

Defining “professionalism” within tertiary journalism studies

Diana Bossio

Dr Diana Bossio is a lecturer at Swinburne University in Melbourne. Her research interests focus on journalism education and practice, as well as security cultures.

Abstract

This paper discusses debates about journalistic professionalism and how these might intersect with the frameworks and assumptions—both theoretical and practical—that underpin tertiary journalism study. Debates around professionalism have impacted on tertiary journalism education, which has in turn impacted on the industry and brought about its own set of debates and issues. Journalism education will thus be analysed as a domain that is subject to multiple forms of influence and debate, as well as being a key stakeholder in differing formations of journalistic professionalism (Anderson, 2008). This, I will argue, has particular ramifications for understanding some of the influences on journalistic self-definition, especially in a contemporary era of contestation of journalism culture and authority.

Introduction

Over 100 years ago in the United States, Joseph Pulitzer first envisioned a school that would improve the “status” of journalism. In what he titled a “rough memorandum”, he suggested that journalism

ought to be one of the great intellectual professions; to encourage, elevate and educate in a practical way the present, and, still more, future members of that profession, exactly as if it were the profession of law or medicine. (As cited in Boylan, 2003, p. 4)

At the time Pulitzer’s reputation, as well as broader respect for journalism, had suffered through the profligate use of “yellow journalism”; sensationalist news content marred by scandal and sentimentality. Pulitzer wished to legitimate the common “trade” by removing the journalist’s apprenticeship from the newsroom and into the tertiary sphere “to raise professional pride and tone” by teaching practical journalism skills, as well as politics, literature and government—“showing the mission, duty and opportunity of the press as a moral teacher” (as cited in Boylan, 2003, p. 5). Pulitzer did not live to see the inception of the Columbia Journalism School, nor the dramatic growth and development of tertiary education offerings for journalism worldwide. However, his original hesitation about whether universities could provide adequate training to prepare graduates for industry, whether universities lacked the “professional expertise” to teach the process of journalism, and whether in fact, journalism could be regarded as a profession at all, are all still debated now.

Journalism education can now be seen a domain that is subject to multiple forms of influence and debate, as well as being a key stakeholder in differing formations of journalistic professionalism (Anderson, 2008). The traditional objective of tertiary education was to replace understanding of journalism as a “craft” learnt through vocational training with professional self-definition developed through the university. However, academic debate has reflected a number of shifts in understanding of the

definition, role and authority of professional journalists in recent years. The changes wrought by the rise of online media and the blogosphere, the downturn of print media's advertising "rivers of gold" and shrinking newsrooms have all contributed to discussion of the consequences for the "professional" journalist. Similarly, the emergence of new academic disciplines in media and journalism studies has led to the "problematization" of the constitution of journalism as a profession. This article will explore how these debates might intersect and be further complicated by academic discussion in journalism and media studies as emerging disciplines. A qualitative textual analysis of curriculum documents from five undergraduate journalism courses within Victoria will provide evidence of some of the complex outcomes that these debates have had on discourses about journalistic professional identity within journalism education. This analysis will illustrate the utilisation of themes around the journalist's role in social and cultural governance and their "codes" of legal and ethical responsibility.

Journalism education and understanding of journalistic professionalism

To survey contemporary discussion of the social role and forms of authority afforded to journalism through tertiary education, one must inevitably begin with discussion of professionalism. At its inception in the United States, the first school for journalists reflected the often contradictory aims and objectives of industry and educators that has continued to the present day. While proprietors had called for university education as a move to professional respectability within journalism, Baylon (2003, p. 6) suggests this was a self-serving call; the industry's lack of workplace standards through low pay and poor training ensured journalism remained a "tawdry" profession. Nonetheless, the beginning of better workplace standards, more work opportunities for women and a better reputation for the industry itself meant that more proprietors, journalists and institutional authorities saw the benefit of professionalisation of the "trade" through university education. The professionalisation of journalism meant the articulation of a cultural identity for the journalist based on the articulation of their role in good governance. As Joseph Pulitzer originally suggested, the education of journalists means preparation for a role in public life as the principled, yet elite, member of "the press" (as cited in Adam, 2001). This was a result of the fourth estate role that journalists continue to espouse to legitimate their voice in governance. Journalism education could thus be seen as the acquisition of a "democratic art", the quality of which would determine the quality of democratic life (Seitz, 1924, p. 467).

