968 and 2012, therefore the most experienced had worked in the profession for almost 45 years – across five different decades – and were aged between 22 and 65-years-old. A breakdown of the survey data shows they had worked in different types of journalism across the UK. Their professional experience across their careers was as follows: 132 of the journalists had worked in newspapers at some point during their careers; 85 in magazines; 53 women in radio journalism; and 35 in television journalism.

A total of 88 of those surveyed had worked in digital or online journalism, 92 in freelance journalism and 29 for news/press agencies. A total of 35 of the women had gone on from working as journalists to working in journalism education. It is however acknowledged that many journalists have been employed in different types of journalism during their careers e.g. newspapers, magazines, radio and television). It is a common career path for journalists to cross between different media (Bull, 2007) and specifically between print and broadcast media (and vice-versa) at different points in their careers (Harcup, 2009b.

This is possible due to the transferrable skills and the common fundamental principles that create a “unifying thread” (Gopsill and Neale, 2007, p.232) that cross different media. In the results presented in this paper, the women are broadly categorized as either ‘print’ or ‘broadcast’ journalists and this is based upon their most recent post.

The methodological approach adopted for the study involved a reflection upon phenomenology and the value of “lived experience” (Holloway 1997, p68). Barnhurst and Nerone (2009) noted that the use of history as a map was a useful tool in documenting journalism and in analysing professional practices within journalism.

“For many scholars today, history provides an indispensable tool for critiquing professional journalism by showing its contingency and entanglements.” (ibid p17)

It is argued that lessons can be learned from cataloguing the experiences of the journalists involved in this study in relation to role models and mentors.
Findings

The Educational Experiences of the Journalists in the Sample

The survey captured data on the women’s professional educational experiences that provides context for the results that follow, see Figure 1. The majority of the participants had undergone NCTJ training (58.5%, n=69) and a further 4.2% (n=5) had a BJTC accredited qualification. In terms of educational qualifications, there were slightly more women who had postgraduate diplomas in journalism which was more than any other type of higher education qualification (23.7%, n=28). A further 22% (n=26) had a postgraduate degree in journalism and just under a fifth (17.8%; n=21) of the women had undergraduate degrees in journalism. There was a further 35 women who chose an “other” option to state their professional qualifications and closer examination of the results show that the majority of these were the older journalists who had commenced their careers in the 1970s and 1980s and they did not have any formal professional qualifications. According to Frost (2012), entry to the profession without any formal qualifications was still possible by the twenty-first century, but had become much more unusual than it had been in the past.

![Figure 1: What professional qualification(s) do you have in journalism?](image)

How Significant are Role Models and Mentors to Women in Journalism?

The female journalists were asked to rate how significant they believed that role models and mentors were in terms of their impact on improving equal opportunities for women in the profession in the UK. Just over a fifth of the women (21.3%, n=37) strongly agreed that having role models and/or mentors were important for creating opportunities for women in journalism, while almost half of the journalists (48.3%, n=84) agreed that this was the case. A further fifth (22.4%, n=39) neither agreed nor disagreed and just 8% (n=14) disagreed. None of the women strongly disagreed that role models and mentors had the potential to have a positive impact (Figure 2).
Views on Role Models and Mentors According to Time in the Profession

A comparative analysis of the views of the journalists on this issue was undertaken according to the time that they had spent in the profession. There was some variation of the views expressed on the significance of role models and mentors to women in journalism. Despite the number of women increasing in journalism over the time period, their views on the potential benefits to women in the profession did not adjust accordingly.

The women that began their careers between the 1960s and the end of the 1970s had the strongest views on the significance and benefits of role models and mentors, see Figure 3. A total of 60% (n=6) of this group agreed with this view, while a further 30% (n=3) strongly agreed. Of the women who commenced their careers in the 1980s a total of 45.8% (n=11) agreed and 16.7% (n=4) strongly agreed that role models or mentors for
women were beneficial. Almost half of the women who commenced their careers in the 1990s (48.2%, n=27) agreed and a further 23.2% (n=13) strongly agreed. Of the female journalists that started their careers between 2000 and 2009, a total of 48.3% (n=29) agreed and a further 20% (n=12) strongly agreed that role models and mentors had improved opportunities. While examination of the responses from the newest recruits to the profession who had begun their careers since 2010 shows that 45.5% (n=10) agreed and 22.7% (n=5) strongly agreed that the influence of role models and/or mentors was significant for women in journalism.

Significance of Role Models According to Type of Journalism

The study captured the types of journalism that the women were working in currently and this allowed for analysis of the results according to their latest experiences. It can be seen from the data presented in Figure 4 that the significance of the impact of role models and mentors showed small levels of variation.

Among the women who worked in newspapers 46.2% (n=60) agreed that role models and mentors were significant and a further 24.6% (n=32) strongly agreed. While of those who worked in magazines 45.9% (n=39) agreed and 24.7% (n=21) strongly agreed. More than half (50.9%, n=27) of the radio journalists agreed about the positive influence of role models and mentors and 24.5% (n=13) strongly agreed. A total of 57.1% (n=20) of the journalists who worked in television journalism agreed and 28.6% (n=10) strongly agreed. Of the female journalists who worked in online journalism 44.8% (n=39) agreed and 22.9% (n=20) strongly agreed that role models and mentors had benefits for improving opportunities for women. The freelance journalists agreed that role models and mentors were influential also with 50.5% (n=46) who agreed that their influence had been beneficial and 24.4% (n=22) strongly agreed. While a total of 53.8% (n=14) of those who

![Figure 4: Views on role models and mentors for women in journalism according to experience of working in specific types of journalism?](image-url)
worked in news/press agencies agreed and a further 15.4% (n=4) strongly agreed. It is of note that the women who had left the profession to go and work in journalism education had the highest level of agreement (62.5%, n=20) about the significance of role models and mentors, with a further 15.6% (n=5) who strongly agreed.

**Personal Recollections of Role Models and Mentors**

The women were asked about their own recollections of any role models and experiences of mentors that they have had in journalism. The aim was to gauge the impact and perceived benefits of role models on their careers and also to assess any efforts made by the more senior females in the profession in assisting women coming through the ranks behind them.

The survey generated qualitative data about the journalist’s own experiences of role models.

“When I became a sports editor for a weekly newspaper in the late 1990s, I was largely regarded as some kind of weird-being that had no place reporting on football matches or covering rugby. The response from the readers was, almost without fail, negative, the attitude from those within my profession was one of ‘good for you’ from the women, and sneering contempt from the men. These days women sports reporters clog up television screens, women can and do report extremely well on all kinds of sport. I didn’t think much of it at the time, but I look back now and realize that by breaking into a very male-dominated area at the time I may well have paved the way for others. I just hope they don’t have to deal with the same abuse that I did!” [Print/1980s]

“...from personal experience it has been seeing women in the workplace forging a career in journalism that has inspired and driven me the most.” [Print/1990s]

While many of the women journalists interviewed were of the view that there had not been any women that had been role models in the newsrooms where they had worked. Content analysis of the interview data shows that 56.25% had had a negative experience and they believed that they had not benefitted from having any positive role models, while only 37.5% had had positive experiences. The reasons given for this was either there had not been many (or any) women working in the same organization as them who they would regard as a role model or because there was a culture of journalists being for themselves.

“There were no older women, the women that were there when I started were all young and then they all left to have babies, so no I have worked with very few women, hardly any older than me, hardly ever.” [Print/1970s]

“No, I can’t think of anyone who has taken me under their wing. If you want to get on this profession you have to be tough and grit your teeth and get on with it. Especially now we are so short staffed so people don’t help each other out as there isn’t the time.” [Print/2000s]

Despite these personal recollections, interviewees discussed the positive impact of being aware of women journalists as role models who were household names.

“There are women in journalism that I really admire and I would like to achieve the same things as, but they are really varied. I guess what they all had in common was that they persevered. In terms of role models in my life, no, there have been editors who have helped me, but I wouldn’t say they were role models as I don’t want to be an editor, most of them have been men.” [Print/2010s]

Some of the women also spoke of how they themselves had tried to act as role models and mentors to other younger females in the profession.
“Maybe when I was editor I would hope that I was [a role model] to the younger ones, it wasn’t something I thought about, but I hope so. I hope that by what I am doing just now, fighting an equal pay claim, will benefit others [laughs].” [Print/1980s]

“I hope, well I know, that I’ve brought on and encouraged people who’ve come after me which is really gratifying. I was at a launch thing the other week and someone that I helped a bit, mentored a bit, is hopefully about to get an editorship and she called me her ‘journalism mum’ and that’s really nice. In a way, one of the sorrows to me of choosing a writing route rather than an executive route, is doing less of that, because I really enjoyed that. ...I can definitely put my hand up and say ‘yes, I helped you’ and I really would have like to have done that with more women, it just didn’t work out that way.” [Print/1980s]

Content analysis of the interview responses about personal experiences of role models according to the length of the women’s careers shows some improvement over time. Those who commenced their careers in the late 1960s and the 1970s, 100% (n=4) spoke specifically about having a negative experience and of not having a role model to look up to. A further third of the 1980s group of journalists (33.33%, n=6) highlighted negative experiences, compared to two-thirds of the 1990s generation (66.67%, n=7) and 33.33% of the 2000s group (n=7). Half (50%, n=5) of the women who had joined the profession since 2010 also spoke of negative experiences.

**Solidarity Versus Individualism**

Conflicting perspectives of solidarity among women in newsrooms were evident in the research findings and this has resonance when it comes to debating the issue of role models and mentors as these functions require an individual to be willing to inspire and to invest time in another person’s career development.

In the survey, the journalists were asked if they considered ‘individualism and a lack of solidarity among colleagues’ to be an issue with regards to career development. As outlined in Figure 5, there were 10.9% (n=19) who strongly agreed that this was the case and a further 27.4% (n=48) agreed. While 32.6% (n=57) neither agreed nor disagreed that it

![Figure 5: Views on the impact of individualism and a lack of solidarity among women in journalism?](image)
was an issue and 27.4% (n=48) disagreed and 1.7% (n=3) strongly disagreed. Interviewees were also asked if they had experienced solidarity from other women in journalism and whether they believed it was relevant. The responses showed that there was an equal number of the women that had had a positive experience as had a negative experience (41.18%). Common issues raised in the discussions included references to ambition i.e. that individuals were driven by their own career goals, which was referred to by 41.18% of the women. These results were analysed according to the decade that the women entered the profession and it can be seen that 100% of those who had become journalists since 2010 had had a negative experience of solidarity in journalism. All of this younger group also spoke about a culture of individualism (or of everyone looking out for themselves) in their responses.

Discussion

As journalism educators it is considered worthwhile reflecting upon the lessons to be learned from historical experiences of role models on the value to journalists of the future of having someone to look up to. Furthermore the perspectives of women who span the age groups of the working populace in the profession are worthwhile when considering the potential value of mentoring schemes.

The results of the survey gauged opinion on the value that role models and mentors can have in improving equal opportunities for women. Almost three-quarters of those surveyed either strongly agreed or agreed that role models and mentors were important for the career development and progression of women. This shows consensus of the positive impact that having someone to look up to in the profession can potentially bring. When examined according to the length of their careers, it was the most experienced women (who had commenced their careers in the late 1960s and the 1970s) who valued this ideal most highly. After this point the levels of agreement were lower, although the majority of responses from the remaining decade groups consistently agreed with this view.

According to the type of journalism in which the women worked the levels stayed at similar levels of agreement (or strong agreement) when it came to the general concept of role models and mentors for improving experiences for young women. However, it can be seen that those working in broadcast journalism, i.e. radio and television, agreed at a higher rate about the significance of role models and mentors when compared to the views of those who worked in the print media. It is interesting to note that the highest levels of agreement about the value of role models and mentors overall came from the women who worked in journalism education, who possibly have more awareness and experience of the potential benefits for their students as well as the existence of such networks in higher education itself (Ramsden 2003; Higher Education Academy 2009; Biggs and Tang 2011).

The examination of the individual’s experiences show that the concept of having role models or being mentored by other women was something that appeared to be amiss from the majority of the women’s experiences. However on closer examination of the results it can be seen that the positive experiences referred to were recalled by those who had joined the profession in the 1990s, 2000s and since 2010. While in contrast all of the 1970s women spoke of negative experiences in this regard with two-thirds of the 1980s journalists highlighting negative experiences also – that they had not had any role models. One reason for this could be that there were fewer women journalists in the profession when they commenced their careers (Chambers, Steiner and Fleming 2004; Franks 2013).
These results therefore suggest that there has been a modicum of improvement for women who entered the profession since the 1990s, with the journalists who entered journalism between 2000 and 2009 having the greatest levels of positive experience in terms of role models (66.67%). The majority of these women are from the generation that learned their trade in a higher education environment, as opposed to ‘on the job’ training in the form of the NCTJ pre-entry or block release style education that was the experience of the majority of young journalists until the mid-1990s at least. (Aldridge 2007; Frost 2012). However the research shows that despite references to positive experiences from the journalists who started their careers from the 1990s onwards, any female role models in newsrooms were not at senior management level. Moreover the youngest women (who joined the profession since 2010) were not seeing equal opportunities demonstrated in practice either. They saw a lack of management roles in journalism being undertaken by women – and also viewed such roles as being male-dominated, which has potential to have a negative impact upon the presence of positive female role models for young women going to work in newsroom environments in the near future. It cannot be concluded therefore that there was any marked improvement for the younger decade groups of women as one might expect. According to Walter (1999) should have benefitted by the twenty-first century from having women in the profession for them to emulate when compared to the experiences of the women who had gone before them.

It was also apparent in the interview responses that when the women focused upon the significance of having role models (or of being mentored) many of them cited their education as being a key factor upon their perspectives. This was more evident in the 2000s and 2010s group of entrants to journalism who spoke of their experiences at university as being positive. This was akin to the experience of Day (2004) who recalled how when she was growing up in the 1980s and 1990s she had benefitted from frequently being asked to identify a role model to aspire to while she was still in education.

“More often than not the answer was Kate Adie. For an impressionable teenage girl, Adie was the living proof that a woman could succeed in a man’s world. Not only had she pursued a career in reporting in an era when it was far more difficult for a woman to be recognized, but she had chosen the most masculine form of journalism as her metier: war reporting.” (ibid)

It is interesting to note too that there were references made by the women journalists during the interviews that some women had worked in climates where female bosses were perceived to be harder on other females than on their male peers. Workplace behaviour that involves women failing to provide opportunities for other women has previously been referred to as one where “women pull up the ladder behind them” (Graham, 2012) – a term also used in relation to Margaret Thatcher’s time as Prime Minister (Murray, 2013; Smith, 2013). It can be seen that there is a correlation between this stance and “individualism” – a perspective of everyone being for themself and this has been identified as a cultural shift dating back to the 1990s often viewed as a legacy of Thatcherism (Budgeon 2001; McRobbie 2000 cited in Genz 2006; McLeod, O’Donohoe and Townley 2009). It can also be identified that an attitude of focusing on one’s own personal gain rather than one of helping others – a viewpoint the researcher refers to as a ‘culture of self’ – has also been seen as characteristic of post-feminism which also first emerged in the 1990s (Budgeon 2001; McRobbie 2009). It is feasible to see how such behaviour may be heightened by a lack of solidarity in the newsroom environment and also by the low number of female role models that exist in senior positions and, as Graham (2012) suggests a feeling that women at higher levels believe that they need to behave in a more masculine manner. In-
indeed the data shows that some of the women interviewed stated that the culture in journalism was such that it was one akin to individualism. It is quite striking that in the analysis of the findings according to the decade groups, the younger journalists (those who had entered journalism since 2010) all spoke – without exception – of a negative experience of solidarity among women journalists. It can be concluded that these young journalists are potentially isolated from the support networks that can help make the profession so rewarding and also from being exposed to role models who could potentially help them navigate their way in the future. Furthermore it portrays a situation that is in stark contrast to that which attracted women into the workplace en masse in the first place. As Abrams (2002) had identified, when women had started to enter the workplace from the nineteenth century onwards it had offered them an opportunity to develop a common female consciousness outside of the family unit for the first time. It also reflects a culture where individualism is perceived as significant when it comes to success, which is a far cry from the collective interests encouraged by some of the early campaigners for equal rights in the workplace for women, such as Marxist feminists (Bryson 1999), which was popular with the second wave feminist movement of the late 1960s and 1970s (Pugh 2000). It is therefore argued that a sense of individualism in journalism could threaten efforts to ensure a robust form of mentoring by discouraging benefits for the common good.

With regards to providing a more formalized approach to mentoring, the research has shown that this has occurred in a random manner and that there is a void that has occurred historically that presents an opportunity for the future. The foundations for such a system could be addressed by hackademics at a point that their journalism students are working towards graduation and that the students could continue to be involved in such a relationship that they could continue to pursue after graduation. The rationale for these youngest journalists being the focus of such an initiative is that this was the group that demonstrated the highest level of agreement that mentoring could be potentially beneficial, this is akin to the findings of Gray (2013). It has also been shown that it is commonplace in higher education pedagogy to favour such support systems and employability networks (Ramsden 2003; Higher Education Academy 2009; Biggs and Tang 2011) and also that those working in journalism education recognize the benefits for their own development (Harcup 2011).

Conclusion

In conclusion this paper has gauged perspectives of the impact of role models on improving opportunities for young female journalists – who are widely considered still to be a minority group in the profession. It has captured views of their significance of ‘having someone to look up to’ from a broad sample, including young journalists who have not long started out in the profession alongside those of women approaching retirement as well as the generations in-between. It has also captured personal recollections of role models and mentors and also of the advantages and disadvantages of their experiences. Factors relevant to the results have been identified as: a lack of role models for women especially of the same gender; a shift in the education and training culture in journalism that has potentially impacted the consistency of experiences for these generations of professionals; and also a wider social and cultural shift that has led to a culture of individualism and a lack of solidarity with others. In terms of the participants of this study, it can be seen that the viewpoints of the younger journalists may potentially be impacted by post-feminist viewpoints of individualism as opposed to ones of working for the common
good, which has been associated with the ideals of second wave feminism associated with the 1960s and 1970s.

Also it appears that the potential value of formal mentoring schemes has been largely overlooked in journalism, both by media organizations as well as by a majority of institutions offering journalism qualifications. While it is acknowledged that mentoring does occur occasionally it tends to be ad hoc such as in relation to work placement modules. The existence of formal schemes that establish links between journalism students with journalists who have been successful in their careers is amiss and could be particularly beneficial to assist in targeting areas where there have traditionally been inequalities – such as has been shown to be the case in relation to women in journalism. What is being suggested therefore is that there is scope for addressing this issue and furthermore there is an opportunity for hackademics (with their valuable practical professional knowledge as both former journalists and as educators) to initiate this process while the young journalists are still in higher education.

It is not being suggested that journalism educators are not engaging with pedagogical practices common in many other subject areas taught in universities and that have been identified as being of value. Moreover what is being mooted is that the subject-specific nature of journalism degrees – both at undergraduate and postgraduate level – could further be enhanced in order to fill this void as there is scope for multiple benefits. It is suggested here that it is highly likely that once students graduate and enter the ‘real world’ of journalism that young women in particular face a lack of role models and a sense of isolation without the benefits of the valuable “networks” and “access to ‘insider’ knowledge” identified by Choudhury and Baines (2012). There is therefore potential for hackademics to address this issue by either highlighting or encouraging reflection upon positive role models by their female students. Furthermore there is scope to commence their students on a mentoring relationship that can be established while the women are still in higher education and exist in high numbers (Cole cited in Franklin 2006; Marshall cited in Ross and Carter 2011; Franks 2013) and a framework would then exist for the mentees and mentors to continue to work together once the women have graduated and are embarking upon their careers. In time by encouraging young women to stay in journalism through such a support system, this could lead to a rise in the number of women in senior posts across the profession that in turn could increase the number of positive role models for future journalists.
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Can universities make good journalists?

Richard Evans, London Metropolitan University

Journalism education in the UK has experienced a pattern of explosive growth since the 1970s without agreement over the range and scope of the subject as an academic discipline. Taught mainly by journalists who move into academia later in life, alongside skills of reporting and knowledge of law and public affairs, students can be required to develop complex sets of qualities, skills, behaviours and dispositions without detailed consideration of the attributes and behaviours they may involve. Driven by a mistrust of the critical approach of media studies to the practices of the occupation, academic qualifications are still viewed with suspicion by some practitioners who consider an aptitude for journalism temperamental and innate rather than a set of behaviours that can be taught. This action research project critically integrates academic literature on journalism and higher education with primary data from interviews conducted with a newspaper editor, two academics and a focus group of students. Data gathered suggests that a university education can develop qualities and behaviours such as curiosity, scepticism, tenacity and “news sense” through appropriate tuition by academics with professional experience and exercises that mimic the workplace experience. It identifies a role for journalism education in extending knowledge beyond the subject area and the increasing importance of ethics.
Forms of tacit knowledge within the occupation are identified and incorporated into a model of skills, knowledge and qualities required of a good journalist and the dispositions and predispositions that underpin them in order to illuminate, facilitate and develop journalism education and promote further discussion among academics and practitioners about the value of higher education in journalism.

“The only qualities essential for real success in journalism are rat-like cunning, a plausible manner and a little literary ability” (Tomalin, 1969).

Since journalism emerged as a modern academic discipline in the UK at Cardiff University in 1970 it has experienced a pattern of explosive growth (Hanna & Sanders, 2007).

