TOWARD 2020

New Directions in Journalism Education

Edited by
Gene Allen
Stephanie Craft
Christopher Waddell
Mary Lynn Young

Ryerson Journalism research centre

Toward 2020:

New Directions in Journalism Education

EDITED BY

Gene Allen, Stephanie Craft, Christopher Waddell & Mary Lynn Young

Ryerson Journalism Research Centre
Toronto

Published by the Ryerson Journalism Research Centre (2015)
School of Journalism
Ryerson University
350 Victoria St.
Toronto ON Canada
M5B 2K3

Cover design: Sally Goldberg-Powell

Table of Contents

Introduction

Gene Allen

With one exception (the keynote address by Robert Picard), all of the essays in this volume are expanded versions of presentations made at the conference “Toward 2020: New Directions in Journalism Education,” held at Ryerson University in Toronto on 31 May 2014. Testifying to the urgent interest in professional renewal among journalism educators, more than one hundred people from Canada, the United States, Europe, and Australia attended the conference. The papers published here represent a reasonable cross-section of the issues discussed. The authors advance different ideas about where journalism education should go from here; at times they disagree with one another, but all share the underlying view that if business as usual was ever a viable option, this clearly is no longer the case.

Robert Picard’s provocative and plain-spoken keynote address to the conference captured the sense of urgency well. While some in the audience disagreed with aspects of his critique (as do some of the papers in this volume), others found his candour in enumerating the ways that journalism education “must do better” refreshing. The conference participants were not aware of Picard’s analysis when they developed their initial proposals, so the essays here should not be read as explicit responses to his analysis. In the aggregate, however, it is striking that most of them address one or more of the principal needs he identified, including an end to journalists’ tendency toward self-satisfaction about their role in society and their established practices; a stronger culture of critical, scholarly research in journalism education; more rigorous and specialized academic training for journalism students, with more focus on critical reflection and less on the acquisition of specific professional skills; and a clearer understanding of how journalists must respond to changes in the business aspects of their field, including its entrepreneurial aspects. Ivor Shapiro’s essay, for example, explicitly questions whether the main goal of journalism programs is, or should be, to prepare students for careers as professional journalists. “Journalism is an approach to knowledge, not just a job,” he writes, “and journalism education is therefore about teaching a distinctive epistemology that enjoys broad professional utility.” Chantal Francoeur scrutinizes journalism’s claim to independence – in this case, independence from public relations practitioners – employing Michel Foucault’s analysis of power relationships. Similarly, Mary-

Lynn Young and Janet Giltrow identify problematic aspects of the "teaching hospital" model of journalism education; using concepts from the scholarship of teaching and learning, as well as genre theory, they seek ways in which "new knowledge – rather than replicated practice – [can] enter the profession." With frank scrutiny of her own professional career and transition to teaching, Sally Haney argues that deadline-driven daily journalism is often characterized by an absence of self-critical reflection, and urges a collective "search for models and frameworks that will not only help us dissect our shortcomings in the classroom, but also [understand] how those shortcomings are inextricably linked to often unexamined beliefs, values and judgments we carried as working journalists."

Other contributions to this volume have a more specific focus. The three papers by Meredith Levine, Paul Benedetti, and Mike Gasher were initially presented as part of a single round-table session examining the trend towards entrepreneurial approaches in journalism education and (a related issue) the shifting relationship between journalism's commercial and public purposes – a shift made possible by, among other things, our growing ability to understand audience preferences through the use of analytics. Levine argues strongly that much of this discussion relies on poorly understood notions of what entrepreneurship actually involves, to our students' detriment. While recognizing that tensions between journalism's commercial and public purposes have a long history, Benedetti asserts that newly emerging practices such as "sponsored content, native advertising, custom content, and brand journalism" represent a radically new and problematic departure, in that "all have the common feature of leveraging the trusted name of their publications to produce advertising content that is virtually indiscernible from regular news." Mike Gasher's brief but elegant essay wraps up this discussion by stressing the need for clear distinctions between education and training, between content and form, between journalism and the news industry, between markets and publics, and between production and distribution (among other things).