The articulation of this social and cultural authority through an institutionalised formation of journalism as a "profession" has underlined contemporary attempts to privilege the role of the journalist and its responsibilities. Understanding of journalistic professionalism has revolved around the acknowledgement of the centrality of news production to contemporary political, social and cultural governance. As Bacon (2000) suggests, professions are historically understood as a "privileged class of occupations," characterised by discourses that suggest highly trained expertise, selection by merit, and peer surveillance of ethical or rigorous application of that expertise (Bacon, 2000). For journalists, "professionalisation" also presents a kind of justification for having a role in the governance of society through a claim to represent or act on behalf of the "public". It is only those who claim a professional and elite status who can also claim social, cultural or political authority to speak about the governance of societies. The rights and responsibilities claimed by the "professional" also establish their privilege

over those who might do the same activities “outside” of professional status; only the professional can claim the elite status of authority to speak with legitimacy.

Within a sphere of influences, journalism tertiary education has become a major site of the production and contestation of discourses around journalistic professionalism. Journalism education is a specific site of change, indelibly intertwined with other social, political and economic forces to mobilise discourse of journalistic professionalism. Traditional debates around the constitution of journalism as a profession have impacted on the provision of tertiary journalism education. Pedagogical discourses about the structure of tertiary journalism education have in turn impacted upon the industry and brought about its own set of debates and issues. In the textual analysis of marketing and course description materials from five Victorian universities offering Journalism Studies, these tensions around the constitution of journalistic professionalism were quite overt. The universities chosen for analysis were Swinburne University, La Trobe University, RMIT University, Monash University and The University of Melbourne. I utilised course and subject description materials that were publicly available from the universities’ respective websites. While the documents are used to promote the course and subjects offered, they may also provide the materials evidence of the university’s perspective on the attributes and skill sets a journalism degree might offer a “professional” journalist.

Three commonalities emerged from the analysis of the course materials for each university. These were: (1) the attributes of a professional journalist; (2) the specific methodology of journalistic practice; and lastly; (3) how the content of the degree would prepare you to be a “professional” journalist. An agenda of professionalisation emerges from these documents, in the way that the documents illustrate how the curriculum is designed to give graduates an understanding of journalism within a professional industry, in opposition to those who pursue journalism-type “activities” without tertiary qualification. What the course documents suggest is that the pursuit of “status” as a tertiary-educated journalist allows legitimate practice of journalism in a professional environment.

The analysis was completed utilising Anderson’s (2008) and Nolan’s (2008) work as a framework to discuss how professional self-definition of journalism and its particular form of “authority” is socially produced and materially manifest, and the practical implications for the role it performs in public life (particularly through education). Anderson’s analysis of professionalism provides a helpful review of the forms of analysis around the constitution of the role of the journalist, suggesting that “a number of studies, many of them written under the broad rubric of the sociology of culture, have analysed journalism as a profession, a form of “sacred knowledge”, and a discursive practice” (Anderson, 2008, p. 248). Anderson suggests three paradigmatic approaches to the constitution of journalistic expertise. Firstly, the perspectives on journalism as a profession that have contributed to an enduring discourse of journalistic authority. Secondly, the “cultural turn” of media studies in the 1970s has focussed on the discursive construction of journalistic expertise and, finally, contemporary work on journalism as a field of social practice, as influenced by Pierre Bourdieu’s work on field theory.