A search of the UCAS and UKPASS websites suggests that British universities are currently offering 273 single and joint undergraduate degree courses and 123 postgraduate courses involving instruction in journalism (Graduate Prospects, 2014; UCAS, 2014). In the academic year 2012-13, 12,025 students were studying journalism at British universities, 10,140 of those as a first degree (Higher Education Statistics Agency, 2014). Despite its popularity there remains considerable scepticism in sections of industry about the value of higher education to journalism, the former editor of The Sun, Kelvin MacKenzie, suggesting that all journalism colleges should be closed down (MacKenzie, 2011).

In higher education, there is no commonly agreed range and scope of the subject area of journalism and ways of thinking or practicing within it (Holmes et al., 2013). Teaching, curricula and assessments are designed by journalists who generally move from practice to teaching later in life and are employed for experience in the workplace rather than experience in HE or a capacity for academic research (Greenberg, 2007; Harcup, 2011). These “hackademics” bring with them from industry particular intuitive and subjective ways of thinking and practicing. Journalism texts require students to “make contacts”, “scrutinise” “subvert” or “hold a mirror to society” (Randall, 2011; Smith, 2007) sometimes without detailed consideration of the attributes, personal knowledge and ways of thinking and practicing this might involve. Students who fail to exhibit these qualities or attributes can be written off as lacking necessary talents or “not suited” to journalism.

This action research study will critically integrate educational treaties on learning in higher education with texts on journalism and gather primary data from students, academics and an employer in order to identify, categorise and model requirements demanded of a “good journalist”. It will seek to establish whether they could be developed in higher education and how universities must achieve that. Its purpose is to illuminate, develop and facilitate learning and teaching practice in journalism education. By challenging MacKenzie’s idea that good journalists are born and not made it will endeavour to establish more clearly the value of a degree in journalism.

---

1 This hybrid term between academic and “hack” (a slang term for a journalist) is thought to have been coined by Matthew Engel in the British Journalism Review in 2003 (Harcup, 2011)
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Context

Journalism is a historically diverse and undefined activity that has been variously conceptualised as a profession, a craft, an industry, a literary genre, a culture, a social practice, a community or an ideology (Deuze, 2006; Mensing, 2011). Journalists’ perceptions of themselves are multi-dimensional and may involve roles as informers, interpreters or advocates (Willnat et al., 2013) but there is no single body to which journalists are answerable and no way of preventing anyone from calling themselves a journalist (Holmes et al., 2013).

The Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) publishes no subject-specific benchmark statements for journalism, instead including the subject area under the cover of “Communication, media, film and cultural studies”, which frames the subject in terms of the theoretical examination of the effect of cultural and communicative activities on society rather than a set of skills and values (QAA, 2008).

In addition, the occupation of journalism has undergone and continues to undergo an unprecedented period of upheaval. Traditional media face declining advertising revenues and audiences (Holmes et al., 2013) and the emergence of activities referred to as “citizen journalism” has blurred boundaries between journalism and other forms of public communication and between journalists and their audiences (Willnat et al., 2013; Tumber & Prentoulis, 2005). The collapse of old business models and career paths is presenting particular challenges to the motivation, purpose and orientation of journalism education which has been trying to keep up with the conflicting demands of industry (Deuze, 2006).

Challenges to the business of journalism are being mirrored in challenges to the purposes of higher education in the new information space where knowledge is more prolific, complex, fast and ambiguous (Land, 2013). The role of universities as gatekeepers of knowledge and learning has been eroded and academics are being encouraged to change the character of their learning spaces (Barnett, 2010). As universities come under increasing pressure to update their own practices and relevance, since journalism courses are already actively engaged in confronting similar issues they could be positioned to become leaders by virtue of necessity (Mensing & Franklin, 2011).

Debate about the value of higher education in training journalists was ignited by the suggestion of the former editor of The Sun, Kelvin MacKenzie, that he would “shut down all journalism courses”:

“No amount of academic debate is going to give you news sense, even if you have a PhD. It’s a knack and you’ve either got it or you haven’t” (MacKenzie, 2011).

Putting these remarks into context, they were made shortly before a somewhat cavalier appearance before the Leveson Inquiry at which he declared that he was not bothered about issues of ethics or privacy and if a story sounded right he would “lob it in” to his newspaper (Leveson, 2012). What his remarks do reflect however is a belief that aptitude for the occupation is a singular “talent” rather than a set of skills and behaviours that can be learned. They reflect a traditional scepticism in industry about the value of academic study and qualifications in journalism and the view that universities are places of “debate” rather than training and development. The industry training body, the National Council for the Training of Journalists (NCTJ), remained opposed to first degrees in journalism until the late 1970’s, arguing that accredited training in further education ensured a better quality of recruits (Hanna & Sanders, 2007) and today the Society of Editors states that “most trainee journalists are trained to degree level: editors do not necessarily regard...
journalism degrees as having more weight than those in traditional subjects” (Society of Editors, 2013).

This study then faces a number of challenges. In order to identify the skills, knowledge and behaviours required of a good journalist it will first have to address the question “what is a good journalist?” and indeed “what is journalism?”

**Journalism: the public function and the set of skills**

In addressing the question “what is journalism”, Brian McNair suggests:

“For some it is a set of technical skills – a craft, to be learned and practised according to traditions handed down over the centuries. For others it is a noble profession, with a special responsibility to defend democratic processes, and an associated set of core ethical values. For others still, journalism is a creative medium, an art form even, as dependent upon fertile imagination and aesthetic sensibilities as a technical knowledge of shorthand or interviewing techniques” (McNair, 2005, p.42).

McNair suggests that journalism is required to be at least three things, often at the same time:

* A supplier of information
* A resource for, support to and participant in public life and political debate
* A medium of education, enlightenment and entertainment (McNair, 2005, p.28).

Whilst these can all be considered recognisable functions of journalism, none of them can be seen as defining characteristics. Rather they reference what can be described as the wider societal function of journalism in the ‘public sphere’ (Habermas, 1989) or the function of journalists to serve citizens or consumers as invoked in the expanding body of literature on the public journalism movement in the United States (Deuze, 2006; 2008).

In order to identify a defining function of journalism it is proposed to separate the public function of journalism from the “set of technical skills” described by McNair as involving the production of “mediated reality” (McNair, 2005): what journalists would recognise as the function of reporting.

Further evidence of these two separate but connected notions of the public function of journalism and journalism as a reporting function can be observed in texts on journalism used in learning and teaching in universities. David Randall, for example, lists “the right attitudes” which make “a good reporter”. These include attributes like keen news sense, determination to find out, a passion for precision, empathy with readers and a sense of urgency (Randall, 2011).

In addition Randall contends that good reporters share a belief in what the job is about: to question and as a result to:

* Discover and publish information that replaces rumour and speculation
* Resist or evade government controls
* Inform and empower voters
* Subvert those whose authority relies on a lack of public information
* Scrutinise the action of government and business

---

2 The others are “never make assumptions, never be afraid to look stupid, be suspicious of all sources, be resourceful, leave your prejudices at home, realise you are part of a process, the will to win, take pleasure in beating the opposition, be professional and individuality”
Comfort the afflicted and afflict the comfortable (Randall, 2011, p.3).

In general, it can be seen that Randall’s “attitudes” tend to be connected to the narrower definition of journalism as a reporting function whilst his “belief” and its imperatives connect to the wider public function.

On one level Randall’s “belief” and its imperatives could be seen as an explicit expression of values and assumed values prevalent in the organisational culture of the news business (Schein, 2010), a set of ideological values deployed to define journalism as an ideology and keep outside forces at bay in the debate about the future of journalism (Deuze, 2006) or connected to a process of socialising students in the practices of the occupation (Mensing, 2011). Certainly journalism can be viewed as a community of practice in which identity, meaning, practice and community are constructed through doing, being, belonging and becoming (Wenger, 2009). Underlying this “belief” and its imperatives however are fundamental behaviours of enterprise, subversion and scrutiny, which are essential to the function of reporting.

This idea of separate notions of the reporting function of journalism and its function in the public sphere can also be observed in a cross-national study of journalistic competencies which cited three roles of journalists:

- Report news quickly
- Provide analysis of events
- Be watchdog of government (Willnat et al, 2013).

What emerges here is a traditional reference to speed as a defining characteristic of journalism, an aura of immediacy stressing the novelty of information as its defining principle (Deuze, 2006). It should be noted, though, that while speed remains important in some sections of the news business, in an information space increasingly shaped by social media other sources are often faster in reporting news.

Journalists in different countries and cultures tend to put more emphasis on particular requirements such as ‘reporting news quickly’ or ‘providing analysis of events’ depending on institutional, cultural or political situations in their own country. In countries such as Brazil, Germany or Japan, where there are close ties between journalists and government officials, journalists are unlikely to place importance on “being a watchdog of government” (Willnat et al, 2013, p.174).

It should be noted that the terms “profession” and “professionalism” are contentious when associated with journalism. Since engagement in this debate was not considered helpful for the purposes of this study, journalism is referred to where possible as “an occupation”. However the term “professional” may be used in two specific contexts:

1; In the educational context of “professional learning”: a process involving acquisition of specialised, cultural and often tacit knowledge

2; Referring to a paid occupation: the antithesis of “citizen journalism”: a term used to refer to a variety of unpaid activities that generally involve members of the public getting involved in newsgathering and reporting but may also involve publication of opinions rather than facts (Gowing, 2009).

It is clear then that notions of success and achievement in journalism can be attached to a number of overlapping requirements and may depend on political, social and cultural factors. It is proposed to concentrate this pilot study on the definition of the “good journalist” in its narrower sense as a reporting function for the following reasons:

Reporting skills are the defining function of journalism. They remain the main distin-
guishing feature of the occupation of journalism.

Defining the good journalist in terms of the public function involves making a number of contested political and societal judgements about neutrality, objectivity, fairness, autonomy, freedom and independence for example, which could detract from the purpose of this study in illuminating, developing and facilitating learning and teaching practice (Deuze, 2006).

Journalism education in the UK is focussed primarily around training students to work in traditional news organisations and development of skills and knowledge required for the practice of journalism, usually in entry-level media jobs (Mensing, 2011).

### Journalism as a set of behaviours

Traditional consensus around skills and knowledge involved in practical journalism is typified by the vocational Diploma in Journalism offered by the NCTJ, which is focused on “the vital skills of finding and telling stories accurately and to deadline”. Alongside their requirements for examination in “essential media law” and “essential public affairs” knowledge the NCTJ list a number of other qualities and behaviours under a section entitled “Want to be a Journalist?”:

“Journalists, photographers and photojournalists have to be confident. They have to be ready to knock on doors and talk to strangers in the street. They must be inquisitive and they have to be ready to get the most out of their working day” (National Council for the Training of Journalists, 2013).

The NCTJ Guide for Trainee Journalists includes a further list of requirements including knowledge of “the world around you”, your industry, sources of information and codes of conduct and an extensive list of “character, attitude, knowledge and skills” you need to be a good reporter. These are categorised into “those you can work on” and “those you are born with”. The latter includes curiosity, an interest in people, intelligence, health, courage, belief in yourself, out-going (an ability to get on with all sorts of people), enthusiastic, determined, accurate, sceptical, thick-skinned and innovative (Smith, 2007).

On examination it’s a somewhat strange list: many highly successful journalists have notoriously unhealthy lifestyles; notions of courage, self-belief and determination can be identified with the acquisition of self-efficacy beliefs (Bandura, 1994) and in most workplaces people often have to give at least an impression of engagement with colleagues and/or members of the public. However, in the NCTJ’s list, the Randall list, and other similar lists, it is possible to identify requirements connected with curiosity, scepticism and enterprise that support the practical function of journalism as well as the activity of learning.

In order to categorise requirements such as these it is necessary to examine whether there is any distinction or difference between what are variously described by journalists as instincts, personality traits, qualities, talents, values, attitudes, beliefs, character or dispositions and examine how they might relate to each other.

Reference was first made to the hierarchy of six “neuro-logical” levels at which learning and change can take place, developed by Robert Dilts and widely used in Neuro-Linguistic Programming: environment, behaviour, capability, beliefs, identity and spiritual (Dilts, 1990).

Although not universally acknowledged scientifically, the Dilts logical levels suggest
categorisation between more outward facing behaviours involving reactions to situations and surroundings to deeper internally focussed beliefs: from “a passion for precision” on the Randall list, for example, to his ‘belief in what the job is about’.

In educational literature too, Lynda Stansfield distinguishes between internally focussed attributes and social attributes which are focussed externally. In her conceptual model, derived from an empirical study of self-managed learners, she categorises a hierarchy of knowledge and skills that are easy to change and attitudes and personality traits that are more difficult to alter without a degree of willingness, effort and time (Stansfield, 1999). Ronald Barnett discusses the role of the higher education curriculum in personal development with regard to notions of ‘knowing and becoming’. He distinguishes between dispositions (such as the will to learn, engage, listen, explore or go forward and tendencies to engage with the world) and qualities (such as resilience, integrity, self-discipline, confidence, enthusiasm and suspicion). Barnett contends that whilst they overlap in character, dispositions supply the energy to go forward, whilst qualities are more subject-specific and find expression in the way a student goes about their studies. At a deeper level they connect to ideas of being and becoming, will and authenticity. Without appropriate dispositions, learning and acquisition of skills is impossible (Barnett, 2007).

Beneath these discussions and the proposition that “a good journalist is born and not made” lie wide ranging philosophical debates about nature versus nurture referenced by geneticists in concepts of heritability and in social and political sciences in structure versus agency. These are considered beyond the scope of this study. Instead it is proposed to focus on the notion of “pedagogical being” defined by Barnett in a student by curricular settings and pedagogical relationships. A student’s pedagogical being is connected to the student’s more general identity involving “being as a human being” but is peculiar to the learning setting (Barnett, 2007 p. 28).

Similarly it can be imagined that being a journalism student will involve “being and becoming a journalist”: a further developing identity which infuses and is infused by other identities but will be peculiar to their function as a journalist. Examining this literature around this subject area suggests that the performance of a student or a journalist could be assessed at a number of levels. A tutor might try to directly measure their skills (the learned ability to perform a specific task) or test their knowledge (a range of information or practical understanding) but practitioners such as Kelvin McKenzie might also make judgements about qualities or dispositions they exhibit as the student goes about his studies or the journalist goes about his occupation.

In order to categorise these requirements, a taxonomy is proposed which distinguishes between behaviours and qualities that are immutable in students or journalists (the predispositions) and those that are not (the dispositions). The predispositions might be typified by attributes such as those involved in the “Big Five” or “OCEAN” dimensions: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism which have been shown to exhibit a high degree of stability among working age adults and across cultures (Digman, 1990). In the proposed taxonomy these predispositions underpin internally focussed dispositions such as self-efficacy and determination which supply energy and motivation. The dispositions in turn underpin externally focussed qualities typified by curiosity, confidence and enterprise which are evident in the way the student goes about their studies or the journalist goes about their occupation.
Most of the requirements of a good journalist discussed above can be mapped onto this model apart from the notion of ‘news sense’ cited by Kelvin McKenzie and Randall: “knowing what makes a good story and the ability to find the essential news point in a mass of dross” (Randall, 2011, p.4). Practitioners such as Randall, MacKenzie and Smith consider news sense a defining requirement of the occupation of journalism:

“You will come across journalists who tell you this is something you either have or you haven’t ... but we are all born with it to some degree. Nobody walks past a blazing house without thinking it worth mentioning when they get to the pub” (Smith, 2007, p.6).

On examination ‘news sense’ or ‘knowing a good story’ is a process of prioritising news agendas by making judgements informed by factors such as knowledge of previously published material, empathy with an audience, awareness of a commissioner’s agenda and identification of key elements such as conflict, involvement of celebrity, human interest or innovation, for example (Holmes et al., 2013; McKane, 2009). These are the sort of skills and instincts identified by Eraut in his theories of professional learning: rapid, intuitive understanding or response, knowledge constructed from aggregation of episodes and transfer of knowledge from one situation to another. Knowledge is embedded in taken-for-granted activities, perceptions and norms and activities involving the acquisition and use of tacit knowledge (Eraut, 2000). Eraut describes a journey from competent to professional involving a series of ill-structured problems and shifting goals, during which the student acquires two types of knowledge: codified, explicit knowledge and personal, tacit knowledge. Acquisition of tacit knowledge in the workplace involves activities such as asking questions and getting information, locating resources, learning from mistakes, giving and receiving feedback and activities located within processes such as supervision, mentoring, coaching, and site visits (Eraut, 2007). Tacit knowledge is also categorised as a form of “troublesome knowledge” associated with threshold concepts which characterise ways of thinking and practicing in a subject area and can be used to benchmark curricula (Meyer & Land, 2003).

News sense then has many of the characteristics of tacit knowledge and for the purposes of this study will be categorised as such.

Development of qualities and dispositions in higher education

There is a considerable body of pedagogic literature suggesting that higher education can affect profound change in students. Self-efficacy beliefs for example can be developed through mastery experiences, vicarious experiences, modelling influences and social persuasion. Whilst self-efficacy beliefs are easily undermined by failure, experience in overcoming obstacles, seeing others succeed and contact with proficient models who possess competencies to which students aspire can develop beliefs which can positively affect life choices, quality of functioning and resilience to adversity (Bandura, 1994). Within subject disciplines, exposure to threshold concepts in the form of troublesome knowledge can change the way a student thinks about their subject producing transformative and irreversible change. Identification of threshold concepts can illuminate ways of thinking and practicing in a subject area (Meyer & Land, 2003).

Barnett suggests a relationship between knowledge and being, in which dispositions and qualities may be developed through engagement with knowledge and “encounters with
strangeness”, a process characterised by language involving “delight” and “wonder”. The process of becoming is delicate and can easily be injured or lost forever but can be life-transfoming: it is not unusual on the occasion of a university graduation ceremony for the proud graduate to say that “this course has changed my life” (Barnett, 2009, p.435).

Further evidence of the potential of universities to develop the individual through the acquisition of knowledge is suggested by the former head of the BBC College of Journalism, Kevin Marsh. Marsh describes a “character, an attitude and a mindset” in successful journalists who are alert and alive to everything going on around them. They question everything they come across, listen properly and have a type of memory that gathers everything “like grannies used to collect bits of string”:

“In the general run of things, the value of a degree to me as a prospective employer wasn’t in the content of the degree itself. It was how everything involved in completing the course had opened the candidate’s eyes to the world” (Marsh, 2011).

Marsh’s comments echo discourses within the wider educational community about the reconfiguration of education in an information connected world (Land, 2013; Siemens, 2004). Universities are being urged to develop different skills in students to deal with information abundance, network distribution, intense competition and a communication process that is interactive and asynchronous (Mensing, 2011). Proponents of this viewpoint contend that in an age of ‘supercomplexity’, where knowledge is growing exponentially and the half-life of knowledge is shrinking, learning and knowledge may rest in diversity of opinions and learning increasingly involves connecting nodes of information (Siemens, 2004; Land, 2013; Barnett, 2009).

Social media, multimedia and interpretative skills are increasingly required of journalists. Journalists in several countries now believe that interpretation is one of their most important roles (Willnat et al, 2013). Any model of the good journalist then should acknowledge a facility to connect to, interpret and critically analyse a wide range of sources of information.

Whilst there will always be a proportion of students who do not respond to philosophies of self-development, studies show that appropriate support structures involving models of capabilities, development goals, guiding frameworks, mediating artefacts, documents and activities can help students develop the required capabilities (Eraut, 2007; Stansfield, 1999).

The study proposes to gather data from stakeholders in journalism education in order to:

Clarify and classify the skills, knowledge, qualities and dispositions required in the occupation of journalism.

Explore whether or how journalism education might develop those behaviours.

**Methodology**

The study has been conducted in the interpretative research paradigm since findings are likely to be personal and subjective and involve interpretation of specifics rather than generalisations (Sharp, 2009). Since the project is being carried out by the teacher as researcher with the purposeful intent of improving learning, it adopted the form of illuminative action research. In particular, it was thought that given the collaborative nature of the project, the interrogation, deconstruction and decentring of knowledge involved in action research would make it particularly appropriate to the research question which depends
on questioning assumptions underlying practices and situations (McNiff & Whitehead, 2009).

Data was gathered through a paired interview with two journalism tutors, a focus group of third year students and a semi-structured interview with the editor of a national magazine. Both tutors were journalists with extensive industry experience employed as academics: one was a course leader (A1) and the other had two years experience in HE (A2). Both had experience of higher education as students: A2 had studied journalism at postgraduate level. The editor (E) had previous experience of national newspapers at associate editor level and as a student studied journalism at postgraduate level.

Findings and discussion: can universities make good journalists?

Data from participants supported the suggestion that a university education could mould, engender or encourage qualities and dispositions traditionally associated with good journalism. The editor discussed her own experience in acquiring news sense in the workplace and in a postgraduate journalism course. She suggested that the same sort of instincts could be acquired in simulated workplace situations provided by the university newsroom:

E: “I think it’s certainly something that you can learn. I would say I learned more from people in a newsroom on the job than I did at university doing my training course but if the people who are teaching you at university have experience themselves, sound experience, then they can obviously help young people start to understand what makes for a news story”.

Data from students suggested that qualities like scepticism, tenacity and confidence had developed during their university education. S6 felt that one of the most important skills he had acquired was the ability to judge whether a story was true or not:

S6: “Three years ago I could have believed in everything you could have told me. Now I’m saying OK but what are your sources”.