Two other essays address more specific questions still. Jordan Press (the only working journalist among the authors) urges journalism educators to expand their connections with the broader university community by offering instruction in news literacy to students outside their own departments. "No longer should journalism schools think only about preparing the next generation of journalists to report the news — schools should also help prepare the next generation of news consumers to navigate the modern news ecosystem." In the only paper in the volume that explicitly addresses the possibilities of new journalistic forms, Gavin Adamson contends that short online videos, presented in a live blog format, offer great potential for audience engagement.

The volume concludes with edited transcripts of two round-table sessions in which prominent working journalists discuss current and emerging trends. One panel, organized on the premise that most journalism educators have been away from newsrooms for at least a few years, is essentially a primer on analytics – the rapid, detailed, and constant flow of information about audience response that is now available to journalists – and how this information can best be used. In the second panel, senior journalists (one from a transforming legacy organization, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, and two from digital-native organizations) offer their predictions about what the rapidly evolving journalistic landscape will look like in 2020 and which aptitudes and capacities journalism graduates will need to succeed in this environment. The changing and increasingly porous boundaries of what counts as "journalism" are a defining characteristic of the current era; as these panels suggest, this redefinition is taking place within journalism organizations as well as outside them. If journalism education has erred by overemphasizing established journalistic formats, failing to explore and experiment with the possibilities of emerging practices would be just as great an error.

****

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the many people whose assistance has made this volume possible. My co-editors – Stephanie Craft, Christopher Waddell, and Mary-Lynn Young – have been tireless in their assessment of proposals and completed papers despite many competing demands on their time. Their detailed assessments have strengthened every paper in this volume, and their broader advice about the overall shape of the volume and our path to publication has been invaluable. I could not have wished for more helpful, thoughtful colleagues. (Please note: Allen and Young were not involved in the assessment of their own submissions to this publication.)

Among my colleagues at Ryerson University, I owe a special debt of thanks to Ivor Shapiro, who encouraged me to organize the conference on which this volume is based; and to April Lindgren, the director of the Ryerson Journalism Research Centre, who has generously supported its publication. Thanks also to Jaclyn Mika for her exemplary organizational work for the initial conference, to Sally Goldberg-Powell for the cover design of this volume, and to Sally Goldberg-Powell and Lindsay Smith for their assistance in making it available online. Matthew Kudelka, our efficient and helpful copy editor, has been a pleasure to work with. A final word of thanks goes to the authors whose work appears here. This has been a long process for everyone, and many authors have undergone multiple rounds of revision with good grace. We now present our collective work to the community of journalism educators more broadly, in the hope that they will find it both thought-provoking and useful.

Deficient Tutelage: Challenges of Contemporary Journalism Education

Robert G. Picard

Speaking to a group of journalism educators about what is wrong with journalism education is like encountering a pack of wolves in the woods and lecturing them about dinner etiquette. It will probably end badly.

Nevertheless, I agreed to make this speech because I believe in journalism and teaching, and because I hope we share a common commitment to improving the lives of young people and preparing them for the future.

In the interest of disclosure, I come from the University of Oxford, which does not offer journalism or media studies. Despite that choice, it has thousands of graduates working in journalism and news organizations worldwide. In addition, scholars at Oxford conduct some of the most compelling media research undertaken. Over the course of my career I have had experience in journalism schools, business schools, and social science departments, so an interdisciplinary perspective informs my thoughts.

I think we can find some common ground, however. I want to remind us of things we know in our hearts and direct our thoughts to some challenges that need to be addressed if journalism education programs are going to survive and be effective in the future. I hope you won’t show too many fangs in the process.

The Journalistic World of the Twenty-First Century Is Fundamentally Different from That of the Twentieth Century

This reality threatens the relevance and existence of traditional journalism education. Many journalists and journalism educators view the twentieth century as the high point of professional journalism because it was an era in which abundant resources supported strong news institutions. This was possible because twentieth-century news enterprises and the journalists who worked for them had near monopolies on daily news provision and controlled the institutions that defined journalism and what its practices were.

Yet research on the journalism of the past century has established that it reinforced dominant perceptions of issues, people, and countries, especially those perceptions held by editors and social elites. It consistently missed the emergence of major stories – financial crises, developing international conflicts, and political scandals – until they emerged as full-blown calamities and disgraces.