Nolan brings a Foucauldian analysis to Anderson’s framework for understanding journalistic expertise, suggesting that journalism “as a historically variable cultural technology operates as part of a broader field of governmental practices”. Foucault’s

governmental analysis extends Deuze's and Rose's work on journalism as a "discipline" through which journalistic activities are regularised through the continual maintenance of discourses around journalistic production practices and professional ideals (cited in Nolan, 2003, p. 65). Governmentality, as forwarded by Foucault, examines how governmental power seeks to "target, shape and work through, rather than undermine forms of autonomy to reach particular ends" (cited in Nolan, 2008). This is important because it shows how a self-constituting field of journalistic practice might act in relation to its role in the public sphere. But it also seeks to recognise other forms of expertise that influence, shape or restrict forms of journalistic authority. This might come in the forms of public relations that have sought to shape and manipulate the practice of journalistic authority, but even in the forms of journalistic education that serve to create a merchantable curriculum through journalism studies in the academy. Taking from a Foucauldian perspective, this paper does not wish to take a critical stance against forms of journalistic professionalism—or to suggest that journalistic authority is ideologically meaningless or "negative". Rather, I wish to suggest that this form of authority emerges out of a number of relations, discourse institutions and practices. One of these institutional influences has undoubtedly been journalism studies within the academy.

Promotion of professionalism in tertiary journalism education

Traditionally, taking on a profession meant elite status and reward. Mass university education made professional occupations like medicine, law and, much later, journalism available to the masses. Contemporary understandings of professional journalism are differentiated from amateur (or citizen) journalistic practice through discursive processes that present professional journalism as "dominant, authoritative, monopolistic, legalised" (Bacon, 2000). Bacon (2000) suggests that professional journalism debilitates and effectively disables the individual to become "exclusive experts of the public good". As professionalism of occupations has spread, they have also come under attack as an elitist protection on knowledge that could no longer be held as "exclusive" (Bacon, 2000). It is, ironically, mass education offered by universities that challenged this form of exclusive knowledge and yet, in recent years especially, learning the exclusive, interpretive work of professional journalists has been the justification of university education for journalists, to be defined against those who perform journalistic activities without the benefit of tertiary education. This has especially been the case where journalists have had to provide professional self-definition against citizen journalists, bloggers and independent online media ventures who stake a claim to journalistic "status".

This elite status intertwines discourses of professional practice, responsibility and governance to the attributes of a professional journalist. This was a major theme emerging from the analysis of the promotion of tertiary journalism education. These appeared to be part of efforts to determine what Bacon (2000) suggests is a more accountable method of professional practice; theoretical aspects of journalistic education offered students an opportunity to question the basic assumptions of journalistic practice, its intentions and its outcomes. Some universities also offered critical examination of the context in which journalistic practice occurred, both within political and legal frameworks (Bacon, 2000). For example, at La Trobe University, one subject explores

how privacy, freedom of information, professional liability, conflict of interest, copyright and fair dealing, defamation, and confidentiality are dealt with by the law, through journalist codes of practice, and by media institutions. In this unit we will draw on the expertise of legal experts and media professionals.

All the journalism courses at the five universities surveyed offer a subject about institutional ethics. Monash University offers two subjects—one “media ethics” subject that appears to be a largely theoretical subject. The subject is framed by professional principles that would guide journalistic work in industry by focusing on the

areas of professional ethics that govern journalism in Australia and in other countries. Topics include fairness and accuracy, media bias, invasion of privacy, conflict of interest, media stereotypes, self-regulation, and reporting on minorities.

This theme of professional accountability is continued in a Media Law subject, which

covers the areas of law that affect journalists in their everyday work, including defamation, contempt of court, confidentiality, copyright and freedom of information legislation. Students learn the extent of legal freedoms and constraints on the publishing industry and the ways some points of professional ethics and the law might come into conflict. (Monash, 2008)

This subject is framed by discourses around “the principle of freedom of expression” which reflects the westernised, liberal democratic theoretical principles that are often used to articulate the roles and responsibilities of professional journalists.