S5 felt that practical exercises which required him to secure interviews with sources of information in the community had developed personal qualities in him:

S5: “When you have to talk to strangers you develop skills that are not just applicable to journalism but to your own life like tenacity and confidence”.

Academic A2 said that his postgraduate diploma in journalism had taught him how to be a “professional journalist”:

A2: “I wouldn’t have got a career in journalism without it. I was hopeless. I had done some writing for university papers and stuff and I thought I could do it but I didn’t really know much at all”.

This data suggests a number of processes could be taking place: development of self-efficacy beliefs and hence resilience in students through mastery experiences (Bandura, 1994) acquisition of tacit knowledge by the editor in a simulated workplace experience (Eraut, 2000) and the tutor “becoming” a journalist (Barnett, 2009). More importantly it suggests that higher education had the capacity to affect qualities and dispositions, particularly scepticism, tenacity or determination, resilience (being “thick skinned”) and confidence: requirements categorised by some practitioners as “qualities you are born with” (Smith, 2007, p3). Similarly data from the tutor and the editor suggest development of news sense in simulated workplace exercises and in the workplace, challenging the suggestion that “you’ve either got it or you haven’t” (MacKenzie, 2011).
The data does acknowledge a variation between students in the capacity for acquiring those skills connected to a deeper set of predispositions. A1 considered qualities like “curiosity, tenacity a sense of irreverence and fun and a questioning disposition” were “temperamental”:

A1: “You can try to nurture or develop or provoke ... those qualities in individuals but I think some individuals are blessed by nature with more of them than others”;

A2 suggest that,:

A2: “Journalism courses can give you the kit of parts to become a journalist: the attributes are harder to endow but I think you can develop them, you can hone them”.

This supports the proposal that any model of the qualities and behaviours demanded of a good journalist needs to acknowledge a distinction between predispositions, which are “temperamental”, and dispositions, which may be affected by experiences such as education.

University - a place of practice and reflection

Data from the participants suggested that practical journalism exercises, particularly newsroom simulations or newsdays could play a central role in developing the “the good journalist”. Students S1, S3 and S5 cited production exercises in the university newsroom, an investigative journalism module in which they had been tasked with identifying and investigating an empty building, and the final year long-form journalism project in being formative of their skills and behaviours. All required students to approach and secure interviews with sources of information in the community: as student S5 put it “talking to strangers”. S5 described the initial prospect of a first year assignment in which he was required to write three stories, each with two original interviews as “quite overwhelming” but said that “having to get out and do it and not just doing it over the phone or over the internet” as having developed qualities of tenacity and confidence.

A1 highlighted the importance of resilience to the good journalist, suggesting that barriers to success in journalism in particular involved fear of failing, ”failing to get the right interview for example”:

A1: “If they feel more able to fail they will learn. I’ve just done a course myself and it reminded me how very unsettling and difficult it is to learn things because you have to confront your ignorance and incapacity”.

S1 said that an investigative journalism module had “pushed him” into acquiring skills which had been formative of his professional practice:

S1: “I learned more from failing. The skills from that module: I am applying them to all my work this year”.

The experience of student S6 (an non-native English speaker) suggested that resilience might be a particular problem. When confronted with exercises involving “talking to strangers” he reported a feeling that he was going to “screw things up”.

Barnett highlights the fragile nation of the pedagogical being and the importance of providing a setting where students can “have a go - intellectually, practically or personally” without experiencing harm (Barnett, 2007 p. 147). This emphasises the need for close supervision, direction, management and support by tutors to ensure that students are provided with a safe place for practice, mastery experiences, modelling influences, vicari-
uous experiences and social persuasion: experiences described by Bandura as developing self-efficacy (Bandura, 1994). The editor, too, considered practical exercises that “got students animated enough to get involved” and required them to “use their skills” had value, particularly in the acquisition of “news sense”:

E: “If you’re getting people to run their own website: put out a magazine. It depends on the staff as well: how much are they capable of running an exercise that mimics the working world”.

The suggestion here then is that practical journalism exercises which mimic the working world can encourage professional learning to take place in a higher education setting, where tacit knowledge like news sense could be acquired by students (Eraut, 2007). The idea that experiential learning in practical journalism exercises can develop required qualities and dispositions in students is supported by a study at the University of Sheffield which highlights its role in growing student confidence, encouraging group organisation, conquering anxiety and enabling students to feel more confident about the prospect of working in a real news environment (Steel et al, 2007). The experience of A1 suggested that historically it was possible to go through these processes and develop those behaviours and qualities without the support of higher education. She said she had “minimal formal instruction in journalism”, a degree in English literature and what she described as “a lot of life experience” and had learned on the job “sitting next to Nellie”.

Tutor A2 also considered experience in industry important, comparing it to “driving test and theory”. He said “you could hear the clicks of the light bulbs going on” when second year students who had been studying only theory experienced the workplace for the first time. However, he said that “rigorous, systematic feedback” and space for reflective analysis through instruments such as reflective logs, which were essential element of the higher education setting, were not provided in the same way outside journalism courses:

A2: “You can see them beginning to reflect themselves on what makes a good journalist, and “am I good enough” and “what can I do to improve” and without courses you don’t get that in a concentrated way”.

This highlights the requirement for a process of reflective observation in the cycle of experiential learning (Kolb, 1984). Feedback, mentoring, and an appropriate level of challenge are central to the process of professional learning alongside development of confidence, commitment and a sense of achievement (Eraut, 2007).

The data suggest that practical exercises which “mimic the working world” and involve “talking to strangers” can not only develop skills such as writing and interviewing but can also engender qualities and dispositions required of journalists. Students need access to tutors who can provide feedback, mentoring and modelling experiences. Effective exercises need to provide an appropriate level of challenge and should be designed to provide mastery experiences, room for reflection and vicarious experiences through social models.

### University as developer of networks

Data from the study highlighted a further requirement of the good journalist and hence a further role for universities: development of networks with industry and with sources of information. Data from students suggested that exposure to working journalists as guest speakers, on field trips and on work experience had profoundly affected their development. In particular, S1 and S2 and S3 discussed one successful fashion journalist who had been employed as one of their tutors:
"It was really good to have a journalist who was successful in one particular field who was that passionate about that field."

"She told us how she got there. She showed us her blog for example and she really inspired us to do it ourselves. She showed us how we could make it successful if we wanted to."

"Some of the guest speakers we had in boost your confidence so much. When you see someone who is passionate and successful tell you how great the job is it boosts you...
we’ve had the chance to hear from so many successful informed people; we’ve had a chance to learn from them."

Student S1 described how access to a prominent investigative journalist who had been brought in as a guest speaker had changed his mind about his future career: “My hero! Meeting people like X was a big turning point for me.”

This data supports the suggestion that contact with successful journalists can develop self-efficacy beliefs in students through modelling experiences, vicarious experiences and social persuasion (Bandura, 1994). In addition, it highlighted the potential of networks of industry contacts in delivering coaching and mentoring to students, two of the recognised learning processes connected to professional learning (Eraut, 2007). Students could also be considered to be going through a process of being socialised into the occupation of journalism (Mensing, 2011).

Evidence from the editor highlighted the importance of universities in developing capacity for innovation, particularly keeping students up to date with changing industry practice:

"(Universities)...can be very useful I’d say in bringing people bang up to date with innovation and really understanding the opportunities that technological change can make to journalism"

Student S3 said that contact with industry through work experience and guest speakers had emphasised the importance of innovative working practices:

"Employers are looking for you to be able to do everything, so we can do online, we can do the TV, the radio, and we’re a lot more flexible to employers and a lot more valuable to them I think"

Whilst social media skills are increasingly important for communicating with existing audiences, building new audiences and building communities (Holmes et al., 2013) reporters are still required to get to know people in their area to find out what is going on, what is likely to happen and to develop news stories (McKane, 2009). Tutor A2 suggested that development of contacts with sources of information in the community was a process that “did not come naturally” to students who are increasingly more used to contact through email and social media:

"Students these days ... are so used to doing everything on Facebook that they don’t actually talk to people so and I think that after they have done work experiences and when they have been out on the streets looking for stories themselves .. they begin to see that one contact leads on to another”.

Students S2, S3 and S4 acknowledged the importance of “talking to people” and “making contacts and connections”:

"Contacts are really important. You can’t be rude to someone because you might need that person whether it’s a few months or a few years down the line you might need to back to them."
S2: “Every small conversation you have you will take something new away from.”

S4: “Another thing about being a good journalist is that you have to be a people’s person and the way you are with people can either get a story from someone or cannot work so you have to be confident and good with people”.

The comments from the students reference Smith’s requirement for a reporter to be “able to get on easily with all sorts of people …. being a good listener, sensitive to people’s feelings, and appearing sympathetic even when you disagree with what you are being told” (Smith, 2007, p4).

On one level this requirement to be “a people’s person” could be viewed as a set of interpersonal skills and taught as such, as communication skills are taught to professional helpers through techniques such as empathic presence and active listening (Egan, 2010).

The evidence of the editor however suggests that a deeper set of skills is required of successful journalists involving knowledge of human behaviour. She cited two examples from her own career in which she had secured interviews by telephoning a chief executive to congratulate him on his appointment and by sending flowers to an artist who had been questioned by police about using human body parts in a contemporary art exhibition.

She cited as “one of the best things she had learned on a local paper” how a photographer had obtained a photograph of a defendant “scurrying away” from a court case by shouting “good luck”, prompting them to turn round:

Editor: “Some people may say that’s unethical but … I’m just using that example to show how people in the media use their knowledge of human beings and use their experience and get what they want”.

At one level, practitioners might consider this an illustration of the “plausible manner and rat like cunning” identified by Nicholas Tomalin alongside “a little literary ability” in his much-quoted self-deprecating article about journalism published in the Sunday Times in the 1960s (Tomalin, 1969). However the transformative effect of this knowledge on the editor, its linkage to experience and its proposed identification as a core concept to the subject area suggests that “knowledge of human behaviour” is a form of tacit knowledge, a taken-for-granted activity acquired on the journey from competent to professional, linked to ways of thinking and practicing within the discipline of journalism (Meyer & Land, 2003; Eraut, 2000). As a result it is proposed to classify “knowledge of human behaviour” as such.

Ethics: The good journalist –v- the bad journalist

Data from students suggested that a requirement of ethical behaviour in journalists and hence an ethical dimension to journalism education was of particular importance:

S2: “It’s been really good to be able to .. learn from the mistakes of journalists in the past and it makes you think about how you would act as a journalist”.

Student S1 said a media law and ethics module had highlighted pressure on journalists from 24 hour news and the internet to get stories and the importance of taking a “moral standpoint”: “to believe in something”. He didn’t believe it was possible to “teach someone right from wrong”, feeling it was “something you were raised with”, but suggested that journalists might still “go against that to get the story”. This further suggests the emergence of an ethical or moral dimension to the dispositions and qualities previously discussed. Barnett distinguishes between dispositions as the tendency, inclination
or potential to act in a certain way and qualities that can be influenced by reason or strong forces, suggesting dispositions may be tarnished or undone by its qualities leading to harmful or unethical outcomes (Barnett, 2007). Hence ethical behaviour could be considered a quality like curiosity, confidence or tenacity, underpinned by ethical dispositions. The student’s suggestion that ethical values could be taught or learned again references the capacity for exposure to troublesome knowledge to affect dispositions (Barnett, 2007).

The editor too thought that education about “professional ethics” was important. Discussing “the best journalists she knows” she said they:

“...really understand the importance of both being close to your contacts but also sometimes knowing that you are going to have to upset them – but treating them decently”.

These remarks should be considered against the background of cultural change in journalism. Editors of mass-market tabloids traditionally considered ethics an irrelevance (Randall, 2011; Leveson, 2012). Randall suggested that traditionally putting the words “journalism” and “ethics” together into the same sentence would risk “reducing the listener to helpless laughter” (Randall, 2011, p.145). Since then however, the Leveson Inquiry “sparked by public revulsion about a single action - the hacking of a mobile phone of a murdered teenager” has called for an independent self-regulatory regime for journalists (Leveson, 2012, p3).

Marsh too believes that there is a requirement for ethical education beyond mass-market newspapers into organisations like the BBC who now employ more than 10,000 casual and freelance workers, many of whom, he says, come to the organisation with no more than a hazy idea of the principles of the BBC’s journalism. He believes journalism education should increasingly be providing awareness of the “ethical landscape in which the unregulated press, the web, campaigning NGOs, freelance and independent documentary makers operate, as well as the regulated broadcasters” (Marsh, 2011).

This study proposes to distinguish, then, between ethical qualities and ethical dispositions in the model of a good journalist in order to reflect the argument discussed.

University as extender of knowledge

Data from the study suggested a further requirement of the good journalists in terms of knowledge beyond the subject area of journalism. Students discussed a class discussion that took place which some students had difficulty understanding:

S1: “People on this course do not have a basic grasp of history or major events that have happened...”

S5: “It’s not even about history: it’s about the present. Knowing what’s going on around you”.

Tutor A1 suggested that some students “don’t have enough knowledge to recognise a good story”. A1 cited a lack of reading of journalism and literature in general as a major problem in universities: “if you don’t read enough you cannot become a good writer”. Student S1 expressed admiration for student S6 who had studied in Italy:

S1:” (He talks) .. about art, society, he has always has input because he has that general understanding”.

Student S6 contrasted his education in the UK which was “too practical” compared with his education in Italy because “it doesn’t make you study books”. Student S2
initially disagreed:

S2: “This course is training you to be a journalist not a historian”

S6: “To be a journalist you need to know history”

S6: “During high school I hated studying Latin but after five years it opened my mind and I didn’t know it”

S2: “You’re right actually because in political and campaigning journalism I only did that because I didn’t want to do fashion or sport but I really enjoyed that”

S6; “You never known when you can use that”

Whilst the discussion between S2 and S6 echoes debate about the balance between academic and practical content within journalism courses, the data in general emphasises the importance of the requirement for “knowledge of the world around you” referenced by practitioners:

“You need to know a bit about a lot, have a good general knowledge and an understanding of the society you live in and be up to date on current affairs. Only then can you judge what is newsworthy” (Smith, 2007, p.7):

“In order to perform their functions journalists need an education which enables them to put themselves and their society in perspective; find out anything and question everything” (De Burgh, 2003, p110).

Beyond that however it should be noted that acquisition of knowledge might be useful to a journalism student at a number of deeper levels. Acquisition of deeper and broader knowledge could inform and develop the interpretative skills increasingly required of journalists in the new media landscape where they are more important that the dissemination of information in some cases. (Willnat et al, 2013).

In addition, it is through strangeness and encounters with knowledge that a student’s pedagogical being is developed and dispositions and qualities are developed such as curiosity and the will to learn, engage and go forward (Barnett, 2007). In order to do that, curricula need to be sufficiently demanding, offer contrasting insights and perspectives, require presence and commitment, student engagement and encouraging and enthusing pedagogy which requires students to give of themselves (Barnett, 2009).

Historically, journalism courses have been under fire from both practitioners and academic for focusing too much on teaching of skills and techniques (Mensing, 2011). Barnett contends that in a world of super-complexity where all significant matters have become inherently disputable a genuine higher education cannot content itself with a project of skills or knowledge or both but has to do with “being” (Barnett, 2009). Employers in general are calling for a broader set of skills from “global graduates” involving global knowledge of issues such as geography, conditions, issues and events, understanding of historical forces and complexity and interdependence of world events (Diamond et al, 2011). In response some US universities are already launching Global Citizen Programmes for undergraduates (Webster University, 2013).

Data from this study suggests students may acquire many forms of knowledge of the world around them in settings both inside and outside the classroom. Tutor A2 cited the transformative effect that a trip to a magistrates’ court had on his students ability to “recognise a story”. Tutor A1 cited an activity in which a high profile MP was brought in to
the university to hold a press conference for students as being a particularly successful learning experience:

A1: “It was such a shock to a lot of them: his naked ambition and facility and the fact that he gave them no quarter. It woke them up to the fact that there are loads of stories out there ... in the wild panoply of human behaviour”.

This study suggests then that in order to become good journalists students are required to acquire a range of knowledge beyond that of news and current affairs and traditional offering of media law and public administration. Acquisition of such knowledge through exposure to people, ideas, contrasting insights and perspectives can also develop the required dispositions and qualities.

**Journalists make journalists**

This data suggests that journalism tutors may take on a complex variety of roles including provider of feedback and social persuasion, extender of knowledge and facilitator of reflection, access to networks and workplace exercises that mimic the real world. They are also likely to take on associated academic functions of assessor and quality assurer: they may also have a role in socialising students into a community of practice (Mensing, 2011) and provision of what Barnett calls “a pedagogy of inspiration”, through which new being is formed and new connections are formed in mind and being (Barnett, 2007, p115).

Data from students and the editor suggested in order to perform these roles effectively tutors need to have practical experience of the workplace. Students S2 reported a conversation with a student studying at another university where academics had no workplace experience of journalism:

S2: “I was shocked. How can they know? How can they teach you? All of our teachers are journalists. From that we’ve had the chance to hear from so many successful informed people”.

S3: “The skills that you’ve got individually you can then pass on to us”.

S2: “You can tell us instances where you’ve used this in the real world and how they’ve helped you with your job”.

The editor too had contact with a course where tutors more familiar with the academic study of journalism than workplace practice:

Editor: “Their view of journalism was entirely negative: ‘you can’t trust journalists because they lie all the time’. I don’t think that’s a constructive place to start if you’re running a course which will lead to journalism going out into the workplace”.

Whilst the editor’s remarks suggest evidence of the intense animus identified between practitioners and media studies academics, her view was supported by a survey of British journalism tutors in which they expressed near-unanimous support for the proposition that practical experience was essential in a journalism tutor (Greenberg, 2007). Three reasons were given: that it gave the course credibility since students respect experience, it was vital to explain why “things are done the way they are” and it provided a “vision of best practice”.

---

**Articles**
In addition, data suggests that tutors with workplace experience bring with them tacit knowledge attached to ways and thinking and practicing in journalism.

**Conclusion**

Data gathered during this study suggested that it is possible for universities to develop dispositions and qualities required of good journalists, such as curiosity, scepticism, tenacity and “news sense” which are considered by some practitioners to be innate. Whilst some predispositions may remain immutable in individual students, data suggests it is possible to develop other dispositions and qualities through the learning process, particular through exposure to strangeness and troublesome knowledge. Practical reporting exercises, with an appropriate level of challenge, particularly those which mimic the working world and involve “talking to strangers”, can engender self-efficacy beliefs and hence confidence and resilience.

News sense, considered “a quality you a born with” is a form of tacit knowledge which can be acquired in simulated workplace experiences. Development of interpersonal skills and tacit knowledge of human behaviour was also important, especially to students more used to communication through social media and online.

The study suggested a role for the journalism course as an extender of “knowledge of the world around you” through exposure to people, ideas and experiences beyond the traditional subject area. Students and practitioners considered instruction in ethics especially important in an increasingly casualised industry and a changing social climate around the occupation of journalism.

Students need to have access to tutors with appropriate workplace experience to secure access to industry networks, provide modelling influences and socialise students into ways of thinking and practicing in the occupation. Tutors should make provision for rigorous, systematic feedback and reflection and be aware of their various roles such as social persuaders and models of good practice.

The figure below represents a proposed model of the requirements of “the good journalist”, designed to promote discussion around the functions of journalism education and to inform, illuminate and facilitate curriculum design. Reference was made to the qualities, skills and knowledge required by the NCTJ and the personal qualities cited in literature and by participants in this pilot study. Examples of each group of requirements are attached to their representation.

Qualities are underpinned by dispositions that in turn are underpinned by predispositions or character traits. Ethical behaviour is expressed as a quality underpinned by ethical dispositions. News sense and knowledge of human behaviour are presented as forms of tacit knowledge that are acquired through professional learning. Expression is given to development of networks, and development of qualities and dispositions through acquisition of skills and knowledge, both of which are essential to a capacity for innovation. Attributes near the top of the chart are easier to mould and more subject specific, towards the bottom of the chart are generic and more difficult to influence.

This model is designed to encourage further discussion between practitioners, academ-
ics and students. The model will then be used to inform a further cycle of action research during which it could be further tested and developed by students and staff. Further research is needed to determine whether it is generalisable or exportable to other vocational courses in higher education.

**FIGURE 1: Requirements of “the good journalist”**
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“Join the discussion on the issues raised in this article at [http://hereisthenews.co.uk](http://hereisthenews.co.uk) or with @richardwgevans
Tracking Onslow: taking journalism out of the classroom and the newsroom

Kayt Davies, Edith Cowan University

Commentary about shrinking newspaper workforces often conflates the financial woes facing the newspaper industry and the fate of journalism (Wake, 2013; Simons, 2013). While newspapers are clearly suffering, opportunities for best-practice journalism abound. This paper describes the application of a theory-based approach to finding authentic learning opportunities for students. The project created a new media product in a volatile setting lacking journalistic attention. It illustrates the value of taking a ‘first principles’ approach to planning journalism activities and describes groundwork for the project that can be emulated to create fertile ground for similar ventures. The project involves journalism students researching and publishing community perceptions of local issues in the remote town of Onslow, Western Australia. Challenges the students have encountered include PR spin and editorial pressure on press independence. This paper will describe the project, the pedagogy and the implications for journalism educators.