Journalism training has far too often uncritically accepted and promoted the ideas that journalism makes democracy function and that democracy is not possible without journalism. These views were important to the development of the mythology of journalism in the twentieth century. However, research about these relationships shows that the connections are tentative at best and that there are far better explanations for democratization and functioning democratic processes.

The idealized view of journalism and the image of the past century as a journalistic paradise are thus dependent upon looking into a very badly distorted mirror.

Today, digital media are challenging the monopolies on informational functions formerly held by journalists and legacy news providers. There is competition in news and information distribution. Many of the information provision functions have been seized by other information providers.

However, professional journalists and journalism educators continue to maintain that only trained journalists can speak truth to power and hold power to account. These are fanciful sentiments. The concept of speaking truth to power presumes that journalists know what is true, that power listens, and that journalists don't have power and aren't part of the power system. Those are highly debatable assumptions. The concept of holding power to account presumes that there are agreed-upon standards of behaviour and that journalists have a means for enforcing accountability. Again, these are questionable assumptions.

It is important for us to remember that the prevailing conceptualization of journalism's role was asserted by journalists, not given to them by society. They used their near monopolies over platforms – printing press and transmitters – to claim the functions of journalism in society. Democratic society acquiesced to those claims because they proved somewhat functional.

Today, other functional forms of communication have emerged and these are every bit as important to speaking truth and holding power to account as journalism. While journalists continue to cling to the old conceptualization, society is moving past it.

Professional journalists continue to maintain that only they are able to effectively convey information, challenge power, and threaten illicit uses of power. This fiction may make them feel important, but it is not borne out in the realities of the twenty-first century. These days, many other sources provide information about what is happening, explain the contexts, enlighten and engage audiences, and help the public sort through ideas and debates.

Today, many journalistic functions have been stripped from the news media. Social media are now the primary carriers of breaking news. Online news sites, blogs, and social media are far more often willing to publicly shame elites than legacy media. The locations of opinion and debate have moved to digital media. All of this has reduced the need for and influence of news organizations.

Even specialized and in-depth news has moved away from traditional media to the web and apps. We are no longer dependent on the professional journalists because others are providing far more attention and expert understanding to events. We are offered coverage of specialized topics such as foreign affairs, the economy, and the environment by academics, professional experts, non-governmental organizations, and entrepreneurial collectives of specialist journalists. These tend to produce information in far greater depth and often with greater accuracy than journalistic organizations producing news for general-interest audiences. In fact, they are increasingly relied upon as sources and expert commentators by many traditional news organizations and professional journalists.

The sad reality is that journalists miss most stories in most places most of the time. Developments and issues tend to be initially discovered by others and are then picked up by traditional news organizations. In this environment, professional journalism is losing a great deal of its functionality and its significance to society.

The importance of this changing environment is evident in attacks on journalists. The Committee to Protect Journalists and *Reporters sans frontières* both report that citizen journalists and professional journalists are now being imprisoned or killed in about equal proportions for challenging power and reporting on crucial developments in their societies.

Clearly, the twenty-first century is a very different journalistic environment. In this milieu, journalism education must change or it will wither and decay.

Journalism and Higher Education Have Always Had an Uneasy Relationship

Journalism isn't an art, nor is it a science. Rather it is a loose body of professional practices and techniques. Journalism education combines tutelage in those practices with sets of technical and practical skills needed to carry out journalism. Consequently, there have been debates for the past century and a half about whether journalism training should be offered in universities.

Some perceive journalism as a trade for which a non-university training course and apprenticeship should be sufficient. Others take a liberal arts approach, arguing that journalists need higher education with solid backgrounds in arts, humanities, and social sciences combined with professional training. Others argue that a full basic degree in any relevant subject – from economics to biology, from sociology to political science – should be completed prior to journalism training. Those arguing for journalism's inclusion in higher education often argue that it is a profession that deserves to be in universities just like professional schools in medicine, law, engineering, or business.

In North America, the higher education battle was won in the United States by former Confederate general Robert E. Lee, who introduced journalism education at Washington and Lee University during his presidency of that institution in the late 1860s. The University of Missouri School of Journalism was established in 1908 as the first university professional school in the field. In Canada, the dispute over whether journalism belonged in higher education continued until after the Second World War, when Ryerson, Western Ontario, and Carleton universities began offering journalism programs.