What can be suggested here is the impact of discourse surrounding the emergence of a professional self-identity for a journalist. As Adam (2001) suggests, discourses around the education of a professional journalist often incorporates immersion in the “news personality” of a journalist; practices that involve subjective or interpretive work around legal and ethical problem-solving, as well as news judgement, evidence gathering and assessment, and methods of representation. While emerging journalism and media studies disciplines have problematised the role of the journalist in an ever-changing media landscape, these promotional materials situate the journalist’s role as an important social authority involved in democratic governance. Professional journalists are seen as maintaining and engaging with the networks of power that provide governance of the “good life” of the society within which it is situated. For example, a subject offered by Monash University (2009) offers students a way to foster critical enquiry to maintain “a comprehensive knowledge of the networks of power journalists are engaged with”. This suggests the differentiation of professional from amateur practice through tertiary study preparation to participate in public governance. Similarly, a La Trobe University (2009) course “provides a broad understanding of the operation and regulation of the media and its cultural, social, political and economic role in society.”

Thus the description of professional journalistic activity and experience is posited in opposition to amateur practice by suggesting the importance of their role in legal and social governance. However the personal attributes of a journalist are also considered an important part of professional identity. For example, RMIT University suggests:

If you have an avid curiosity about the world, a passionate interest in news and current affairs, read, listen to and watch a wide range of news media, have strong writing skills, can work to a deadline under pressure, and have a burning desire to tell others what you find out, then journalism is for you. (2009)

These attributes are common within contemporary definitions of a professional journalist. It is not unusual to find such all-encompassing definitions of a journalist’s

“personality” as part of their professional self-definition, though it would be considered somewhat unusual within other professions. These course documents suggest that aspects of news “judgement” are homogenous and universally shared by professional journalists, regardless of organisation, medium, cultural or political background. As RMIT University’s description of journalistic attributes illustrates, these seem to be based on a sometimes uncritical description of the “issues” that a professional journalist might face. This is perhaps a result of what Graeme Turner suggested as the “fetishisation” of journalistic professional identity:

Journalists could acknowledge that their profession systematically produces an insider discourse which privileges certain kinds of information, certain kinds of sources of information, and ultimately produces their fetish—the figure of the journalist. More than any of the academic discourses, journalism over-invests in its occupational mythologies. (Turner, 1999, p. 363)

Similarly to Turner’s suggestion, the promotion of university education over-invests in these characterisations of the journalist’s professional identity, based on the suggestion of the unified, elite, interpretive practice of reporting.

Nonetheless, the contemporary problematisation of the journalists’ role in the ever-changing mediascape has questioned the need for professional self-definition. For example, Daniel Hallin’s (2000) work has suggested a “decline” in professionalism due to changes in more traditional realms of social, political and cultural authority. This takes into account the broad changes in the western political-economic environment, as well as broader social and cultural belief that have led to changes in the way professional journalism is pursued. Hallin’s work with Mancini (2004) suggests that journalism is instead a materially constituted and historically variable form of professional knowledge, subject to neo-liberal machinations. For example, the undermining of a traditional model of “objective reporting” within more actively partisan journalism has been a response to forms of organisational and political communication management, as well as a lack of public confidence in public authorities and institutions more generally. News production as the “common knowledge” of a professional elite reduces the variability of formations of journalistic expertise over time and context. This is instrumental in creating the idealistic or rigid notions of the forms that news may take. Indeed Hallin (2000) also suggests professionalisation of journalism may be especially short-lived because it cannot survive the historical and economic shifts in media production currently occurring.

Anderson (2008, p. 248) “reframes” professionalism, suggesting that questions about the “identity and relevance” of journalists in a globalised internet age can be reframed through notions of expertise. Within his analysis of journalistic expertise, Anderson also touches on journalistic authority and how these both contribute to journalism’s “professional project”. He suggests journalistic authority is comprised of the

power possessed by journalists and journalistic organisations to present their interpretation of reality as truthful, accurate and of political importance . . . a cultural form of power that is to a form of domination considered largely legitimate by those who exercise and are subject to it. (Anderson, 2008, p. 250)

Notions of expertise and authority contribute to a professionalisation project where those who have once been privy to this “sacred knowledge” now struggle to “gain and maintain a legitimate jurisdiction over certain discursively, culturally and epistemologically constructed forms of expertise” (Anderson, 2008, p. 250).