Keywords: ‘authentic learning,’ local journalism, student magazines, fieldwork, community

Australia’s economy currently relies heavily on the export of natural resources, but the resources industry requires expensive infrastructure and large workforces that can place strain on other sections of society
and on their local host communities. This project combined journalism theory and an ‘authentic learning’ approach to create an ongoing magazine and website to meet the needs of a host community undergoing a dramatic upheaval.

The first section of this paper outlines the political and media milieu that gave rise to this collaborative media project. The second describes its human resources, technological and financial details. The third section explains the pedagogical impetus behind the project; using examples to show how theories of media practice were applied in the real-world setting.

Section 1: Setting the scene

New resource projects are seen by many Australians as a political necessity. Debate arises, however, about how much the communities affected by resource development should be compensated for the inconvenience that hosting a project inflicts, especially given that the commencement of big projects provides a windfall to some community members. Dissatisfaction with the degree of compensation host communities receive surfaces in a political context around election time. In 2008, in the Western Australian state election, the National Party (a rural-oriented, conservative political party) campaigned strongly on a “Royalties for Regions” platform, which promised to “pump 25% of all mining royalties back into regional areas” (ABC, 2008). The party won the balance of power in the state parliament, forming government with the (conservative) Liberal Party on the condition of Parliamentary support for its Royalties for Regions policy. In 2013 the National Party again successfully used Royalties for Regions as the centerpiece of its campaign. The perceived need for community compensation is also visible in the increasing use in corporate circles of the term Social Licence to Operate.

“The term ‘Social Licence to Operate’ or ‘Social Licence’ is gaining prominence in the resources sector as the industry increasingly focuses on recognising the interests of communities affected by mining activities. As originally conceived, the notion of a social licence to operate reflects the idea that society is able to grant or withhold support for a company and its operations; with the extent of support being dependent on how well a company meets societal expectations of its behaviour and impacts. A social licence is tacit, intangible and context specific. It needs to be earned and is dynamic, as people’s experiences and perceptions of an operation shift over time.” (Gas Industry Social & Environmental Alliance, 2013, p1)

The remote Pilbara region is approximately 20% of Western Australia’s land area. Including its offshore gas and petroleum, it provides 80% of the state’s resources sector value. The companies operating in the Pilbara include BHP Billiton, CITIC Pacific Mining, Chevron/Shell/Exxon Mobil, FMG, Rio Tinto and Woodside Energy. The scale of these projects, their contributions to the state and national economies, as well as their influence on election results, warrant a better flow of information about their impact on host communities.

Approximately 51,000 people, around 2% of West Australians, live in the Pilbara. The coastal town of Onslow is in the local government Shire of Ashburton and it is one of the oldest communities in the Pilbara. It was gazetted in 1885 to serve the budding local pastoral industry, later becoming a pearling port and deep water harbour. More recently it has been sustained by fishing, tourism and salt production. In 2006 Onslow had a popula-
tion of 576 and in 2011 its population was 667 (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). In 2011, 180, (27%) of the Onslow residents were Indigenous. Since Indigenous affairs is a contentious issue in Australian politics, there is an additional fourth estate rationale for documenting the standard of treatment of Indigenous people.

Gas was discovered off the Pilbara coast in 1971 and since the 1980s several offshore projects have developed. Some of these feed gas into a pipeline that runs from Dampier (122 kms north of Onslow) to Perth, supplying the WA domestic market. In 2010 a BHP Billiton-led joint venture committed to develop the $A1.67 billion Macedon onshore gas processing plant near Onslow, to pump gas into the pipeline to Perth. A precinct called Ashburton North was established and construction began in 2012. The Macedon project construction phase involved 600 workers, and its operational workforce is 16 people. Construction of Macedon was completed in 2013 and the project life is expected to be 20 years. In 2008 a Chevron-led joint venture committed to develop the $A29 billion Wheatstone project to process gas for liquefaction and export. The construction workforce is expected to peak at 6500 and the operating workforce will be 300. Construction of the plant, also at Ashburton North, began in 2011 and it is due for completion in 2016. The project life is expected to be 40-50 years. It is estimated that by 2017, when both projects are in their operational phases that the population of Onslow will be around 2200 people, and that five years later, in 2022, the population will be around 3750 (WA Planning Commission, 2011).

On the matter of the Social Licence to Operate, in 2008 BHP Billiton established a Community Reference Group (CRG) for the Macedon project involving representatives from local government, relevant authorities and the community. In 2005 Chevron established a CRG for its North-West gas projects with branches in Karratha and Onslow and in 2008 the Onslow branch became a Wheatstone-focussed CRG. A Chevron spokesperson explained that the aim of the CRGs is to function as a two-way forum, to enable the companies to respond to community concerns, as well as to keep the community informed of company activities (Tania, 2013). In addition to communicating with the community, Chevron has committed A$250 million towards developing infrastructure (for its own project and the community) and BHP Billiton contributed A$5million to a social infrastructure fund (Ottaviano, 2013).

The gas-hub companies also regularly produce glossy report documents explaining their activities in reader-friendly ways. These are distributed through community meetings, networking and sometimes via letterbox drops. Other media about the gas-hubs and their impact on Onslow comprises of the Shire of Ashburton’s newsletter, Inside Ashburton, (which also covers the other towns in the shire), and a monthly 50-100 page publication assembled and photocopied by Onslow visitor centre staff. It is comprised of pieces submitted by community members, given that no journalists are commissioned to contribute.

While people in Onslow can access Australian Broadcasting Commission radio, television and online content, as well as some private programming and state and regional newspapers, there are no journalists based in Onslow and so activities in the town are rarely reported in those media. In 2011 a civic-minded social media services provider based in Onslow started a Facebook group called For Sale in Onslow and a Facebook page called Town of Onslow WA to facilitate community communication and cohesiveness. By September 2013, the group had 291 members and the page had 296 followers/likes.

This turbulent big dollar context and lack of independent professional media working in town provided an opportunity for the emergence of a new media product designed to fulfil the basic functions of independent journalism as outlined in numerous journalism text-
books, such as Errington and Miragliotta (2007), Lamble (2010) and Whittaker, Ramsey and Smith (2000). Errington and Miragliotta (2007) categorise these various ‘first principle’ reasons for journalism to exist, as three key functions: the watchdog; the provider of information; and the facilitator of the public sphere. The first of these refers to the function of holding the powerful to account, including scrutinising the appropriate spending of public money (and, in this case, money allocated for public benefit); the second refers to the gatekeeper function of ensuring that information that can help a community or society run more smoothly is available to the citizenry; and the third is to do with reducing alienation and hostility by enabling different subgroups within a community to understand and empathise with each other. Lamble (2010) adds to this the truism that journalism is also the first draft of history. As Onslow’s transformation involves large sums of money, complex arrangements between corporate and government bodies and an influx of new people, all of these media functions seemed relevant.

Section 2: The project’s human, technological and financial details

In early 2012 a collaboration between the Edith Cowan University journalism program and The Shire of Ashburton was conceived and formalised through a Memorandum of Understanding. It commenced in mid-2012 and will conclude in 2015 or in 2017, subject to ongoing funding. The project involves a week-long visit to the remote town of Onslow every six months by a crew of three to six journalism students to create a niche media product in the form of a 36-page magazine and website. The Tracking Onslow project is creating a first draft of the history of the town over the Macedon and Wheatstone construction phases by documenting its physical and social evolution. The project output is online at www.trackingonslow.net including the four magazines created so far displayed as flickzines. The project has also attracted the attention of mainstream media and been reported online, in print and on regional and national radio.

Recruiting student journalists

Once the scope of the project had been negotiated, four students were recruited via an invitation to all students in the journalism-major at the University. Three travelled with the author (a journalism lecturer) to Onslow for a week in July 2012, and one provided research and subbing support from Perth. The second, third and fourth trips each involved five students who travelled and each time two or three aspiring or former crew members provided subbing and research support from Perth. The most engaged students were invited to stay with the project and have provided valuable continuity and taken leadership roles. All students are invited to remain engaged as Perth-based supporters and proof readers after they have travelled. This has enhanced the project’s knowledge management processes as crews have been brought together for social/work gatherings and encouraged to share insights, contacts, and the resource material the project has collected (Milton, 2005). In summary, the project has involved 17 students to date, and of those five have been involved in more than one edition. More students could have been involved if the cost of transport to and from Onslow had not been so high. The journey involves a three hour flight and a three hour drive each way.

Technology and production issues

The original aim was to use journalistic data gathering techniques (Lamble, 2004), including audio and video interviews and photography, and for the material to be edited and displayed solely online. However, many of the people we interviewed in Onslow in 2012
said that they did not have regular internet access, or that they couldn’t watch videos online because of broadband limitations in the remote area.

This prompted us to consider producing a hard copy print media product. The shire of Ashburton offered to cover the A$2775 cost to print 500 magazines after each visit and the project evolved. The relatively low price of this print run is the result of recent advances in print technology that have made small print runs considerably more affordable. As well as being distributed free-of-charge in Onslow by the Shire of Ashburton, the magazine was also published as a flick-zine online and additional photographs, text and videos also feature on the project’s website (www.trackingonslow.net). More details on the publication and website specs and on the technology used is available in the Appendix.

Financial arrangements

The financial expenses covered by the Shire of Ashburton include the airfares and accommodation (in a shire-owned house) for the crews travelling to Onslow, the cost of printing 500 copies of each magazine edition and transporting them to Onslow. Edith Cowan University is paying for the ISSUU and Wordpress pro-subscriptions and provides, on loan, most of the camera and recording equipment and the iPads, staff computer and software required to produce the magazine and website. It also provides the staff member co-ordinating the project.

Section 3: Pedagogy and real world media challenges

Pedagogy – Authentic learning

In terms of education theory, this project falls firmly within the camp of ‘authentic learning’, as described by Herrington (2013). She describes authentic learning as learner-centred and based in rich, relevant, real-world contexts that resemble or present opportunities to experience real life application of knowledge. Herrington and Herrington (2006) state that the benefits of authentic learning environments are well supported by the literature, but not yet used as widely as they could be for a variety of reasons, including inertia within academic systems. Reeves (2006) concurred and pointed out that the need to adopt more student-centred and problem-based learning environments has been recognised by education theorists for many years, but he also laments that “few academics seem able to comprehend what it means to teach and learn in fundamentally different ways” (p. viii).

There are several procedures used in this project that were inspired by the elements of best-practice ‘authentic learning’ pedagogy as described by Herrington and Herrington (2006). These include modelling by the author of how and what to ask the Onslow community members and other interviewees, and also, of appropriate behaviour in what Herrington & Herrington (2006) call the “social periphery” of the relevant tasks. The modelling of journalistic practice (and scaffolding of fledgling attempts) took the form of the lecturer conducting the first couple of interviews (and pre-interview conversations) in order to demonstrate, and all subsequent interviews were arranged and conducted by the students. The lecturer also conducted some telephone interviews with difficult/reluctant interviewees in front of the students to model polite tenacity. (For example a media spokesperson for a gas company that had previously had an industrial accident was reluctant to answer questions for a story about the history of Pilbara gas developments, the author firmly told him that he could comment or be reported as declining to comment, as the facts would be reported regardless and he then opted to co-operate).
In accordance with Reeves’ (2006) description of problem-based learning, in cases where students encountered problems, such as feeling swamped with information and unable to start writing their stories, the author prompted them to articulate their problems and then suggested a first line. Sometimes the student was asked to verbally explain the crux of the story, thereby replicating traditional newsroom-based methods of training ‘cub reporters’. Also, when students were unable to gain a balanced understanding of an issue from their own research, the lecturer provided research tips or an explanation, and where that was not sufficient, either assigned another student to help or completed the task and then discussed the final stages of it with the student.

In the context of this project, the ‘social periphery of the task’ was experienced through each crew’s week of living in Onslow and mingling with locals while grocery shopping, taking evening walks and dining in the local pub. To ensure that the professional reputation of the project was preserved the students were told prior to travelling that they would have to behave with reasonable decorum at all times, including when socialising and drinking. All understood the reasoning behind the request and only one needed to be told more than once about potentially inappropriate behaviour. In addition, the act, by the lecturer and other students, of taking photos and footage of the student journalists in action conducting interviews, gave an opportunity to engage in ‘social reflection’. Knight (1985) stated that this kind of ‘active reflection’ fostered ‘aware attention’ towards others and towards professional behaviour.

In requiring the students to support each other, to proof read each others’ work and give each other feedback, the lecturer encouraged them to articulate their understanding of quality in media production. The value of this as a learning process is that speech is not only a vehicle for the expression of ideas, the act of creating the speech also influences the learning process (Herrington & Herrington, 2006). Vygotsky (cited in Lee 1985, p.79), said: “Thought undergoes many changes as it turns into speech. It does not merely find expression in speech; it finds reality and form.” The implication of this is that the act of finding the right words for providing feedback to each other helps the students refine their own practice.

**Educational editorial challenges**

The journalistic approach used in the project was derived from authors such as Lamble (2004), who describe journalism as a methodology primarily defined by a set of questions and a sceptical attitude. Lamble said most journalism lies between two extremes, shallow and formulaic reporting of events and proactive meaningful research and writing, that requires persistence, forward planning, access to data, analytic skills and sometimes elements of personal danger. The existence of abundant low quality journalism does not negate the existence, and need for, high quality journalism which can be cultivated in academic settings.

The project set out to document the changes in the Onslow community from a ‘neutral point-of-view’ journalistic perspective, as opposed to a pro-local government or pro-company perspective. In this sense the journalism would function in its well-defined role of being a first draft of history and it is seeking to present information in a fair and balanced way. However, taking on board the “scholarly insistence that journalism cannot be objective” (Calcutt and Hammond, 2011, p86), the ethical aims set out by Ward (2010) were adopted as the touchstones of the endeavour. These include: Acting as global agents (by
promoting informed tolerance, and challenging distortions); serving the citizens of the world (by refusing to align with factions, regions or countries); and by promoting non-parochial understandings. These are further operationalised by Ward via recommendations that journalists should report critically on economic associations; assess the quality of social life; and assist in social bridging, and building media literacy by using global comparisons.

In journalism it is always important to have a clear idea of the target readership. In this case starting with a small town with a population of about 600, we sought as wide a readership as possible within that 600. The shire was able to distribute via facilities in town used by various sub-sections of the population of Onslow. This inclusivity found expression in our decision to use a large font in the magazine for ease of reading by older eyes, and by our strategy of seeking to interview members of as many different sub-sections of the community as possible, such as the business sector, the sporting enthusiasts, the pub goers, the young mothers, tourists and the Indigenous community. We also included in the magazine a regular section called In Your Words that features 100-150 word pieces in which 10-12 different people per magazine state their views on the gas hubs and the changes in town. These pieces, along with the interviews in the longer stories seek to illustrate and represent the range of people and opinions in town as fully as possible.

Recruiting interviewees:

Our recruitment strategy was partly random and partly deliberative. The random element involved walking around town introducing ourselves to people working and shopping and asking if we could pose a few questions. People who agreed were also asked if they were happy to be voice recorded, filmed or photographed. Some declined to be recorded or photographed while others were happy to be. This strategy is in accordance with Lamble’s (2004) description of journalistic research as sometimes opportunistic and sometimes proactive.

The deliberative recruitment was in the form of contacting people in key roles in town, including the head of the local police force, the school principal and the manager of the supermarket. Most of these people agreed to be interviewed and recorded; the exceptions were employees of the major resource companies who will be discussed later in this paper.

Accuracy:

Many industry codes cite accuracy as the most crucial tenet of journalism. While accuracy is a contentious concept when conflated with the frequently debated issue of objectivity, it is also an important aim of journalistic practice. Ward (2004) argues that journalistic objectivity is not a set of absolute standards, but instead involves the same fallible but reasonable objectivity used for decision-making in other professions, and that the pursuit of accuracy is a key defining feature of journalistic practice. In creating the Tracking Onslow publication the pursuit of accuracy arose as an issue in three distinct ways: fact checking, editorial independence and spin.

Fact checking: The students were encouraged to check facts carefully to ensure that names and numbers were correctly reported. While the proofreading by fellow students and the lecturer picked up many inaccuracies prior to publication, a few were missed and corrected later in the online version (such as the name of a local river and the unusual spelling of a councillor’s name). To minimise the number of errors of this sort in the publication, the project collaborator from the Shire of Ashburton was invited to proofread the magazines prior to printing and online distribution.
Editorial independence: The decision to allow a shire staff member to read the magazines prior to publication raised student concerns about editorial independence and influence. In communications about the project, including on the website and in the editor’s letter at the front of each magazine, it was clearly stated that the project is editorially independent and not subject to manipulation by corporate or government sources, even though the Shire of Ashburton is a partner in the project. While the editor (lecturer) and shire collaborator were careful to adhere to this, and proofreading was restricted to correcting errors of fact, the publication’s independence needed to be defended against questions raised about the content of the publications.

Many of the stories published in the magazines that involved interviews with shire staff members were simple good news stories about works being done, or explanations about why projects were taking longer than expected. These articles fulfilled the second of Errington and Miragliotta’s (2007) three media roles by providing of information about local government activities.

The magazines also played the other two roles, functioning as watchdog and facilitator of the public sphere. In the time between the first and second editions (July 2012 and February 2013), the shire underwent a major upheaval. In response to questions from the (elected) Shire President, the CEO recommended that the shire ask the Department of Local Government (DLG) to conduct a ‘probity compliance audit’ to ensure tendering and other procedures were being followed correctly. The elected shire councillors agreed but the audit raised concerns. The councillors then opted to sack the CEO, and the DLG then suspended the council for six months, appointing a commissioner to stand in for them and a temporary CEO and requiring the councillors to undergo governance training. This was clearly a newsworthy series of events. As the councillors are elected by the residents of the area, reporting on their suspension fulfilled the watchdog role and it needed to be done in a manner clearly independent of shire control. The headline used for the article in edition two pulled no punches: “CEO Sacked, Council Suspended: A challenging year for Ashburton Council”. When senior people involved with the council questioned the bluntness of the headline, the project’s shire collaborator reiterated the explanation about the independence of the journalism.

A similar concern was raised by shire councillors in response to a balanced article in edition three that documented the views of a range of stakeholders in town about the slow progress of the financial ‘boom’. The article quoted the head of the local Chamber of Commerce criticising the council. In a letter to the Acting CEO, one of the councillors wrote:

“I note that the Shire of Ashburton contributes financially to this document. I find this type of commentary unhelpful, distasteful and not warranted when both Councillors, yourself, and the Shire administration are working under trying circumstances to rebuild the Shire of Ashburton reputation. I would request that this type of blatant negative commentary be stopped. I’ve spoken with a few Councillors today unhappy with this level of press. This paper is meant to document Onslow’s transition & change, not be a propaganda [sic] to be used by the Onslow Chamber of Commerce to “Shire bash”.”

(Email available from the author).

The response to this letter, written by the project collaborator, stated: “The Tracking Onslow document is actually produced as an independent publication, and the Shire does not have any input into the content … Edith Cowan University has full editing and content
rights” (Email available from the author). These experiences indicate how journalistic independence requires constant vigilance as efforts to be fair and balanced, such as allowing a range of opinions to be included can lead to accusations of bias (or insufficient positivity), even from project partners.

**Spin:** The other source of spin involved was (unsurprisingly) the resource companies. The Chevron and BHP Billiton websites and hardcopy reports were used as sources of information for the magazines. The companies were also both contacted for all editions and asked questions for articles. Both companies have media management personnel and our questions were diverted to those people, and not always answered. BHP Billiton allowed a site visit during the project’s first trip to Onslow hosted by the staff member who co-ordinated the Indigenous heritage site evaluation work. Chevron was asked if we could visit its site and worker’s village (which is now home to 2000 people) during our second and third visits but refused in both cases. Chevron’s Community Liaison Office was interviewed for the second edition, but asked that the piece about him be withdrawn, as he had not been given corporate permission to be interviewed. In accordance with the ECU research ethics requirements that the project is bound by, we had to comply. He was interviewed again for the third edition but stipulated that he wanted the Chevron media office to check the article about him prior to publication. The compromise agreed upon was that the piece could be shown to the Chevron PR contact person prior to publication, and it would still run as long as nothing in it was amended. No changes were made to the article. After the second visit (and publication of the second magazine) and prior to the third, Chevron contacted the project and invited the students to a meeting in Perth. At the meeting the students (and lecturer) were shown a PowerPoint highlighting the company’s achievements, and added to a Chevron media release distribution list. However, a re-iterated request for access to Chevron sites and/or staff members for interviews was denied.

Students found reporting good news stories about works being funded by the resource companies straightforward, but were nervous about reporting negative comments from people in town about the resource companies. In many cases the students were reminded of their ability to evaluate the legal and ethical risks of including or excluding negative comments, in order to maintain balance in their reporting by accurately reporting what people said, without fear of recrimination (such as suits for defamation).

These examples show how students working on the project were exposed to and involved in efforts to enhance the accuracy of the project via vigilance with fact checking, active ongoing defence of editorial independence and caution about the influence of corporate spin. They were also reminded during the production process that this work was necessary in order to produce a product that served the three functions of journalism: the watchdog; the provider of information; and the facilitator of the public sphere. Combining language about models and functions of journalism from textbooks (that the students had read) with hands-on production experiences not only brought the theory to life for the students who travelled, it also served as a source of anecdotes that were used in campus-based classes. The involvement of their peers in these stories enlivened them for the whole class, assisting engagement with pertinent debates.

**Student workers, professional product: A few challenges**

Some of the student work was of very high quality, reflecting a good grasp of complex
issues, such as the council problems and Indigenous land rights and policy. But some students needed help, and some articles needed considerable work in order to be publishable. The types of problems that arose indicated gaps in the students’ professional skill sets.