Contemporary academic discussion of journalism has seen connections across different historical, cultural and political institutions and practices as having an impact on the constitution of professionalism. For example, work by Nick Cauldry (2003) and Toby Miller (2008) have highlighted the importance of interconnected media systems, cultures and institutions to the way in which journalistic professionalism is constituted. Other scholars have sought to negate the professional status of journalists altogether, Hartley (2008) being the most vocal in suggesting that journalism should be considered a “human right”, rather than a specialist form of expertise. Barbie Zelizer (1992), on the other hand, has focussed on the importance of journalism as a “community” of meaning-making, stepping away from the discussion of the more material practices that constitute journalistic professionalism. Other scholars (Gerlis, 2006; Adam, 2001) have argued for the preservation of professional self-definition for journalists, both to differentiate from citizen journalism and to ensure public belief in “quality” or “principled” journalism. What these debates suggest is the effect of multiple social, political and cultural forms of knowledge on the articulation of journalistic work. These debates about professionalism continue because journalistic work has changed with the emergence of historical trends in line with particular social, cultural and political settings. Rather than treat journalism as a unitary and historically stable profession, these debates about professionalism may be utilised to understand how journalism has emerged historically, and the major effects of particular institutions and social settings on the discourses about journalistic authority.

Despite these contemporary academic discussions, tertiary education has been situated as giving professional attributes to do the practical, ethical and interpretive work that amateur or citizen journalists do not have the knowledge or authority to do. This also stems from the mercantile and pedagogical interests of university education. Three universities highlighted the importance of being taught by industry professionals who contribute practice-based expertise. The importance of staff knowledge of professional practice is emphasised in contrast to the educator’s research experience, which none of the curriculum documents mentioned. The documents suggest only professional journalists know how to teach journalists. Like a craft, journalistic knowledge is passed down through the experiences of elders who possess knowledge of news and the industry universally understood and practiced by journalists regardless of social, political or cultural context. This is articulated in the promotional material for the journalism course within the media discipline at Swinburne University (2009):

The course is taught primarily by people who have extensive workplace experience (in publishing, the print media and radio) and who share the belief that the student who is best equipped to face the vagaries of the workplace is the one who has a general and broad overview as well as a specialised appreciation of how it operates.

It is the personal experiences of past professional journalists that are being promoted in the curriculum documents; the personal attributes of a professional journalist can only be passed down through those who have participated in making the news. While proponents of citizen journalism might argue that anyone can be a journalist, the professional journalist is differentiated in tertiary education. As the description suggests, professional self-definition as a journalist appears to be influenced by experiences as a “real” journalist working in the field, complete with the “war stories” to illustrate the attributes of the industry and your own character as a professional journalist.

These discourses suggest the ways universities have positioned tertiary education in contrast to vocational training, especially given previous debate about the value that potential media employers attach to university education. Nolan (2009) suggests there has been a refusal of professionalism amongst media practitioners in the past, preferring “on the job” training, rather than tertiary qualification. This has been illustrated in a workplace culture where hiring editors have followed a tradition of merit-based promotion from cadet to graded journalist through practical experience. Professional journalists continue to advise university students to “do their time” in regional reporting roles to gain the news-gathering experience that will ensure their promotion to metropolitan newsrooms.

Indeed, there have been many “sub-set” arguments stemming from debates around the constitution of professionalism and how it articulates into the tertiary education of journalists. The Australian Press Council (2006) has reported, for example, that different journalism educators have debated the value of a “theoretical” tertiary qualification compared with traditional on-job training in a newsroom. The industry itself has also made it clear through its recruitment practices that, while it values tertiary education (and postgraduate education), it does not require specific study in journalism.

Many employers claim journalism education is too concerned with theoretical constructs and does not always result in “job-ready” applicants. Journalism academics counter that their courses are skills-based and that theory represents a relatively small component of a vocationally focused journalism program. (The Australia Press, 2006)

As Nolan previously mentioned, the anti-professionalisation culture of the traditional newsroom has pit vocational trainers and employers against traditional academics arguing the value and relevance of aspects of university courses teaching journalism.