While the project was not auspiced under a specific course or unit for academic credit towards the students’ degrees, time spent on the project could be counted towards the workplace internship/placement unit (a pass/fail unit based on ‘satisfactory’ performance as a junior journalist, as judged by an editor) in addition, some larger articles were submitted as alternative assessments in units with feature article assignments. A week or two prior to each visit, the crew members assembled and discussed story ideas. Each student was allocated between two and four stories to work on, and asked to do preliminary research and book interviews before leaving for Onslow, so as not to waste time on location. Some students took this advice, while others appeared to have done minimal preparation. The first edition crew were given deadlines that extended a fortnight beyond the visit, and two of the three failed to meet this deadline because they had not kept good written notes, their memories of their interviews had faded, and once they were back and into the routine of the university semester they struggled to find time to transcribe their interviews. While they eventually produced satisfactory work, including good quality edits of video content, the deadline problem needed to be addressed. For subsequent editions the magazine was almost completely produced in Onslow during the visit so that students were on hand to edit and proofread each other’s work, enabling weaknesses in stories to be addressed while the sources were still accessible. Furthermore, students could witness the process of magazine production – including the allocation of space for stories, negotiations about story order, and satisfaction of the requirements for captions, text boxes and illustrations.

Stories that students struggled with included a piece about the relative wealth/earnings of Onslow people and its cost of living. Figures on both of these metrics were available from government sources, but the first student allocated the task struggled to explain how the figures were calculated. A second student was assigned to help and achieved greater clarity. Another student was asked to report on the history of the gas industry in the area and she struggled to piece together information from the many companies involved and from government sources. Several revisions of a diagram she produced were required. Mindful of the need to develop data journalism skills (Gray et al, 2012), this student was also asked to produce a series of publishable pie charts using Microsoft Word or Excel showing the joint ownership of the many North-West gas projects, but repeatedly failed to adjust the fonts to a readable size. Another student was asked to report on the current safety of nearly islands that were the site of British Nuclear Testing in the 1950s, and his research found that wreckage on the island emits 6kBq/kg of radiation, but he failed to convey how dangerous that level of radiation is. The lecturer had to conduct an interview with a biophysicist to correct that omission. Another student was asked to write about the two corporate Community Reference Groups running in town, but only reported on one of them. And another student was asked to report on an agreement to lease almost all of the holiday accommodation on a nearly island to a company for worker accommodation and needed help finding reference to the arrangement in the council minutes. These instances indicate that more instruction in real-world research skills is required in university-based classes. They also indicate the value of problem-based authentic learning for the lecturer, because it reveals missing competencies that can, once discovered, become a focal point for in-class work.
Conclusion

While there is always a degree of serendipity involved in the establishment of unusual collaborations, fertile conditions can be created by journalism academics seeking to learn from or emulate this case study. In this case there were several consciously-created pre-conditions for the establishment of the project.

The first was experience in taking students off campus to work in a community setting that included having to negotiate the social periphery of the professional task. The lecturer’s previous experience included taking students to law courts to practice court reporting, and to the WA Police Academy to practice crime reporting with trainee detectives. These activities flow from an understanding of the benefits of authentic learning practices as described by Herrington and Herrington (2006) and Reeves (2006). Lecturers can reach out to local governments and other organisations seeking collaborations; these may start as simple guest lecture spots that develop into co-training initiatives or more ambitious projects.

Secondly, the author’s experience as a former magazine editor provided the ability to work with the student-produced content to render it publishable. Other educators could play to their strengths and create audio, video or online products.

The third was a willingness to explore cost effective production methods, to work within time and money budgets and with the competencies that we had or were able to acquire. This included acknowledging that we lacked web-building and sophisticated graphic design / photo manipulation skills, but were prepared to work with user-friendly, affordable resources. While the end product is not as polished as high-end commercial media, it still serves a range of functions.

The fourth precondition was an appreciation of the three roles of media, as described by Errington and Miragliotta (2007), and a willingness to create a new media product – within time and budget capacities - if a niche requiring either or all of these roles was identified. We were also mindful that traditional media organisations are no longer the most likely employers of journalism graduates, many of whom will work in new emerging media environments. In the words of journalism educator and commentator Margaret Simons:

“In this fast changing world we need to move beyond old divisions, and try to think clearly about what matters in journalism as it has been practiced, and how to preserve and evolve reporting of integrity. Part of this involves an acceptance that journalism is being done in many places that are not traditional media organisations.” (2013. p1).

The upshot of this approach is the potential to develop in students the ability to initiate and craft media products that provide new evolving niche markets with the social and democratic functions of old-school journalism.

Our good luck was a meeting between two individuals, one from a local government and one from a university, who both saw the value in the project and were willing to work on it. But the precursor to this meeting was an existing internship relationship that had seen students engaged in work placement creating booklets for the shire. Prior to launching the Tracking Onslow project we established a simpler internship program that involved students producing commemorative booklets for other towns in the shire. These kinds of internship relationships are common in universities and this project illustrates their potential to be extended.

Summing up, the project shows that taking a first principles approach to the function of
journalism and seeking opportunities to create new media products from scratch to suit
the needs of niche communities can provide a viable opportunity to engage students in
an authentic learning experiences with spillover benefits to the community and broader
society.
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Appendix

Magazine specs: The full-colour magazines are 36 pages plus covers, 275 by 210cms, staple bound and printed on 115gram paper with 170gram cover paper.

The layout and graphic design work was done by the author using Microsoft Publisher 2007 and 2010.

The website was created using Wordpress and a free theme (Triton Lite). It is hosted by Wordpress and rendered free of some annoying features via a Wordpress Pro subscription. The magazines display on the website as flick-zines. This was achieved by publishing them first on site called ISSUU (again a Pro-subscription freed the product of distracting advertising). We then used a hyperlinked image on the Wordpress site to make the magazines appear to be part of the project’s main site. The same approach was applied using Youtube to host the videos and linking to them from the site in order to minimise the amount of material stored on the site, which could slow down its responsiveness. Photographs displayed on the site were also down-sized to speed up viewing/download times.

The equipment the first crew took to Onslow included an H2Zoom, a Cannon 4D Camera and a Sony NX70 video recorder. The second crew took iPads with iMovie, with apps called Soundnote and Phototoaster, as well as their own cameras, most of which were from the top end of the digital compact camera range. These cameras performed well and the students took spectacular photos, such as of dust and lightning storms. As a result, a
small photo exhibition, displayed in other towns in Ashburton and that the University, formed a spin off project. The third crew took iPads, their own cameras and a Sony NX70 video recorder. Most of the students in the second and third crews had not previously used iPads and they were given no tuition other than being advised to watch tutorials on the Apple website. All mastered basic film editing in iMovie within a few days. They also used the iPads as voice recorders during interviews and to take still photos. Footage taken on the Sony NX70 was edited using Final Cut Pro, as some students had learnt to use that program in a previous teaching unit.
From traditional gatekeeper to professional verifier: how local newspaper journalists are adapting to change

Lily Canter Sheffield Hallam University

The traditional role of the journalist as gatekeeper is being undermined and challenged in the online world where anyone with an internet connection can publish to a global audience. As a consequence the role of the journalist is being constantly redefined as the ‘profession’ no longer holds exclusive rights to the dissemination of news to the masses. This study seeks to explore how local British journalists perceive their role in the era of Web 2.0 and how willing they are to adapt. Through interviews and observation at two local British newspapers it was possible to gain a greater understanding of the modern role of the local journalist and their professional distinctions from the public. These NCTJ qualified journalists increasingly view themselves as verifiers of news who use their training and expertise to amplify news to the wider public. Despite some initial reluctance they are largely enthusiastic about technological and cultural adaptations to their role although some are still resisting this change. There is also evidence to suggest audiences play a role in secondary gatekeeping by influencing the selection and prominence of stories on newspaper websites. Furthermore the findings seek to inform educators of the con-
tinued relevance of the professional accreditation body, the NCTJ, to an industry persistently challenged by citizen journalism.
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With the daily expansion of Web 2.0, a term coined by online innovators O’Reilly and Battelle (2009), newspapers are facing an ever increasing barrage of challenges, as they are continually forced to compete against digital journalism.

Within this online world the gatekeeping authority of journalists is being contested as readers have gained the ability to publish direct to the web and learn from their peers as much as from traditional sources of authority (Rusbridger, 2010). Furthermore, technological and cultural shifts are enabling news organisations and audiences to converge resulting in the blurring of the lines between professional authority and amateur citizen. In the online world where anyone can publish directly to the web, what sets journalists apart from anyone else with an internet connection? As Donsbach (2010) suggests “the very definition of journalism and what it means to be a journalist is no longer as clearly defined as in the past”, (43). This context informs this paper which seeks to examine the modern role of local British journalists and whether their traditionally authoritarian perception as the gatekeepers of community information and news still exists within the age of the internet. Local newspaper journalists in Britain are of particular interest in this field due to the formal nature of their sector compared to their national or international peers. Journalists working in local and regional newspapers are expected to achieve qualifications from the National Council for the Training of Journalists (commonly abbreviated to NCTJ) as a pre-requisite to working in the industry. Although these qualifications are not a legal requirement they are an unofficial one and today almost all job specifications in the local and regional press require job applicants to have achieved their preliminary NCTJ qualifications (Hold the Front Page, 2013). However these requirements are not mirrored in the national press, where many newspaper companies have their own in-house training schemes (The Times, 2014) and do not rely so heavily on the NCTJ for formal training. Local newspaper journalists therefore have a more formalised professional identity re-enforced by their NCTJ qualifications and as such are an appropriate sub culture to explore in the context of gatekeeping roles. They are also particularly relevant to journalism educators as trainee posts in the regional press are often the employment starting point for journalism graduates, from which local and national television and radio take their cues, in the so called “news pyramid” structure (Culture, Media and Sport Committee, 2009, 11).

Gatekeepers redefined

As journalism steps somewhat tentatively into the digital era there are many who argue the journalist-as-gatekeeper role has not diminished but it is simply being redefined. Jour-
nalists are now the verifiers of mass information as other individuals and organisations have also taken on the role of information gatherers and distributors in the online environment. Singer (2001; 1997) and Hermida (2009) describe journalists as sense makers, who filter the glut of information online, whilst Charman (2007) refers to journalists as human algorithms sifting through volumes of data, communicating what they believe to be important to the public. Meanwhile Gillmor (2006) argues that it is the modern journalist’s role to shape larger conversations and provide context alongside the traditional role of newsgathering. Indeed, in his more contemporaneous research, Bruno (2011) sees verification as the only added value of professional journalism in the future. In order to clarify which perspective has the most pertinence to contemporary journalism at a local level this paper seeks to explore whether local journalists believe their professional role is changing, and if so what their modern role is.

It must be acknowledged that some journalists are reluctant to adapt and accept that their role is changing. As previous research suggests, journalists’ attitudes tend to fall into opposing camps; those ready to embrace change and those clinging onto their traditional role (Robinson, 2010; Chung, 2007). Robinson describes these camps as the convergers – those who are younger and hired more recently - and the traditionalists – those who are over 40 and have been at the newspaper for a number of years. Furthermore Singer et al’s 2011 international research reveals that although some journalists stress the democratic benefit of including reader participation and user generated content, others fear doing so undermines the very basis of journalism. The research also found that polarised views existed, with the spectrum of viewpoints divided into the three camps. These were the conventional journalist (traditional gatekeeping role), dialogical journalist (collaboration between users and journalists) and the ambivalent journalist, which was the biggest camp and included those who saw merits in both the conventional and dialogical approach. This paper therefore seeks to explore to what extent local journalists are willing to change and accept that their gatekeeping role has evolved.

Part of the reason local British newspaper journalists remain reluctant to accept changes in their gatekeeping role is due to worries about the accuracy, credibility and quality of user generated content (Singer, 2009). Similar concerns have also been identified by Chung (2007) and Robinson (2010) in their news room studies. As McQuail suggests the professional ideology of journalism contains “unwritten obligations” (2005, 162), something which Deuze (2005) more explicitly outlines as the five traits of public service, objectivity, autonomy, immediacy and ethics. It is therefore important to understand how local journalists respond to citizen journalists and how they distinguish themselves from them.

A final area for consideration is the impact of secondary audience gatekeeping in response to the news (Shoemaker and Vos, 2009) and the growing role of web analytics, also known as the clickstream, central to this (Anderson, 2011; Dickinson, 2011). Shoemaker and Vos make a convincing case for audiences as “secondary gatekeepers” who become active once the mass media process stops (2009, 7). Audiences share stories on traditional news media websites by emailing them to friends or posting them to their open social network profiles and in doing so tell journalists which stories are popular. Furthermore research by Shoemaker et al (2008) indicates that readers use different criteria for gatekeeping decisions than journalists do for news selection. News items about unusual events and public welfare play a much bigger role when readers decide to send news items than when journalists select events for news items. The increase in the use of web metrics or analytics to measure most-read stories, most-commented stories and most-shared
stories is beginning to shape journalistic decision. This is supported by research into the Leicester Mercury newspaper website (Dickinson, 2011) and a study of news rooms in Philadelphia (Anderson, 2011). Both studies conclude that audiences are not impacting on the gatekeeping process via user generated content but are influencing news selection via web metrics. According to Örnebring (2010) this influence can lead to a change in news values to soft over hard news, quirky over substantial, visual over non-visual and an overall preference for sensationalism. This paper therefore seeks to understand to what extent secondary audience gatekeeping is occurring in British local newspapers.

Methods

In depth interviews have been called “one of the most powerful methods” in qualitative research because they allow investigators to “step into the mind of another person, see and experience the world as they do themselves” (McCracken, 1988, p.9). For this study interviews were conducted with editorial staff at two local British newspapers and these results were triangulated with news room observation to ensure validity. The advantage of the qualitative interview as a research methodology is that it is more adaptive and responsive to people’s individualistic perceptions of the world and can explore beliefs in sub-cultures such as print journalists or newspaper readers. Interviews can also explore “areas of broad cultural consensus and people’s more personal, private and special understandings”, (Arksey and Knight, 1999, p.4). Furthermore as participants enter new situations (such as Web 2.0 and its impact on gatekeeping roles) the understandings constructed are less governed by social rules, norms and conventions and more likely to be individualistic (Arksey and Knight, 1999), therefore more qualitative approaches are needed to understand these meanings. It was therefore felt that the sub-culture of local journalists lent itself to a more individualist and subjective approach such as the interview, rather than a broader, less nuanced quantitative approach such as a questionnaire.

Snowball, convenience and strategic sampling is prevalent in journalism studies research (Birks, 2010; Vujonic et al, 2010; Thurman and Lupton, 2008) particularly when interviewing journalists within a news organisation and therefore a combination of these methods were identified as appropriate for this study. This type of purposive sampling allows units to be selected due to their theoretical significance rather than being statistically determined due to their representativeness (Brewer and Hunter, 1989). In this study, prior to the journalist interviews at each of the two newspapers, the researcher spent one week observing the news room and editorial staff. At both sites the researcher observed the news desk, web desk, reporters and attended daily conferences and editorial planning meetings. All areas were observed at varying times of day including early and late shifts, from 7am through to 10pm, Monday to Saturday. Since interviews are about what people say rather than what they do (Arksey and Knight, 1999) observation is a useful and complementary method which can record what people actually do and allow the observer “to see what participants cannot”, (Sapsford and Judd, 1996, 59). The use of observation and interview is a common practice to understand the complexities of particular phenomenon within their real life economic, cultural and social contexts and has been used with success to understand newspaper practices (Robinson, 2010; Boczkowski, 2005; Singer, 1997).

A further advantage of conducting observation for this study was that it enabled the researcher to identify appropriate strategic journalists to interview, who had then recommended other journalists to interview. The aim of this sampling technique was to keep interviewing people until saturation was reached which was indicated when all the diverse
opinions started to be repeated by different interviewees and the interviewer was not hearing anything new (Kvale, 2007). The benefit of this approach is that “sponsorship encourages cooperation” (Sapsford and Jupp, 1996, 81).

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with 19 members of editorial staff at the Northcliffe-owned Leicester Mercury and 18 at the Newsquest-owned Bournemouth Daily Echo. These ranged from trainee reporters to the newspaper editor and included department heads in news, sport, features and web. All, bar two, of the interviews were conducted face to face in a private room within the newspaper offices. Two interviews at the Bournemouth Daily Echo were conducted on the telephone due to the journalist involved working from a different location. Journalists who wanted to remain anonymous were given a code. These are indicated in this paper as L for Leicester Mercury and B for the Bournemouth Daily Echo. Those who were willing to be identified are indicated via their name and job title.

The interviews and observation conducted for this paper were part of a wider three-year research project exploring Web 2.0 and the changing relationship between British local newspaper journalists and their audiences (Canter, 2012a) which also incorporated reader surveys and online content analysis. It is recognised that the journalist interview sample was a relatively small one however the research is situated within a field of existing case studies, and can therefore be compared to other studies in order to build a larger pattern with greater generalizability.

The evolution of journalists

In each of the interviews, participants were asked whether the role of the journalist was changing in the Web 2.0 environment and if so what it was changing to and what their role

Figure 1: Attitudes towards current role of journalists
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incorporated. The responses were coded into two sections, the first looking at the attitudes towards the current status of journalism. As illustrated in Figure 1 the responses fell into
three key attitudes which ranged across a spectrum from a traditional view, to one where journalists felt their role was under threat. The dominant response only was coded for each participant in order to give a clear indication of attitudes, which were then explored in further detail through the use of probing questions. The responses were coded as follows: the role of the journalist is Unchanged, Adapting or Under Threat. Figure 1 displays the results as a percentage of all editorial staff interviewed. Interestingly no participants felt that the role of the journalist was redundant, even when asked this as a direct probing question.

The largest proportion of journalists felt the role of the journalist was adapting, as it has done throughout history.

The results were very similar at both case study sites, with 53 per cent at the Leicester Mercury and 54 per cent at the Bournemouth Daily Echo, expressing that their job and journalism, were changing to the meet the demands and expectations of digital consumers. Even the contemporaneous editor of the Bournemouth Daily Echo, Neal Butterworth, who described himself as “a traditionalist who likes to think he is forward thinking” acknowledged that the relationship with the audience had changed and the profession was evolving, albeit in a haphazard fashion.

“I still think we’re kind of growing. Life-cycle-wise we are wide eyed teenagers a little bit, we’ve not become totally au fait with how to do it, what the best thing to do is. And that’s not just here but within the industry. There is no perfect solution to running a print media and running simultaneously a 24-7 digital media offering as well, so we are learning all the time...I think it’s that whole cliché of how it used to be us and them and now it’s just a massive us. It used to be that we could decide what people read about and when they read about it and there was much more of a we’ll tell you what the story is and we’ll do that because we have chosen to write about this part of it and chosen to include these quotes” (Butterworth, interview, January 2011).

The idea that newspapers could no longer dictate the news agenda and act as authoritarian gatekeepers of information was echoed by some journalists at the Leicester Mercury. One reporter commented:

“As I keep saying you have to be relevant to their lives and the issues important to them, rather than trying to dictate to them what is perceived to be the issue of the day or what is important” (L17, interview, October 2010).

However despite 50 per cent of staff accepting that journalism was adapting, a significant number from various age groups remained obstinate, expressing that their role had not changed and it was simply the tools and technology that was different. A reporter at the Leicester Mercury in their mid-thirties, commented: “Whether it came through carrier pigeon or whether it comes by a message saying check this out, the internet is just a different way of doing that” (L1, interview, October 2010). Furthermore a reporter at the Bournemouth Daily Echo in their fifties retorted: “The basic job hasn’t changed much at all except it’s more intense. The actual business of going out and talking to people and getting a story out of them is the same” (B2, interview, January 2011).

**Threats from non-‘professionals’**

At the Bournemouth Daily Echo journalists identified a number of different threats to their role including citizen journalists, bloggers, sports stars or sports fans. One editorial staff member was particularly anxious about their job and was concerned that they might
be replaced by members of the public willing to provide content for free.

“In the past three years there have been redundancies. Every Christmas has been truly terrifying. You don’t know what they are going to cut and why. They are trying to keep shareholders happy. It is really, really scary” (B18, interview, January 2011).

Meanwhile one sub-editor shared similar concerns about reporters being replaced by citizen journalists.

“Whether we go down the route of not being journalists, I can see it happening and being filled with unpaid people writing stories. We will be run out of jobs. The quality would be much poorer I would imagine. They might be able to write well but a journalist is a journalist” (B4, interview, January 2011).

The sports journalists at Bournemouth Daily Echo raised concerns about former sports stars replacing journalists as match commentators and competition from fans on reporting news stories.

“At the ground the other week when the managerial situation was blowing there was supporters down there with iPhones and BlackBerrys, iPads and everything else and they were all posting on internet forums and their own blogs and all that, so we are down there competing with them on our blog and own website, trying to get it out first... So there was 50 supporters down there with equipment and it’s competing with them as well as the other media - social journalism, doesn’t make it easy for us anymore, everyone’s a journalist now” (B14, interview, January 2011).

The issue was also a concern to department heads, with problematic instances already occurring. The head of content and multimedia (Andy Martin, interview, January 2011) gave an example of a councillor scooping the Bournemouth Daily Echo.

“We had an issue the other day about a local councillor who has her own local blog/local news website in Boscombe. And she gets access to all press releases put out by the council. We made an enquiry about FibreCity which has been digging up the roads and work has stopped for the last four months because they haven’t got any money and there is an issue with the payment of contractors. We rang the council and said we wanted a statement on what you are doing about FibreCity. The council then put out a statement but they put it out to all the councillors as well in the form of a press release and to us. And one of those councillors put it on her website.”

Spectrum of roles

Although Figure 1 shows three distinct attitudes towards the broad role of the 21st century journalist for those who believe the role is changing it is less clear what it is changing to. As Neal Butterworth, editor of the Bournemouth Daily Echo, expresses above, journalists are still “learning all the time” (Butterworth, interview, January 2011) and working out what to do in the digital age.

Figure 2 indicates the responses given by interviewees about the role of the journalist within the content of Web 2.0. The results are displayed as a percentage of all the answers given and every response given by each interviewee was coded, rather than a dominant coding system being used. For Leicester Mercury journalists the biggest role was that of verification (44%) and “sorting the wheat from the chaff” (L16, interview, October 2010) in an environment where anyone can publish online and where there is information overload.
The second largest response (28%) was a mixture of different views which did not fall into one single category, therefore they were categorised as Other. These responses included the role of a journalist as a watchdog, analyser, filterer and quality controller. These could be interpreted as the traditional roles of a journalist being adapted to an online environment. A quarter (22%) of the responses from Leicester Mercury journalists included that the role of the journalist was to amplify information and spread it to a wider audience, having already built up a reputation for reliability over time.

The perception of the amplification role of journalists was much higher at the Bournemouth Daily Echo making up 50 per cent of responses. This might have been due to the multiple social media platforms that the company utilised and its drive to build new audiences on new platforms via the appointment of a digital projects co-ordinator. Verification was also a fairly frequent response (30%) at the Bournemouth Daily Echo along with Other (20%) which at this case study site was made up of the view that the modern role of a journalist was to be a digital storyteller.

Prior to the internet the role of the journalist was to let information through the gates and be a voice of authority. However the results of this paper indicate that in their modern guise local journalists recognise that they no longer hold the keys to the gate. Instead they believe that their role as verifiers of information who can spread quality, analytical content to a wide audience has actually been heightened.

**The age of adaptation**

As outlined above there is some reluctance amongst journalists to adapt to the changes brought about by Web 2.0. However the dominant responses given by journalists in interviews at the two case study websites indicate that the majority are willing to adapt (Bournemouth Daily Echo 80%, Leicester Mercury 67%) and it is the minority who are reluctant to change (Bournemouth Daily Echo 20%, Leicester Mercury 33%). Figures 3 and 4 display the percentage of journalists who fall into each viewpoint at each case study site.
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Age did not appear to be a distinguishing factor which contradicted Robinson’s 2010 research, as journalists in their fifties were eager to use new technology and open up audience participation and journalists in their twenties were reluctant to move beyond traditional norms and practices. Indeed many journalists recognised that although they had been reluctant to change in the beginning they were now changing their attitudes.

One reporter at the Bournemouth *Daily Echo* in their early 30s admitted they had “come round full circle” (B14, interview, January 2010) and now liked interaction and were accepting of audience participation, viewing it as a “worthwhile thing”. Furthermore a re-
porter in their thirties at the *Leicester Mercury* (L16) said they recognised that they were “not solely a print journalist” (L16, interview, October 2010). At both case study sites there was a sense that journalists were embracing and even relishing the changes to their roles. Richard Bettsworth, aged 45, deputy editor of the *Leicester Mercury* at the time of the study said it was important to embrace changes brought about by the internet.

“I think there has been very much a culture historically in newspapers of we are the journalists...What I don’t think is possible is to stick to the traditional newspaper model, it has changed already, (the model of) we are the guardians of all news. I don’t think that is possible, I don’t think that is a good thing. I think you have to embrace the things that develop and you have to provide the needs to allow people to have a say and participate and that is in general a good thing, I think it is a positive thing. I see the newspaper’s role in facilitating it as providing space whether that is on the internet, whether that’s in the newspaper” (Bettsworth, interview, October 2010).

A reporter at the Bournemouth *Daily Echo* in their forties said they had absolutely “revolved since the website came along” (B12, interview, January 2011) and enjoyed greater interaction with readers and instant feedback on stories. But despite the overall optimism there were still some staff members reluctant to change, particularly at the *Leicester Mercury*. At this case study site a third of editorial staff showed a reluctance to change, ranging from those in their twenties up to journalists in their fifties. One young reporter (L11) in their mid twenties was adamant that their job was writing for the newspaper and not creating content for the website, whilst an older member of staff made it clear that they were unhappy with recent changes brought about by online technology.

“A newspaper is not a forum for anyone to write something down, it’s not a website, it’s a matter of record, a good one is well put together, well made, well thought through, legally correct, full of useful information, of course we make mistakes, of course we leave things out we shouldn’t do but it isn’t just a haphazard collection of thoughts from members of the public put into some sort of order... I don’t think journalists are in such a hurry to rush to the public” (L6, interview, October 2010).

**Difficulty in changing mindsets**

The reluctance to change amongst some staff was a source of frustration for other journalists as one rugby correspondent explained:

“I get the piss taken out of me for being on Twitter by a lot of my colleagues. ‘What are you doing wasting time on that thing again? What you tweeting about now?’ And that’s just one department, so there’s a reluctance there because people don’t understand it and it’s not like it was in the old days and things have changed for the worse” (L9, interview, October 2010).

This issue was also evident at the Bournemouth *Daily Echo*, particularly amongst more senior members of staff. The editor said the biggest obstacle to change was “changing people’s mindsets” and making staff realise “just how important the digital offering is to the future of our business” (Butterworth, interview, January 2011). In particular it was an obstacle for the digital projects co-ordinator Sam Shepherd who was trying to promote audience participation and journalist interaction.

So there are some people who are always going to think that the internet is a pain in the neck and there are some people who are always going to think that because someone has contacted them on Facebook and said ‘can you do a story about this’ that they don’t have...
to respond (Shepherd, interview, January 2011).

Even though, overall there was a sense that journalism was adapting and journalists were willing to make this transition, there was still a strong attitude at both sites that journalists needed to maintain a certain level of editorial control. At both newspapers 100 per cent of interviewees agreed that user generated content such as information, stories, photographs and videos should be moderated. It should be noted that comments were seen as a separate entity to user generated content being viewed by journalists as opinion rather than fact and the issues over moderation were complex. Some journalists held the rigid view that “if it is not moderated it’s not a newspaper” (B10, interview, January 2011) and readers should not be “dictating what you put in your paper” (B15, January 2011). Another argued that the journalist always remained the authority on a subject:

We are finding this information out for their benefit on their behalf so we are wiser about issues than they are. So they are right to say to us you should be asking this question and we have the right to say I don’t think that question is relevant. And they might not like that but it comes down to us at the end of the day, and down to the editor’s choice (L1, interview, October 2010).

Despite a reluctance from some journalists to enable the public to set the agenda it was apparent during the observation period that on the case study websites this was happening to a certain extent. The news desk and web teams were aware of what stories were popular due to the number of views they received or the number of comments they attracted. Stories that scored highly in one or both of these areas were likely to be developed into follow up stories. A frequent remark from interviewees was that comments on stories were good feedback for indicating which stories were popular and for measuring public opinion on a subject, which in turn was a strong basis for more stories. One of the values of audience participation to journalists was the possibility of receiving instant feedback and creating follow-up content which had an in-built audience.

At the Bournemouth Daily Echo the digital projects co-ordinator, Sam Shepherd, responded directly to web analytics and would move stories around on the homepage accordingly. She would also constantly check the web statistics and was aware that internet readers were interested in different stories to newspaper readers, preferring hard news stories over human interest news. Popular online stories included those on the topic of cyclists, speed cameras and council spending. Sam Shepherd admitted that she also changed headlines in response to web analytics:

Sometimes the story will go up and it will have a certain headline on it and I’ll notice that later in the day the subs have put a headline on it that doesn’t really work and I change it to something else. And the difference between the number of people who look at it with the original headline and the people who look at it with the changed headline can be massive. So sometimes it’s good for we know this is the angle that people are interested in, this is the angle on the headline they clicked on, whereas they’re not interested in this angle because they didn’t click on that, so it can be a good way of gauging interest (Shepherd, interview, January 2011).

This pratice indicates that the public is influencing gatekeeping online and as Shoemaker and Vos (2009) propose audiences are acting as secondary gatekeepers, telling journalists via web analytics what stories are popular and in turn shaping journalistic decisions.
Distinguishing professional standards

During the semi-structured interview process it became apparent that a high proportion of journalists saw their role as being different from that of the work of citizen journalists. The researcher therefore asked each interviewee what distinguished them from a citizen journalist. Eight factors were identified by the interviewees and each factor was coded individually. Figure 5 shows the popularity of each factor as a percentage.

At both case study sites the most frequent distinguishing factor identified was that of NCTJ training. This made up for a fifth of the responses at the Leicester Mercury (19%) and a third of responses at the Bournemouth Daily Echo (28%). Although journalism is not a profession requiring legal qualifications, journalists working in the local and regional press are expected to have passed the preliminary NCTJ exams. Therefore it is understandable that journalists working at the two case study sites would cite their NCTJ qualifications as a factor which one senior reporter at the Bournemouth Daily Echo explained:

*You have to go through a lot of training to become a journalist, you have to know a lot of law and ethics, it's not just about being able to point a camera at something or write something down (B9, interview, January 2011).*

However should the same question have been asked of journalists working in the national press or within broadcast journalism the number one factor may have been different due to a different set of entry requirements and the lesser importance of NCTJ qualifications particularly to journalists employed more than 20 years ago when journalism training in further and higher education was less prevalent.

Other factors deemed significant to journalists at both case study sites included a robust understanding of media law. Indeed if Media Law as a factor was included within the Training category (as essential media law is one of the core NCTJ exams) this would make a total of 31 per cent of responses at the Leicester Mercury and 44 per cent at the Bournemouth Daily Echo. A further factor was the ability for journalists to report objectively. A comment made by journalists at both case study sites was that citizen journalists may have an axe to grind and therefore could not remain impartial.
The ability to produce quality content was also a prominent factor, particularly at the Bournemouth Daily Echo. One reporter said “there is a perception that citizen journalist pictures are just as good but they are not” (B18, interview, January 2011), whilst a feature writer (B11) commented “everyone has a story to tell but I wouldn’t necessarily say that the lady next door will tell it in the best way” (B11, interview, January 2011). Criticisms were made about the way in which reader content was written and it was countered that it was a journalist’s job to turn such information into a structured news story.

“Most of the time when it comes to the reporting of news events if they (the public) try and do the same (as journalists) they lack ages, they lack addresses. You will be confused about exactly what’s happened, there won’t be the context in it that we would be expected to provide in a news story, which is fair enough, I don’t expect people to write news reports for us” (B10, interview, January 2011).

These opinions were reflected at the Leicester Mercury with journalists criticising citizen journalism as being of inferior quality whether it be text or photographic content. One senior reporter said: “The one thing I am not so keen on is if people think now they have got digital cameras anybody can take a picture, and they so can’t” (L12, interview, October 2010), whilst a department head insisted that the average reader “cannot write a piece for the paper, nor should they try” (L6, interview, October 2010). A comparison made by a number of journalists at the Leicester Mercury was that of the difference between a doctor and a journalist. The journalists argued that you would not want a citizen doctor to operate on you so why would you want a citizen journalist to report the news? The case was also made by some Leicester Mercury journalists that citizen journalists actually undermined democracy as they did not have the skills to hold public bodies to account. One department head lamented:

“We might get to the point where the local newspaper closes down and the only people covering the local council might be a pair of twittery nutters...there will be no journalists and the council can get away with doing what they want without public scrutiny... democracy will be less effective” (L6, interview, October 2010).

The fact that journalists themselves can be held accountable was also seen as a vital part of their role particularly at the Leicester Mercury. One reporter commented:

“If I make a mistake 60,000 people will read about it and we will probably have a letter published about it in the paper and I might get a letter from a lawyer - I’m accountable. But I also think it’s about, that my job is to make sure other people are accountable and citizen journalists follow what stories they want and although they might be accountable to the people who read their blog they are not accountable in the same way” (L11, interview, October 2010).

The journalists at both case study sites held the view that this accountability also enabled them to have access to people and events, closed to the public due to the credibility that came with working for a traditional news organisations. Sports reporters had access to club players, managers and chairmen and general reporters had access to chief executives, spokespeople and public officials. One Leicester Mercury reporter explained:

“The Leicester Mercury does carry a bit of weight with it with regard to trying to follow an issue whether it be through an MP, or a matter with the police or the health authority or the local education authority. And I think also it works, this may only be my perception, I think these organizations I think they are more likely to respond to dialogue with the Leicester Mercury then say somebody who is doing a blog or something like that. As an accredited newspaper and accredited journalists, I think it is incumbent on them to reply but I don’t think it would be as much with a blogger or somebody trying to do their
These distinguishing factors may provide some explanation why 80 per cent of journalists at both case study sites did not feel their role was under threat. There was a sense that professional journalists and citizen journalists played different roles. A Bournemouth Daily Echo reporter said: “I don’t think things like citizen journalism, blogs, whatever you like to call them, I don’t think they are true competition as they are not in the same game at all” (B2, interview, January 2011). Meanwhile the picture editor at the Leicester Mercury described the two types of journalists as catering for different markets:

“There is always going to be more than one market for more than one product and we’re the John Lewis. And I would always expect my photographers to be producing the John Lewis picture and not the Poundland picture. If it’s a Poundland picture it gets rejected and it doesn’t go in” (L2, interview, October 2010).

However there was one lone voice from a single reporter at each of the case study sites. A Leicester Mercury reporter disputed that there was any difference between a professional journalist and a citizen journalist other than one was paid and one was a volunteer:

“In terms of skills if they have picked up shorthand and have a copy of McNae’s (media law book) and they can write alright there is no kind of difference between the two...I think we are very similar” (L10, interview, October 2010).

Meanwhile a Bournemouth Daily Echo reporter (B3) appeared to be unable to decide whether there was a difference between herself and a citizen journalist:

“I don’t know really. Do they get paid? They might be qualified so I guess there is no difference. And is there a difference even if they aren’t qualified? I don’t know” (B3, interview, January 2011).

The results would indicate that the vast majority of journalists at these two newspaper perceive themselves as having a distinct set of practices which distinguish them from others, including those referred to as citizen journalists.

Discussion

As the literature indicates the role of the journalist is changing and this is reflected in data collected via interviews and observation in this study. Web 2.0 is impacting on journalists by forcing them to adapt in order to survive, compete economically, and to reconsider how to best maintain a relevant, reliable service for the public. Singer (2001, 1997) refers to contemporary journalists as information sensemakers and Charman (2007) talks of information curators, whilst Bruno (2011) points towards the role of verification. All of these interpretations acknowledge that journalists are no longer solely the gatekeepers of information but have a role in sifting through an increasing amount of information which is often already in the public domain, reshaping it into accurate, objective accounts and publishing or broadcasting it to a wider audience. This paper indicates that within local British newspapers the two key functions of a modern journalist are to act as verifiers and amplifiers of information. In doing this, journalists are able to fulfil their traditional roles of acting as watchdogs, quality controllers, analysers and storytellers, while using the tools of modern technology. There is less evidence to suggest that the role of the journalist within Web 2.0 is to shape larger conversations as suggested by Gillmor (2006) and this may be due to journalists concentrating instead on striving to maintain some editorial control and act as gatekeepers of accurate, quality information.
The research also suggests that journalists do have differing opinions and tend to fall into three camps which are positive, neutral and negative. As Singer et al (2011), Robinson (2010) and Chung (2007) suggest there are those journalists who are willing to embrace change and those clinging onto their traditional role. Singer et al also suggests a third group which sits somewhere between the two and make up the largest proportion of journalists. However within this study the largest camp is the embracers who accept that their role is adapting (positive camp); followed by the traditionalists (neutral camp). The third party is made up of those who feel their role is under threat and may become redundant in the future (negative camp). Although this makes up less than a fifth of journalists it is a significant finding since it is not in evidence in other empirical research. This may be due to the fact that local journalism in Britain is facing more severe financial problems and job losses than its national and international counterparts on which much other research is based. Another noteworthy finding is that contrary to Robinson’s (2010) research of American newspapers which found age to be a factor, this research found that age and time in the industry did not correlate to attitude. Traditionalists were found amongst all age groups, as were adapters, whether they had worked in the industry for a year or 30 years. The data also suggests that the level of reluctance to change was minimal and at least two thirds of staff were willing to adapt and indeed many were excited by the potential to open up audience participation.

The results indicate that the majority of journalists at the two case study sites portrayed themselves as embracing changes to their role and that they welcomed audience participation. Yet most journalists viewed this participation as something which should happen within the confines of editorial control, with the newspaper verifying and selecting purposeful content. Therefore although journalists in theory were accepting of the changing nature of their gatekeeping role, in practice they tended to hold onto traditional claims of authority. This position was based on the belief that the role of the journalist contained professional traits and procedures which were not adhered to by the public acting as citizen journalists. However rather than these factors implying they were unable to accept changes to their gatekeeping role as suggested by Robinson (2010), Singer (2009) and Chung (2007), it appeared that they heightened their modern, adapted role as verifiers and amplifiers of information within the Web 2.0 environment. The journalists in this research distinguished themselves from citizen journalists by holding claim to a range of skills and standards that in their view identified them as professionals. The eight professional traits were: training, media law, quality, objectivity, trust, accountability, accuracy and access. In particular accountability, accuracy and objectivity mirror the traits of scrutiny (McQuail, 2005), truth seeking (Donsbach, 2010) and objectivity (Deuze, 2005). Furthermore access, quality, media law and training correspond with Örnebring’s (2010) notion of journalism as a profession with a special body of knowledge, skills and expertise. Meanwhile trust could be understood to fall under Örnebring’s (2010) category of autonomy which requires minimal external influence. However the most important factor identified by journalists was training which is unique to the culture of local British newspapers because it relies heavily on NCTJ qualifications as an entry requirement and these qualifications are now incorporated into many undergraduate and postgraduate degree programmes. This supports the view of Örnebring (2010) that journalism requires a specialist body of knowledge gained through education and this is increasingly being provided by higher education institutions.

Although in summary it could be said that the impact on the role of journalists as gatekeepers is one of redefinition rather than revolution, more striking changes are happening
in the presentation of news on newspaper websites. As some scholars make the case (Anderson, 2011; Dickinson, 2011; Örnebring, 2010a; Shoemaker and Vos, 2009) the growth of web analytics is influencing news selection online. There was evidence of secondary gatekeeping, as outlined by Shoemaker and Vos (2009), at both of then newspaper websites particularly the Bournemouth Daily Echo which was more website orientated than the Leicester Mercury. This is likely to increase further in the future particularly in light of the strong economic factors driving online development in newspaper companies. Stories are being selected and placed higher or lower on the agenda according to audience response to those stories, whether it be through passively viewing them, or actively sharing or participating in them. Audience participation could therefore be said to be partially setting the agenda online and disrupting the gatekeepers’ selection process. However this does not necessarily lead to an increase in sensationalised or soft news as Örnebring (2010) suggests, as the findings are more in line with those of Shoemaker et al (2008) who found that audiences tend to select stories of an unusual nature or those focused on public welfare.

Conclusion

This paper has identified that the role of the journalist as gatekeeper is being subtly redefined due to the impact of Web 2.0 but the traditional skills of a journalist still remain relevant and perhaps even more important than ever before. Although journalists are no longer gatekeepers of information or even news selection they remain the largest and loudest gatekeepers of credible and verifiable news. Furthermore journalists at the foundation of the news pyramid identify their professionalism as interchangeable with NCTJ qualifications, emphasising the role these historic examinations still play in role perceptions.

Bibliography


and the journalist audience relationship in the commenting policies of online news sites. Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies, 16(1), 125-43.


Everybody or somebody?
Assessing the impact of social media on newsroom organisational structures

Clare Cook, University of Central Lancashire

With social media’s increasingly important role in fast-paced news, there is a need to identify the occupational and professional implications of social media specifically in terms of jobs and roles in newsrooms. This paper serves as a preliminary enquiry into what social media jobs have been created in newsrooms under which job titles. It explores trends associated with this and the tasks being carried out in those roles to assess the extent to which social media is ring-fenced as a responsibility. From this it is possible to query the wider impact of social media on organisational structure in newsrooms. Two main newsroom models are identified: firstly, newsrooms that place an emphasis on everyone being responsible for social media and secondly, newsrooms where social media is a specified role. The study further serves to guide social media skills for inclusion in journalism training.

Newsroom roles relating to social media have been evolving over the past decade. Their first guise was as community coordinators with The Portland Press Herald being one of the first newspapers to hire one full-time (Pew Centre for Civic Journalism 1998). Since 2011 ‘the concept of community management has become a hot topic’ (The Community Roundtable 2013) and major news organisations such as the Associated Press, the BBC and the Wall Street Journal have made high-profile appointments.
The evolution of social media roles, however, has been the subject of much experimentation. Then head of digital engagement at the Guardian, Meg Pickard, tweeted how social media editors would become obsolete if they were successful (Pickard 2010). Yet the Guardian now has one of the most advanced social media teams of any newsroom with specialists embedded across editorial, community and commercial departments. The New York Times eliminated its social media editor position. Jennifer Preston said at the time: “Social media can’t belong to one person. It needs to be part of everyone’s job” (Tenore 2010). But the NYT went on to shift its organisational structure in 2012 and appointed Liz Heron as its social media editor.