Similarly this debate can be traced in the changing theoretical basis of journalism study as a discipline. Within universities themselves a major issue has been the “theory versus practice” paradigm in university education of journalists. As Vorster (n.d.) suggests, “there are different understandings of how journalism as a field of study needs to be constituted”. The theoretical component of Journalism study has been provided from a diverse range of disciplines, such as philosophy, politics and literature, to more contemporary disciplines such as Communications and Media Studies. An issue arising from the “broad church” of both Media Studies and Journalism Study is that a consensus over pedagogical approach often highlights disciplinary differences. Other academics have claimed that the juncture between media studies, cultural studies and journalism studies is too wide for there to be a fruitful discussion between the disciplines. Graeme Turner’s “Media Wars” (1998) is an elegant description of these debates, concentrating particularly on the often needlessly vehement derision of the influence of cultural and media studies on journalism. Turner suggests that Communication Studies, Journalism Studies, Media Studies and Cultural Studies are all disciplines that have often developed in an ad hoc and institution-specific manner. Most develop with an inter-disciplinarity that is often productive for research, but clashes when a defined pedagogical approach is required.

While journalism studies have evolved over time and this has impacted on the teaching practices pursued within higher education, the professionalisation “agenda” has had a profound, and sometimes conflicting, impact on the way journalistic authority has been constituted in the public domain. This can be seen in debates around how journalism

education should be constituted, stemming from the debates around professionalism outlined above. Skinner et al's (2001, p. 333) suggestion is that journalism study should revolve around the interpretative where "the quality of which would determine the quality of democratic life". Much current debate has followed this turn to the "interpretive" by suggesting that too often journalism is taught uncritically, as a "method". Adam (2001, p. 317) instead argues that

[t]he co-ordinates of a good journalism education comprise, like the practice of journalism, a fundamental concern with "news" and a corresponding concern with the acquisition of complex methods of knowing, representation and analysis.

However, as Deuze's (2005) and Hallin's (2000) analyses illustrate, this turn to the interpretive negates the many economic, political and social impacts on the practice of journalism. Defining journalistic authority within an agenda of professional practice has become all the more important both to practitioners and educational institutions given the high economic stakes for both parties. Journalism has become a profession through the institutionalisation of its practice; a way of organising middle class labour in an advanced capitalist economy. The model of work that is increasingly being exhorted by universities tends to follow along the lines of that favoured by the "neo-liberalising state and the private sector" (Stahl, 2008, p. 231).

These debates have influenced the way journalism is presented as a subject of study in tertiary education, as well as a description of the attributes, the role and the experiences of professional journalist and journalistic practice. This is indicated in university promotion of the value of a professional tertiary qualification in journalism within a "continually changing" media industry (RMIT, 2008). RMIT University's Journalism program is promoted as having "strong links with industry and deliver[ing] relevant knowledge and preparation for the fiercely competitive and constantly changing news media environment". However each university contained different examples of how a journalism tertiary degree might help a practitioner to cope with the demands of rapidly changing industry. Melbourne University stated: "Our program provides the critical and analytical skills needed to understand the changing role and significance of media and communications industries". La Trobe University, however, suggests that professionalisation of journalistic practice increases employability across industries:

The media industries are evolving rapidly. Apart from the traditional publishing and broadcasting industries, and emerging online media, there is a growing awareness of the need to employ graduates with media, communication and journalism skills in many areas of government and industry.

La Trobe University's subject guides continue the industrial focus of journalistic practice with the inclusion of a "media industries" unit that discusses

the implications of structural change within the media industries for employment and the creation of content; the role of governments in protecting national production industries, and the use of media by non-media organisations.