This evolution is in some ways inevitable given the speed and dynamism of social media in newsroom practice. Even roles which once had clear start and end points have changed. Sub-editors, for example, are often now expected to be aware of sub editing for social media. Job listings in media spheres have become increasingly broad: job titles such as information architects, community coordinators, social media strategists have begun to emerge. Equally, strategies around newsroom management of social media are still very much in a transitional phase.

As the creation of social media roles has emerged, so has an active and dynamic community around those roles, including job boards and professional conferences such as the Virtual Community Summit, or the informal Community Manager Appreciation Day (on Twitter under #emad). Lively discussions exist on Twitter under #cmgr, #community and #socialmedia hashtags.

Yet there has been little academic study to date on the occupational and professional implications of social media specifically in terms of jobs and roles within newsrooms. This paper poses three questions. What social media jobs have been created in newsrooms? What tasks are being carried out in those roles and to what extent is social media ring-fenced as a responsibility? What is the wider impact of social media on organisational structure in newsrooms?

Literature Review

Overview principles from the field of human resource management (HRM) serve as a fitting context for understanding the impact of social media on resourcing in newsrooms, notably in terms of organisational structure and labour supply (Foot and Hook 2005; Bratton and Gold 1999). Creating social media roles is a move to maximise the HRM principle of a ‘competitive advantage through people’ (Pfeffer, 1995) that is often overlooked (Dyer 1995).

The media workplace has a tradition of no formally organized personnel departments (Lindley 1958) and a ‘news flow’ historically subject to complex political, press agency and internal service factors (Oestgaard 1965). All bets were off as to how newsrooms would shape and be shaped as journalism encountered the world wide web in the late 1990s (Hall 2001). Defining the specifics of a professional model of online journalism was particularly problematic (Deuze and Dimoudi 2002). From the perspective of more practical organisational structures, the impact of convergence on newsrooms has received much academic attention (for example Dupagne and Harrison 2006; Lawson-Borders
2003; Deuze 2008).

There are competing theories on how and why such change occurs in newsrooms. Bar-doel and Deuze articulate ‘network journalism’ as the convergence between the core competences and functions of journalists, but argue that technology in itself ‘cannot be seen as the determining factor in defining what professional convergence and overall change in journalism’ is (2001). The competing antithetical approach is based in the social shaping of technology (Mackay and Gillespie 1992). These two approaches have been combined into the determination-contingency framework (Lievrouw 2002) and, later through the impact of social media, to the concept of journalism as ‘a shared, distributed action with multiple authors, shifting institution-audience relationships and altered labor dynamics for everyone involved’ (Robinson 2011). Boczkowski (2004) finds that “new” newsroom jobs in online newsrooms are brought on by multiple information flows. The alterations in journalistic practices lead to journalists living ‘out in their everyday practices a tension between tradition and change’ (Mitchelstein and Boczkowski 2009). The adoption of interactive technologies follows a traditional S-shaped diffusion curve – slow at first, building more rapidly and then easing off as saturation point is reached (Rogers 1995: 5). This is of particular note when the social media specialist acts as a change agent (Rogers 1995:6), persuading or advising other people.

In terms of newsroom resourcing, early studies pre-Internet go some way to mapping how responsibilities can be divided out according to different organisational structures (Esser 1998). Garrison identifies a ‘computer elite’ (2000), those with greater experience and training for use of online resources. Garrison (2001) goes on to present a redefinition of roles in the newsroom resulting from adoption of the web and other online technologies ‘breaking from traditional news-researcher, reporter and editor roles’. It is Aldridge who sets the most fitting precursor to the level of autonomy afforded in social media roles. Stating the ‘iconic individualism’ (2001) of journalists she notes how the operational meaning of being ‘professional opened up spaces for radical change in what the job is, what it ought to be and how it is done’ (Aldridge and Evetts 2003). A study of Finnish Broadcasting staff focussing on job descriptions, tasks, responsibilities and skills found journalists are faced with a fusion of job responsibilities and the mixing of competencies (Rintala and Suolanen 2005). Much can be learnt about organisational structures from the analysis of web production workers in general. Damarin (2006) identifies ‘distinct sets of tasks that are not permanently assigned to workers but rather mixed and matched in the composition of jobs and in the contents of careers’ (Damarin, 2006: 431). Where Weiss’ (2009) study moves forward is in how journalists, specifically, ‘are frequently faced with the transference of duties and additional tasks’. Deuze concludes that ‘the routinization of newwork becomes a crucial strategy in managing the accelerated newsflow – a flow further supercharged by the addition of citizens as producers next to consumers of news through online platforms’ (2008). There is a general recognition that social and networked media have prompted the emergence of new roles (Beckett and Mansell 2008). Cross-industry studies have looked at how organizations structure social media teams (Ragan 2013). However there have, to date, been no specific studies on the occupational and professional specifics of social media jobs in newsrooms.

Inevitably, social media has impacted on who does what. Hedman and Djerf-Pierre
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(2012) identify three main categories of journalists in their use of social media: skeptical shunners, pragmatic conformists and enthusiastic activists with evidence of a professional digital divide between categories. The differences in social media use are mainly associated with journalists’ age and type of work but also with professional attitudes towards audience adaptation and brand. Lewis’ framing of journalistic ‘boundary work’ - a natural inclination to patrol and preserve what is familiar, while also dominating activities such as blogging and user-generated content - offers a pertinent perspective when set against the evolution of social media roles which juggle user-generated content or social media production (2012). This results in a professional-participatory tension (Singer et al 2011). The tendency has been to normalize audience material to meet existing recognisable formats (Singer 2005), within the flow of news that is required opportunistically (Bruno 2011) or simply demoting it to the periphery (Singer et al 2011; Karlsson 2011), potentially demonstrating resistance to change. This relationship between journalist and audience is important in contextualising any new role which has as its aim to specialise in social media, bridging between the news worker and ‘active recipients’ (Hermida 2011) ‘the people formerly known as the audience’ (Rosen 2006) also known by the NUJ as ‘witness contributors’ or ‘information providers’ (Stromback 2005) depending on the level of news professionalism accorded.

As social media has been normalized into journalistic processes, focus has turned to its use in sourcing, producing and disseminating stories. Gulyas (2013) explores the uses of social media by journalists and their views about these tools in four European countries, but stops short of attributing that usage to roles or structures. Other studies have focused on social media as a professional journalistic tool (Hjort et al 2011), how social media can create a beat for journalists to manage or be part of (Armstrong and Gao 2010; Broersma and Graham 2012) or the impact of blogging on newsroom practices (Hermida 2009; Sheffer and Schultz 2009; Nielsen 2012). Research is increasingly specifying how Twitter is being used in storytelling whether at the individual journalist level (Artwick 2013; Lasorsa et al 2012; Hermida 2010) or in specific genres such as sports journalism (Price Farrington and Hall 2012). There is also a clear evolution of academic analysis in sourcing practice from early critiques of journalists relying on official sources and ‘ready-made’ news events (Fishman 1980; Shoemaker and Reese 1996) through lack of objectivity and distortion (Davies 2009) to the complexities of modern-day sourcing practices through social media (Diakopoulos 2012). This has also impacted on journalists’ professional norms, ideals and identities in relation to social media (Bogaerts 2011) and on a general perception of journalist roles and visions of the future of the industry (de Macedo Higgins 2009).

In order to remain relevant, journalism trainers must respond to the changes in process and skill set brought on by social media. Lowrey et al (2005) first assessed how journalism schools were experimenting with convergence in curricula and then how ‘journalism as a process’ could be incorporated (Robinson 2013; Bradshaw 2013). Others specify how social media skills can be best used in multi-faceted learning (Hewett 2013) or indeed the extent to which students themselves are the barrier to ‘professional fluency’ in social media (Hirst 2011). Specific social media training courses exist such as Get Satisfaction’s Community Management Certification course, designed to train new and current commu-
nity professionals. This paper surfaces a range of social media tools and techniques that trainers should note in particular for use in the classroom, or at course and module design level.

Definitions

Because social media tasks in newsrooms, and the jobs relating to those tasks, involve evolving processes, the terminology surrounding them is also evolving. Definitions of social media follow the evolution of communication processes (Beer and Burrows 2007), through web 2.0 and the use of a technological platform to create, modify, share, and discuss content rather than passively consume it (Fuchs et al 2010) towards user-generated content, the sum of all the ways in which people make use of social media (Kaplan 2010; Kietzmann et al 2011; Hanna et al 2011) or add a degree of experimentation (Harrison and Barthel (2009:174). It is within the field of sociology where the most nuanced distinctions of social media can be found. Citing Ellison’s (2007) work clarifying social network and social networking sites, Beer (2008) pushes for ‘more differentiated classifications of the new online cultures’ which have yet to settle. Social media can be conceptualized as ‘flickering connectivities’ (Hayles 2005) and ‘cultural circuits of capital’ (Thrift 2005: 93) that build towards an online ‘participatory culture’ (Jenkins 2006) that allows for ‘networked public spheres’ where audiences can share, discuss and contribute to the news (Hermida 2011). Social media is ‘the space outside of the recognised structures… where people interact and create content’ (Cook and Dickinson 2013).

Social media is defined here to reflect the impact of these wider shifts on roles and jobs within newsrooms. It is understood to be social platforms and interactions as part of the journalistic functions of news gathering, publishing and discussion that happen predominantly away from a home website or publication. This could include activity on social sharing platforms (such as Facebook, Flickr, Pinterest, Google), social communication tools (such as Storify, Twitter, Reddit, Tumblr, Topsy, Hootsuite, Facebook Opengraph) and social multimedia sites (such as Instagram, Youtube or Vimeo).

Social media jobs are defined as specific roles in newsrooms where the primary responsibility of the role is to engage with that social media. Engaging with users is a primary focus and a high level of social media competence would be expected. This also recognises the engagement in social media on behalf of a larger brand, or professional purpose, rather than personal use (Hedman and Dierf-Pierre, 2012). The most commonly cited job titles were: community coordinator, communities editor, community architect, social media manager, social media editor, and social media coordinator. These are classed as first generation social media jobs.

There is much subjectivity and diversity in roles, with some differentiating them from social media management (Pedde 2012). However there was not space within the confines of this preliminary study to explore these distinctions. Rather, the definition was more concerned with the distinction from other roles such as online editors and reporters.

Where the study does begin to draw a line is between first generation and management-level social media jobs. Evidence emerged of newsroom management roles which have specific social media responsibilities. These included roles such as head of audience and
engagement. These roles often included line management of community teams, as well as an emphasis on social media strategic perspectives and are referred to as second-generation social media jobs. There is a growing range of social media roles that exist in non-newsroom settings, the mapping of which would be of further value to journalism trainers.

**Method**

Methods in this study comprised analysis of job adverts and industry job news, case studies of seven newsrooms and a survey to triangulate the findings. Firstly, 6,088 job adverts were gathered from 16th September 2011 to 28th June 2013 from the weekly Gorkana Journalism Jobs email service. Gorkana were chosen as specialists in media recruitment. Guardian Media Job alerts and alerts from Hold The Front Page were also gathered, but were later dismissed in order to reduce the overlap of job adverts in the sample. The job adverts were systematically approached; firstly, the sample was divided into jobs and internships, with a total number of job ads counted for each. These were then divided into sub categories: social media jobs/internship and indirect social media jobs/internships. A job listing was categorised as social media, for example, where the job clearly stated in the title that the main responsibility was social media. Jobs for maternity cover were included while media training and freelance listings were not. It also allowed an assessment of change over time. Dividing subcategories relating to internships also evidenced the extent to which social media was a ‘starter’ job opportunity. The purpose of this method was to ascertain what social media jobs have been created in newsrooms and the job titles.

A qualitative analysis of media industry personnel news via monthly Gorkana Consumer Alerts was also carried out. A total of 173 alerts from October 2011 to June 2013 were included. These email ‘newsletters’ allowed for a more narrative insight of roles being created within the newsroom around social media, or those posts which were more transient in nature. A similar method was used to identify a set of curation competencies for professionals within the field of digital information services (Kim et al 2013).

Then, staff working in newsrooms in a social media role were invited to complete a survey. This was created as a Google spreadsheet and shared across social networks. This method was used to ascertain job titles, to what extent social media was a starter position, where the role fitted in the organisational structure and the skills involved. It also required a breakdown of the social media tasks completed in the role under six categories: monitoring, advising, evangelising, content creation, audience engagement, and dissemination to further guide journalism curricula. The survey was written to allow responses to be as free as possible and 14 respondents took part.

Finally a case study approach was used to research organisational structures and overall strategy behind social media resourcing. The case studies were made up of varied content including 40 semi-structured interviews with members of management and editorial teams, newsroom observations and organisational charts. This allowed for a relatively free exploration of the strategic reasoning which informed the social media resourcing plan as it is evolving, with specific focus on ring-fencing social media as a position. Seven newsroom case studies were included: Channel 4, BBC North West Tonight, Sky News, The Guardian, Trinity Mirror, North West Evening Mail from the CN Group, BBC
Africa. The sample was chosen to offer a variety of newsroom settings in both size and main platform. The case studies allowed for the categorisation of ‘everybody’ or ‘somebody’ models as adopted by Garrison (2001) in his breakdown of staff conducting online research in newsrooms.

**Analysis**

**Evolving occupational characteristics**

It is apparent that there is little consistency in the organisational and professional implications of social media, which are still evolving. The job alert analysis identified 92 social media roles and a further 418 were classed as indirect social media responsibilities from a total of 6,088 job listings. This data allowed for a preliminary categorisation of social media job titles in newsrooms. These included job titles such as social media, community coordination, social media strategy, community architects, digital debate editors, social media writers, community content curators and community evangelists. The market for external supply (Foot & Hook 2005: 53) of people into social media roles from outside newsrooms is therefore relatively niche. Specialist social media jobs represent a relatively new field with nine out of 14 respondents moving to their social media job since 2011. News of appointments on Gorkana Consumer Alerts between September 2011 and June 2013 confirms this. Social media jobs were notable for their absence with the majority of listings referring to traditional newsroom roles. Within 173 alerts read, only 17 specific social media roles were classified. In the sample period of job listings, 1.5% of the total job listings were classed as social media roles, and 6.8% for indirect social media jobs.

There is more evidence to support the case that social media jobs evolve from within the newsroom (Foot & Hook 2005: 50). In the structured online survey all but two respondents said they had been recruited into their social media post internally. One multimedia producer said: ‘The role came from my own initiative. Social media became an add-on. The role evolves organically. The job changes all the time and I can direct the evolution rather than waiting to be assigned new tasks.’ Another social media producer said: ‘Social media has been a gradual shift in the last three to four years to become something that is the theme of the newsroom.’ This is also supported by trends noted on specialist community coordinator job boards: ‘I don’t see roles like that advertised.’ (John 2013) and in other industry sectors ‘overwhelmingly staffed in house.’ (The Community Roundtable 2013:11).

The data was somewhat contradictory as to whether social media could be described as a starter job. From the structured survey 13 out of 14 said their role was not their first newsroom job. However from analysis of the 981 intern job listings between September 2011 and June 2013 it is possible to suggest internships are more likely to include social media activities. In comparison to the full-time roles, the percentage of internships classed as social media was more than double the job listings (3.7% of internships were classed as social media compared to 1.5% of job alerts). The internships classed as maybe social media were also higher (9.7% compared to 6.8% in the job listings).
Organisational structure: everybody

The study found that the existence and creation of social media jobs in newsrooms related to two broader categories of newsroom organisational structure. This was evidenced in particular from the seven mainstream newsroom case studies. The first model placed an emphasis on all newsroom staff sharing responsibilities for social media. In this model there was often a social media champion or a member of the newsroom staff praised as being an example of best practice but the tasks were largely divided up across teams. *Sky News London, BBC North West Tonight, Channel 4 News* and regional title *North West Evening Mail* from publisher CN Group could best be described by this model. There were three main reasons cited for this strategic approach: a lack of staff resources to have a ring-fenced social media role; shift patterns which would make it difficult for a separate social media person to offer consistency in the tasks needing to be delivered; general championing of the team approach.

At *Sky News London* social media tasks are divided up across a complex organisational structure, which incorporates many teams such as newsdesk, online and iPad. ‘We simply don’t have the resource to have a dedicated social media team so this is the best way of managing things’ (Richardson 2013). Similarities could be drawn with the workflow at *BBC North West Tonight* newsroom. The management team is made up of four editors, deputies and assistant editors. The assistant editors take on different responsibilities, such as social media.

‘I would take responsibility for social media rather than it be a job, and it certainly was not specified in the job description. Everyone who is deemed responsible has the log-in details for the social media accounts so it is done by everyone.’ (Steggles 2013)

Presenters update the programme’s branded Twitter and Facebook feeds, @BBCnwt and *BBC North West Tonight* page respectively, while on-screen correspondents run social media under their own branded accounts, at their discretion. Planning desk focus on retweets, call outs for stories, researching leads using tools such as Twitter lists and Tweetdeck and experimenting with different hashtags. A series of social media guides and training sessions help divide social media tasks to specific roles ‘otherwise it would never get done’:

‘Presenters can offer a personal touch and people really like that - there is one who is very good and I can use them as an example of best practice. There have been no new jobs created because of social media; it’s extra that people have had to take on.’ (Dummigan 2012)

At *Channel 4 News*, Twitter is used to inject the news programme’s ‘fun and personality’, according to senior programme editor online, Paul Brannan. While there has not been a huge sea change in job descriptions, he advocates everyone in the 120-strong team being involved:

“Anna Doble was our social media editor and her role was to infect everyone with social media. But that role is anachronistic. The trouble is that everyone else thinks ‘it’s not my job’ -it’s the social media editor’s job. But social media should be part of the DNA of every journalist, part of their operating kit, and not something hived off to a specialist. Part of the process of writing a story now is tweeting, Facebooking and G+ing. If there is a social media editor they abdicate responsibility for it. You can no longer say you are this or you’re that: you have to do everything.” (Brannan 2012)

A banner suspended from the ceiling at the *North West Evening Mail* reminds all report-
ers to use Facebook and Twitter. All the newsroom staff are expected to source and disseminate content on social platforms, with newsdesk putting out callouts for story ideas before conference. “All the reporters post questions and engage with social media: it’s an important way of interacting, often with swift results. This is a small team with shift pattern; it would be impossible to have only one person responsible for social media.” (Lee 2012)

Here, roles begin to resemble the post-bureaucratic model of work (Heckscher 1994) in which workers more independently self-manage their tasks (Carlson and Zmud 1999; Giuliano 1991). Separate and explicit job descriptions are being in some ways overshadowed by fluid, ambiguous and deliberately ill-defined tasks and roles (Dess et al., 1995) in this newsroom model.

Organisational structure: somebody

In the second broad category of newsroom organisational structure, there was evidence to suggest specified social media jobs exist. This model was evidenced at The Guardian newsroom, Trinity Mirror regional titles and BBC Africa Service. The Guardian has had a community team for three years, headed up by a Digital Development Editor (Social & Communities Editor). Laura Oliver, community manager, is in charge of the day-to-day strategic running of ten community coordinators who are each embedded in different desks.

“The logic is that we want our editorial staff to be involved with social media and engaged with readers, part of their day to day. If we put it entirely on to one team or pool we risk it being syphoned off or too easily siloed. However it does still need to be a group of specialist staff who can test out new platforms and push ahead. We are the guinea pigs to keep updating and advising others on what works best. There is still a challenge to make sure everyone is on board but having community staff in each desk allows us to use different social media techniques for different needs.” (Oliver 2013)

Regional newsgroup Trinity Mirror has steered a comprehensive strategic shift to Newsroom 3.0 since 2012 with digital priorities on social media and live blogging. Newsrooms have been restructured to make way for Community Content Curators, non-journalists who manage social media accounts and prepare or process content from social media and community contributors. They work under the Communities Editor, who works with the digital desk.

“It’s about putting digital and social right across the newsroom. On the outer levels all journalists are expected to use social media, on the inner circle is web editors and then at the centre of that is a social media champion who are immersed in social media, living and breathing it more than anyone else. Social media evangelist - enthusiast isn’t enough”’ (Higgerson 2013).

In this model, social media has emerged as a specialist role. ‘It has to be ring-fenced so that someone is away from the article with the attention to concentrate just on social. It really helps with the live blog, and suggesting social media strategy’ (Harper 2013).

In 2011, BBC Africa created a full-time Social Media Producer to make changes to boost social media usage across the team. The role had four main aims: to find stories and eyewitnesses, to find unique contributors, to generate traffic to radio programmes and to
engages with audiences.

“The challenge was embedding a cutting-edge social media operator in the radio news team to get everyone to ringfence time in their day to engage with social media. Young, aspirational Africans are much more savvy on social media but as a manager it is difficult to quantify success: should we have a target number of Twitter followers? But we are in the land of disruption, the Wild West because of social media.” (Mayoux 2011)

However within this model there is a risk of other staff resisting social media. The challenges of a specified role include convincing other team members to engage. ‘Social media journalism is a different kind of journalism and you need to invest a lot of time to achieve it. The newsroom have been confused about the impact of this role on workflow.’ (Quansah 2011) This was echoed by respondents to the survey, all of who said they expected their colleagues to engage with social media. Some expressed a wish that other newsroom staff came on board more.