This promotion suggests an increasing push by higher education for journalists to arm themselves with tertiary qualifications in order to fit into a professional environment. "Professional Journalists" now work as salaried employees of often very large corporations. Their professional identities often revolve around discourses based on their role in public governance and democracy. These discourses are impacted, however, by a range of strategic practices related to economy, politics and culture that affects their production of "professional journalism". Often these remain

unacknowledged within contemporary discourses of professional journalism, as Bacon (2000) argues:

A particular tension concerned with professional autonomy exists both between the individual practitioners and those who utilise their service in the public space and also between the practitioners and their employers in the relevant institutions, themselves governed by bureaucratised and corporatised cultures undergoing major changes.

These debates provide the framework for the constitution of journalistic professional identity forwarded (and problematised) through education systems. While much scrutiny has revolved around the apparent transformation of journalism in discourses associated with journalism education, much of this discussion has assumed these changes to be occurring within the sphere of a universally understood professional realm.

These tensions manifest within the epistemological frameworks underpinning contemporary teaching practice of journalism studies. While these tensions do reflect the struggles occurring to define journalism within the field of journalism studies itself, they also suggest the tangible influence that education systems have on the “professionalisation agenda”. Bacon et al (2000) make the important point that universities have a major interest in, and influence on, the development of the knowledge bases and ethical codes that surround professional journalistic practice. At the same time, both the news media and universities perpetuate these forms of knowledge. These institutions and their discourses are also impacted by social, economic and political factors on an often global scale. As Skinner argues:

On the one hand, journalism educators seek to satisfy the demands of news organisations by providing a steady stream of graduates ready for the newsroom. On the other hand, journalism schools are asked to meet the standards of university administrators who perceive post-secondary education as something more than vocational training. (Skinner et al, 2001, p. 344)

These impacts and tensions surrounding the constitution of the contemporary professional journalist’s role was the basis of the analysis of Victorian tertiary education materials associated with journalism studies.

Conclusion

In identifying these discourses, this article aims to lay the groundwork for a larger project discussing the affects of socio-political, economic and technological transformations on the definition of journalistic expertise. This article does not have the scope to encompass discussion of all the processes of substantive transformation that have affected redefinition of journalistic expertise and authority. Instead, I will suggest here that particular discourse about journalism forwarded by universities has an influence on understanding of journalistic professional self-definition. This in turn, has consequences for professional self-definition of journalists in the workplace, especially once graduates apply theoretical and practical knowledge taught within tertiary education systems.

The analysis of curriculum materials at Victorian universities illustrates that journalism studies very much reflect the discourses of professionalisation that have permeated the journalism industry. Conversely, the professionalisation agenda so debated within journalism studies can be seen to be influenced by dominant discourse around the attributes, roles and responsibilities that constitute a professional journalist as

forwarded by discourses promoting tertiary education as the process of becoming a professional journalist. Journalistic education, with its own influences and agendas, can be seen to shape the way journalism's role and authority is constituted within curriculum and journalism studies, particularly "[u]niversities as competitors for traffic in merchantable instruction, recognising the importance of the "industrial arts"" (Veblen cited in Miller, 2008, p. 221). While this is shown as an aspect of the "marketing" of a particular version of journalistic identity and practice within curriculum documents, there are also reflections of debates within journalism study around the identity and authority of the journalist in the public sphere. Thus the sphere of influences and myriad changes occurring in the field are reflected by the practice of journalism itself, as well as the institutions and relations that seek, through their own agendas, to have an influence of journalistic professionalism.

References

- Adam, G.S. (2001). The education of journalists. *Journalism*, 2(3), 315-339.
- Aldridge, M., & Evetts, J. (2003). Rethinking the concept of professionalism: The case of journalism. *British Journal of Sociology*, 54(4), 547-564.
- Anderson, C. (2008). Journalism: Expertise, authority and power in public life. In D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The media and social theory* (pp. 248-264). Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Australian Press Council. (2006). *State of the news print media in Australia report*. Retrieved from <http://www.presscouncil.org.au/snpma/ch08.html>
- Bacon, W. (2006). Journalism as research. *Australian Journalism Review*, 28(92), 147-157.
- Bacon, W., Groundwater Smith, S., Nash, C. & Sachs, J. (2000). Legitimizing professionalism. *British Educational Research Association Annual Conference*. Cardiff. Retrieved from <http://www.acij.uts.edu.au/archives/profprac/LegitimizingProfessionalism.pdf>
- Boylan, J. (2003). *Pulitzer's school: Columbia University's School of Journalism, 1903-2003*. USA: Columbia University Press.
- Cauldry, N. (2003). *Contesting media power: Alternative media in a networked world*. London: Rowan & Littlefield.
- Deuze, M. (2005). What is journalism? Professional identity and ideology of journalists reconsidered. *Journalism*, 6, 442-464.
- Dunn, A. (2004). From quasi to fully: On journalism as a profession. *Australian Journalism Review*, 26(2), 21-30.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hartley, J. (2008). Journalism as a human right: The cultural approach to journalism. In M. Loffelholz & D. Weaver (Eds.), *Global journalism research: Theories, methods, findings future*. Malden MA: Blackwell.
- Henningham, J. (1995). Journalism in the USA and Australia: Some comparisons. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 22(1), 77-91.

- Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. & Roberts, B. (1978), *Policing the crisis*. London: Macmillan.
- Hallin, D. (2000). Commercialism and professionalism in American news media. In J. Curran & M. Gurevitch (Eds.), *Mass media and society* (pp. 218-237). London: Arnold.
- Hallin, D. (2008). Neo-liberalism, social movements and change. In D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The media and social theory* (pp. 43-58). Oxon, New York: Routledge.
- Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- La Trobe University. (n.d.). *Journalism*. Retrieved from <http://www.latrobe.edu.au/coursefinder/local/2010/Bachelor-of-Journalism.4813.html>
- Miller, T. (2008). Step away from the croissant: media studies 3.0. In D. Hesmondhalgh, D & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The media and social theory* (pp. 215-223). Oxon, New York: Routledge
- Monash University. (n.d.). *Journalism*. Retrieved from <http://arts.monash.edu.au/journalism/>
- Nolan, D. (2008a). Tabloidisation revisited: The regeneration of journalism in conditions of advanced liberalism. *Communication, Politics & Culture*, 41(2), 100-118.
- Nolan, D. (2008b). Journalism, education and the formation of "public subjects". *Journalism*, 9, 733-749.
- Nolan, D. (2009). Rethinking journalism culture and authority. *Paper presented at ANZCA Annual Conference. Brisbane July 8-10, 2009.*
- Osborne, T. & Rose, N. (1999). Do the social sciences create phenomena? The example of public opinion research. *British Journal of Sociology*, 50(3), 367-396.
- Platon, S. & Deuze, M. (2003). Indymedia journalism. *Journalism*, 4(3), 336-355.
- RMIT University. (n.d.). *Journalism*. Retrieved from <http://www.rmit.edu.au/browse;ID=n7d1mu57gg5x>
- Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom: Reframing political thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sedorkin, G. & Schirato, T. (1998). Theory and current affairs television. In M. Breen (Ed.), *Journalism: theory and practice* (pp. 104-118). Paddington, NSW: Macleay.
- Seitz, D. (1924). *Joseph Pulitzer: His life and letters*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Skinner, D. & Gasher, M. (2001). Putting theory into practice: A critical approach to journalism studies. *Journalism*, 2(3), 341-360.
- Swinburne University. (n.d.). *Journalism*. Retrieved from [http://courses.swinburne.edu.au/courses/Bachelor-of-Arts-\(Journalism\)-N0515JOU/local](http://courses.swinburne.edu.au/courses/Bachelor-of-Arts-(Journalism)-N0515JOU/local)
- Turner, G. (1998). "Media Wars": Journalism, cultural and media studies in Australia. *Journalism*, 1(3), 353-365.

University of Melbourne. (n.d.). *Bachelor of Arts (Media and Communication)*. Retrieved from <https://handbook.unimelb.edu.au/view/2010/105-MC>

Vortser, J. (n.d.). *An analysis of curriculum development processes in a journalism and Media Studies Department at a South African University*. Rhodes University.

Zelizer, B. (1992). *Covering the body: The Kennedy assassination, the media, and the shaping of collective memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.