Social media tasks

Findings from the survey and case studies were collated to ascertain the tasks being carried out by staff in social media roles, so as to better inform how curricula – or teaching and learning practice – can be adapted in recognition of these tasks. These were categorised under: monitoring, advising, evangelising, content creation, audience engagement, and dissemination. These categories were selected based on ‘how-to’ articles by experienced social media professionals (for example Knight and Cook 2013; Murphy 2013). This information is of particular value for those hoping to work in these roles, or trainers preparing others for these roles.

**Monitoring:** Tasks included managing branded Twitter, Facebook and Google+ accounts, Facebook pages and community pages, searching for people and content, tracking comments on content management systems, tracking analytics (on bitly and other software), and using Spundje and Tweetdeck (or other social media dashboards). Monitoring also included community management and sharing content with key influencers. Some monitoring was said to happen out of hours ‘if the topic demands’. One respondent cited the need to monitor other social media staff.

**Advising** tasks included training other staff on social media and demonstrating tools, helping to implement best practice, and deciding how best social media could be shared across newsrooms. Several respondents cited an involvement in writing strategy. Story ideas from social media were also passed to the news team.

**Evangelising** included sharing ideas across the newsroom, encouraging journalists to build individual brands, promoting how social media can enhance and promote the print product, championing the uses and possibilities of social media, and suggesting stories for writers and crafting tweets. One said: ‘I spend half my day doing this - mentioning others and getting their names out there.’ Another said: ‘[Evangelising] is done by championing, praising, encouraging and sending out examples of great work recognised by [its performance] on shares.’

**Content creation** tasks included managing website content, using widgets and programme widgets, Facebook posts, writing breaking news events, feeding tweets through...
to news teams, and internal newsletters about social media analytics. One respondent, a social media coordinator, said: ‘I stare at Tweetdeck all day, gathering relevant tweets.’ Other tools cited were Hootsuite, Topsy, Geofeedia and Trendsmap.

**Audience engagement** included sharing planning applications on Slideshare, organising guest posts on blogs, expanding debates and discussions, and asking for comments on stories. Specific tasks included Tweet of the Day, Flickr spreads, nostalgia pages, Pub of the Week, Ask the Audience web chats, setting up Jotforms, promoting surveys and polls, asking readers for case studies, and tailoring news to people’s interests according to social buzz.

**Dissemination** responsibilities focussed around linking and verification tasks, often posting to social networks with links back to website content. Specific tools included Google calendar, Coveritlive, Youtube, Google.maps, RSS and teaser content, writing posts on social networks. Competences included knowing how much content to send out to avoid being ‘unliked’ and knowing strategies on how to post to drive traffic back to websites, retweeting across accounts, creating lists, scheduling tweets and retweeting. Three respondents said they did not have dissemination tasks in their role.

Much of the task-based data support Damarin’s (2006) findings that tasks involved in online work are multifaceted and ever-changing, presenting a particular challenge to journalism trainers.

**Second-generation social media roles**

In the relatively short period since 2011, the data suggests social media roles have already experienced a cycle of evolution. This has occurred in two prominent directions. Firstly, management-level social media, which includes roles such as ‘head of’ and include strategy (for example, writing social media policy documents, or identifying strategic objectives or partnerships). Secondly, social media roles that have moved beyond evangelising or day-to-day running (especially personal updates to Facebook or Twitter for example) into research and testing.

The management-level social media role often includes line management. Communities editor for Trinity Mirror regionals Jo Kelly says: ‘The second generation social media role is very much about experimenting and listening. My job has become more about the process of social media across offices and community teams’ (Kelly 2013). The role can also emerge as a level of expertise. Hannah Waldram is one of 10 community coordinators at The Guardian who are embedded into different desks (such as news, sport, music, global development) to reduce the demarcation of social media as a role.

“Our role has evolved into more of a specialism. As more reporters get on board we can offer more specialist and advisory social media services. We can look ahead to bigger projects, do more on social search and analytics, following social trends - and because we are not in the day-to-day story pressure we can experiment with social media, try things and then feedback.” (Waldram 2013)

In this way there was evidence to suggest a diffusion of innovation (Rogers 1995: 5) in that expertise – in this case around social media - had been communicated through the team over time, which frees up social media staff to become more specialist. ‘There
is no need to be evangelising about social media any more, that is what we had to do before individual reporters were on board. Now I can focus more on partnerships and more technical developments’ (Richardson 2013). The evolution of second-generation social media roles is broadly consistent with findings in other sectors (Caggiano & Hurst 2013) and concurs with broader commentary on the need for alternate processes to deal with social media (Millington 2013).

Conclusions

Echoing the changing habits that were indicative of the evolution in information gathering in the newsroom in the 1990s, there is a similar tentative redefinition of newsroom roles taking place as the newer social media expertise are adopted. The study finds that the organisational structure implications of social media are still evolving with varied approaches. As Rogers (1995: 738) indicated, this is a process and not a case of immediate transition. Two main newsroom models are identified. Firstly, newsrooms which place an emphasis on everyone being responsible for social media (but may have a social media champion), prompted by resourcing issues, shift patterns and a general championing of the team approach.

The second newsroom model is categorised as the ‘somebody’ approach in that social media is more ring-fenced or driven forward by social-media specific roles, both functionally and strategically. All newsroom staff are still expected to engage with social media, particularly day-to-day and one-to-one exchanges on personal accounts. However, specified roles exist to drive social media forward as a strategic editorial or experimentation priority.

Job titles relating to these social media roles include social media editors, community coordinators, social media strategists, community architects, digital debate editors, social media writers, community content curators and community evangelists. The study provides evidence to suggest how defined roles emerge from within the newsroom and can be led autonomously by individual competences. It is of particular note for journalism trainers that internships were particularly likely to include social media skills. In some cases, second-generation social media roles have emerged. These take two main forms: management-level social media roles, or roles where social media is acknowledged as a specific expertise.

As social media continues to evolve it is likely social media occupational and professional characteristics will also evolve. The study prompts extensive areas for further study in order to better understand the occupational impact of social media on newsroom organisational structures.
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Reviews section

By Reviews editor Tor Clark

Welcome to a Reviews Section full of journalistic virtues.

The first virtue is exclusivity, and as you might expect from a journal involving so many journalists, we have something for you no other journal can offer – a review by broadcaster, academic and author Gary Hudson of John Mair’s latest edited collection, *Is the BBC in Crisis?* edited with Richard Tait and Richard Keeble, a book sure to engage journalists, academics, students and the general reader in equal measure as the Beeb stares into an uncertain future.

Not content with editing several interesting and useful texts on journalism this year, the prolific Mr Mair is also becoming one of this journal’s stalwart reviewers, and he explores the virtuous world of journalism ethics with a look at the fascinating area of journalistic moral dilemmas, in a review of *When Journalists Cross The Line* by Stewart Purvis and Jeff Hulbert, which will surely become required reading in the widening field of the study of journalism ethics.

Glyn Mon Hughes continues this journal’s recent focus on newer ways of conveying the news with a review of *Online Journalism: The essential guide*, by Steve Hill and Paul Lashmar.

And finally, where would journalism be without the humble sub-editor, whose chief virtue was of course, pedantry. What the rest of the world sees as an annoying fixation with exactitude, those of us who have wielded the blue pencil in anger, know to be a simple mark of quality – and of course the last refuge of the defenders of the apostrophe. So for our Classic From the Journalism Bookshelf we turn back the clock for an appreciation of *The Simple Subs Book* by Leslie Sellers, contributed by Kevin Duffy of UCLAN.

All in all a virtuous selection, we hope you will agree? We also hope you continue to enjoy this reviews section and we invite readers to suggest texts or offer reviews for the next edition in November. Please contact the reviews editor Tor Clark at tclark@dmu.ac.uk
The Simple Sub’s Book by Leslie Sellers

Review by Kevin Duffy of the University of Central Lancashire

Was the legendary Daily Mail sub-editor Leslie Sellers able to foretell the future? Did the author of The Simple Subs Book have ‘the gift’?

For anyone familiar with Sellers’ classic 1968 title – reprinted in 1985 – these are perfectly reasonable questions. They are prompted by his entertaining use of real and imagined examples to demonstrate the practice of good sub-editing. Skills – as if it needed stating - which are just as relevant to journalism undergraduates today, as they were when the book was first published.

It is a sequence of events in a sleepy part of East Anglia that left me wondering whether Sellers had the ‘Third Eye’. Or maybe the old journalistic saying ‘You couldn’t make it up’ is a plain truth, rather than an aphorism. Judge for yourself.

First, we go live – as it were - to a very real situation unfolding in Norwich where, according to the Daily Telegraph, 72-year-old Ivan Langley has just locked a Hotpoint delivery driver in his home. (http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/newsbysector/retailandconsumer/8156533/OAP-72-holds-female-Hotpoint-delivery-driver-hostage-in-bizarre-row-over-faulty-cookers.html) Mr Langley is angry because his new cooker has been delivered with a dent in it. Irritating enough, but the pensioner is on the warpath because this machine is a second replacement, after the original delivery AND a first replacement were both faulty.

So far, so straightforward, as it were. Now turn to page 55 of The Simple Subs Book where – decades earlier, please note - Leslie Sellers has conjured up an astonishingly similar tale, to show how bullet-point sentences are a good way of making a complex story easier to digest. Mr Sellers’ fictional report says: ‘At 10.15 Mrs Belcher phoned the Gas Board and said she’s locked their fitter in the wash house and wouldn’t let him out until they fixed her cooker’.

Cue that wobbly vertical line trick which TV uses to mark a change of scene and time and rejoin retired but not retiring Ivan Langley in the real world of Norwich, where things are starting to get unreal. According to the Daily Telegraph report: ‘As police attempted to diffuse [sic] the stand-off, the retired lorry driver, who is disabled, declared: ‘I don’t make a habit of this but I’ve had enough’.

Hmm…stand up, take aim, and dive Harry Potter-like, back into the fictional yarn in The Simple Subs Book: ‘At 10.20 the showroom manager phoned Mrs Belcher and said the police would be called unless the fitter was released. Mrs Belcher said No.’

Click fingers… and it’s back once again to Norwich and the Daily Telegraph story which says the ‘kidnapped’ fitter was a 34 year-old woman called Anna Hawes, adding: ‘Miss Hawes, whose bosses alerted police, appeared to take the incident in her stride’.

Close eyes, clap hands, and back into the Sellers book: ‘At 10.25 the district manager phoned to tell Mrs Belcher that she would be charged for all the time the fitter was detained.’ Clap hands twice and return to a sort of reality in Norwich; the Daily Telegraph reports angry pensioner Mr Langley has moved from Hotpoint to boiling point, but says his ‘hostage’ is safe and well: ‘She has been treated with respect and we haven’t beaten her up or anything. We’ve even offered her a bed for the night.’
The good news is the Hotpoint fitter/delivery driver in Norwich was eventually freed unharmed after police arrived at the home of retired Mr Langley.

Tantalisingly, the fate of the unfortunate gas fitter in *The Simple Subs Book* is a mystery. As the fictional drama reaches its peak, Sellers decides that his point is made and concludes the tale mid-sentence with three dots...

Sellers’ book endures because he talks in depth about best practice when it comes to simplicity of prose, accuracy, intros, headlines, captions, purging jargon, and much more. These are journalistic first principles which will never grow old. What he has to say about sub-editing is evergreen too, especially in an age when journalists increasingly function as their own sub-editor.

On some pages the book is very obviously a product of its time, and a modern reprint would excise now-irrelevant comments about such anachronisms as zinc photo blocks and composing rooms, as well as a couple of dodgy cultural and gender references. But overall, even with its references to Linotype machines and hot metal, this is a book still worthy of a place in any journalism degree reading list because it deals with the fundamentals of journalism, which are (although memory fails me, as to who said it): writing tight, bright and right.


---

**When Reporters Cross the Line: The heroes, the villains, the hackers and the spies by Stewart Purvis and Jeff Hulbert.**

Review by John Mair, editor or joint editor of 12 recent books on aspects of journalism, including *Is the BBC in Crisis*, reviewed elsewhere in this section.

This book should be on every journalism course’s reading list. It is a rarity - a quasi academic book which is well written and difficult to put down, readable and packed full of stories.

Stewart Purvis is one of the great TV journalistic ‘suits’ of this generation. He saved Channel Four News and headed up ITN before his present position as part of the great and good on Ofcom, Channel Four and other boards, as well as being the first Professor of Television Journalism at City University. He is in a good position to dig out and extract the lessons from the misbehaviour of fellow hacks, to some of whom he was the boss.

Ethics should be at the core of what we teach. Purvis and Hulbert’s book is a valuable addition to this. It simply addresses the question of what happens and why some journalists cross those red lines of ethical and/or professional respectability. It does that through a series of short, sharp case studies in bite-sized chapters. It tells people (some of them bad people) stories.

They include the well-known like Reg Foster and Brendan Mulholland, who went to gaol rather than reveal their sources to Lord Denning, though Purvis and Hulbert leave
the reader in some doubt about whether those protected sources were real or imaginary. Andrew Gilligan and his infamous 6.07 BBC Today Programme broadcast on spin and the Iraq War, which led to the Hutton Report and yet another BBC Crisis also features, alongside Martin Bell in his White Suit with his conscience hanging out for all to see and Guy Burgess with his covert then Soviet sympathies.

There are also some surprises and some new tales – like the visceral hatred by the TV regulator the IBA of Granada Television founder Sidney Bernstein, who they regarded as a proto-Communist. Also in the spotlight are big beasts of the jungle of TV journalism like the late Sir Charles Wheeler, who never hid his views from his BBC Journalism output however trivial the story, Freddie Forsyth, who all but defected to the Biafran side in the Nigerian Civil War, and the ever present John Simpson, who emerged on the wrong side in a trial of truth of ITN’s reporting in Bosnia. He has since recanted.

The less well known, or forgotten, find themselves between these pages too, like John Peet, who defected from Reuters to the DDR and Norman Ewer the British journalist turned British spy.

All fourteen stories Purvis and Hubert tell are fascinating, all illustrate the moral and editorial dilemmas of modern journalism from what version of ‘the truth’ do you accept to whose side are you on? in war and peace, to exposing vile behaviour, to bigger questions of conscience or of politics. personal, national and global. Journalists, especially those in war or stationed abroad, find themselves at the crossroads on many interests competing to get their ‘truth’ to the public.

This book is superb. There are a few lacunae - the sequential footnoting is hard to follow - but overall it is a cracking read. Purvis (and Hulbert) deserve our congratulations for this and for the excellent BBC Radio Four Archive on Four programme which gave birth to it. Cross the line to the bookshop or the university library to find it.


---


Review by Glyn Môn Hughes, Liverpool John Moores University

It’s probably fair to say most people teaching journalism over the last 15 years or so will have talked in detail about print and broadcast and perhaps added, often as an afterthought, that consideration should be given to online, too.

For those of us old enough to have worked through the revolution in the print industry in the early-to-mid 1980s, when wizened old hacks who could not bear to be parted from their typewriters claimed, through the fag-ash fog of old-style newsrooms, that ‘it would never catch on’, the online onslaught has considerable, if not chilling, parallels.

Working in London in those days, it was hard to know whether the office would still be
there the next day as you put away pens, em rules and carbon paper.

And, while Steve Hill and Paul Lashmar’s book on Online Journalism studiously avoids harking back to the alleged ‘golden’ days of journalism – historical context is hard to come by in this volume: indeed, it’s rather indifferent, even cold-shouldered towards the print industry – it is a worthy handbook for the aspiring online journalist.

As an academic volume, the only real discussion of how the internet became a platform for journalism is in the short, final chapter of the book which surveys how the web has revolutionised what journalists do. Even so, academic references are few, maybe because discussion in this area is relatively new. That said, there are plenty of journal articles which have discussed the impact of the internet. For probably very obvious reasons, discussion of the future is brief, since this whole sector seems volatile. What happened to My Space? Or Bebo? And when did Facebook become the chat room of the middle-aged? And what will be the scenario when anyone starting an undergraduate course this year leaves university?

At first glance, the chapters on law and regulation as well as ethics and good practice appear to be little more than summaries of what is available elsewhere but closer reading does reveal that they are finely tuned for those budding online journalists.

Particularly useful are the sections on writing for the web, with the authors drawing close attention to how this branch of journalism really is distinct from other areas. The same goes for the chapters on social media, freelancing and blogging and participatory journalism. The hints and tips on photography, video and audio content and general page layout again contain a good deal of detail which is available elsewhere but it’s all finely tuned towards online content.

The interviews with experts in their own respective fields are engagingly written and give valuable insights into the world as it is right now. One cannot help but feel, however, that in such a fast-changing environment, this could soon become dated.

The book is packed with facts and the QR codes which link a smartphone or other mobile device directly to a relevant website are not only useful but also feel totally relevant to the subject matter of the book itself.

The authors do court controversy at times, however, which in the old days might have prompted a Letter to the Editor. ‘The message,’ they say, ‘is words matter. There’s always a demand for well-crafted journalism.’ That, for this reviewer at least, lit the blue touch paper of a rather explosive disagreement. That apart, though, it is a useful addition to the literature of journalism theory and practice.


Is the BBC in crisis? by John Mair, Richard Tait and Richard Lance Keeble (Editors)

Review by Gary Hudson, University of Staffordshire

The editors of this substantial volume have assembled a stellar cast of
It would be an A-list of guests for any studio discussion of the corporation’s future.

Like a roster of classic movie stars, only surnames are needed for some of the TV execs - Grade, Bazalgette, Elstein, Liddiment. There are chapters from Raymond Snoddy and Torin Douglas, the doyens of media commentators. Respected insiders like Vin Ray and Atholl Duncan offer the BBC staffers’ perspective, and from hackademia and elsewhere, the LSE’s Sir Howard Davies sits comfortably alongside Professor David Lloyd, formerly of Channel Four. The former Guardian editor Peter Preston analyses the threat to and from the fading world of newspapers – a more than peripheral factor in the broader arguments about the licence fee.

A star-studded cast then, and no cameo roles. Each delivers a coherent and usually thought-provoking essay, most covering the writer’s specialist area of expertise, many looking at the broader media landscape with quite radical visions of the future. Almost all inevitably foresee a pared-down corporation - hence Michael Grade’s introduction, craftily titled ‘Wither the BBC’ - but none offer unmitigated pessimism.

Inevitably the fascination for this BBC pensioner is to read the testimony of senior BBC figures who not only know where the bodies are buried, and who buried them, but may well have wielded the spade. So alongside the future-gazing, there is much to interest students of how a publicly-funded public service broadcasting organisation survived its past crises, whether or not there is a current one. Vin Ray’s forensic dissection of Newsnight’s McAlpine scandal is both compelling and painful, detailing the impact on the episode’s many victims, from the Director-General who served the shortest term to date to the victims of abuse possibly left without a voice. It’s a consequence of the multi-authored format that Ray’s account covers a lot of the same ground as Torin Douglas’ chapter about the challenges of being the BBC’s media correspondent covering its internal problems, and other chapters, notably Richard Tait’s, dwell on the same material. But the repetition is balanced by the advantage of hearing a range of inside voices and being able to reach one’s own conclusions without an author’s intervention.

Phil Harding, a former Chief Political Adviser, reveals some of the processes behind the daily attempts at interference by politicians. He tells how the crisis over Andrew Gilligan’s reporting of the Iraq dossier in 2003 and the ferocious battle with Labour’s spin doctors escalated because of the demise of the ‘back channel’ of communication between the senior figures of the BBC and the government. The shouting and swearing of the Alastair Campbell era has been replaced today by intensive texting. Harding also argues that the public owns the BBC, and there’s a need for a more open and porous organisation, forging ‘real relationships not token ones’ with other bodies that provide public service values. The genie’s out of the bottle with regard to top-slicing the licence fee ever since part of it was allocated to fund digital switchover in 2006.

Inevitably, there are minor mistakes. The kidnapped correspondent Alan Johnston is twice referred to as Johnson, Breakfast Time is called Breakfast and the sum paid to Deputy Director-General Mark Byford to ‘keep focus’ in the run up to his redundancy is variously described as £300,000 and £500,000.

But there is academic excellence here too. The University of Lincoln’s Brian Winston rips apart the received wisdom that constitutional convention protects the BBC’s independence,
and in doing so highlights that there is a risk of interference from politicians far more serious than anything Phil Harding has suffered.

The final words of *Is the BBC in Crisis?* go to Andrew Scadding, Head of Corporate Affairs at the BBC, who unsurprisingly concludes that it is not in crisis and that its best years lie ahead. His chapter ‘The best is yet to come’ includes some of the kind of spin he might have employed in his time with the Conservative party. With so many big hitters in these pages championing a much-loved national institution, the BBC’s future might seem assured. But the problems discussed in the rest of the volume suggest Britain’s traditional model of public service broadcasting will have to change. The prospect of greater glories to come begins to look a little over-optimistic.

And yet, for all the navel-gazing by insiders past and present and external scrutiny by experts from a variety of academic and professional backgrounds, it’s a *Times* editorial from December 2013 (quoted here by Torin Douglas) that caught my eye as the most concise summary of the BBC’s fundamental enigma:

‘The eternal mystery of the BBC is how an organisation that works so badly can work so well. As impressive a journalistic organisation as any, it is nonetheless a managerial basket case.’

Anyone who worked for the BBC, particularly as a journalist, might agree. But even we are unlikely to have considered more than a fraction of the issues and ideas in this invaluable and fascinating book. It is essential reading for journalists, would-be journalists and anyone who studies the unrivalled influence of the BBC on Britain’s public life.
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