The incorporation of journalism education into universities has never been fully accepted by others in the academy, however. Even today, faculties in other disciplines in many universities look down on or dismiss the importance of journalism programs and the research contributions of journalism faculty.

They are not completely wrong in doing so.

Journalism Education Has Failed to Develop Professional Knowledge and Practices

In the 150 years since journalism education entered universities, it has not developed a fundamental knowledge base, widely agreed upon journalistic practices, or unambiguous professional standards. Large numbers of journalism educators have failed to make even rudimentary contributions toward understanding the impact of journalism and media on society. Some of the reasons for these failures are philosophical. Some are because we have tended to separate journalism education from media studies. Many of the deficiencies exist because journalism is closer to craft than a profession.

In the contemporary environment, this state of affairs is especially problematic because the journalism profession of the twentieth century is waning. The existential crisis of journalism is being magnified in journalism education and is ignored at great peril.

Whether one believes journalism is craft, trade, or a profession, one is faced with a fundamental question: Can students study journalism and be prepared for a world of future employment? This question reveals the fundamental conflict between the concepts of journalism training and higher education.

Higher education isn't about ensuring employment. It is about shaping and sharpening students' abilities to think and about giving them skills they can use in a variety of activities in future years. It is about helping them understand the past, how people and societies work, what forces affect the human condition, how to deal with the inevitable changes they will encounter in their lives, and how to find their own paths to success.

No one can teach the future, of course, but we must help students learn how to discover, interpret, and navigate their ways through it. This is not impossible and is done daily in other professional programs in business, engineering, and biomedical sciences. They do so by focusing on fundamental knowledge and practices, on the means for discovering new knowledge and practices, and on how to innovatively use changing technologies and practices as means for achieving goals.

Unfortunately, that is not what many journalism programs do. Their primary contribution is to teach students to communicate well, but without having anything to communicate and with little rationale for communicating. Minimal effort is expended on teaching students how to think and critically analyse social developments. Journalists who can't think effectively will be even more worthless in the future than they are now.

Many journalism programs teach how to use specific technologies: audiovisual editing systems, news website software packages, and design software. Far less attention is given to why practices using those technologies produce more impact in the minds of audiences than other practices or how they affect costs and strategies of operations. We teach rote operation, not contemplation about what one is doing.

Journalism education must do better.

A Primary Reason for Deficiencies Is That Journalism Education Has Been Co-opted by Industry

For decades, journalism programs have been influenced by and aligned with major employers. Their curricula have been designed to produce news factory workers who can be dropped into a slot at a journalism factory. Even today, while the locations that can offer journalistic employment are diminishing in number, many journalism schools can't shake off the emphasis on preparing workers to enter corporate employment.

Most journalism programs are still preparing students to go to work for established news organizations and not giving them enough training in entrepreneurship and independent journalism, where employment opportunities are rising; they are not teaching students how to establish themselves to work as individual journalists or in journalistic cooperatives.

Journalism programs need to teach students how to become more self-sufficient journalists, provide much more training in specialized forms of journalism, and teach how to cover local communities and topics such as climate, energy, defence, and social policy.

These are where value is truly created, and they all require interdisciplinary programs with tight relations with other disciplines in the university – something few journalism programs have developed.

It is the responsibility of journalism faculty to implement the changes required in the current century, but it requires support and pressure from stakeholders of journalism programs. Like all organizations, educational institutions change slowly unless they have to. Some schools are changing more rapidly than others, but even when programs decide to undertake change, it may take five to ten years before the results are apparent.

Journalism education must do better.

Journalism Programs Will Never Move Forward by Hiring Middle-Aged and Senior Journalists

Month after month, I see journalism programs gloating that they have hired notable journalists from major print and television companies. They circulate the news in glowing press releases about the years of experience of their new faculty. Although this helps aging journalists who have lost their employment with news organizations, it is not going to help students develop the attitudes and skills necessary to thrive in the emerging news environment.

Why would anyone think that hiring someone from a decaying news organization, steeped in old ways of doing things, is an effective way to create the journalists and news organizations for the future? Few former journalists who have spent the past twenty or thirty years working for a large firm have the outlook, attitudes, and skills needed now. Although many are able to convey effectively the basic skills used in gathering and producing news, most are not able to provide the skills necessary for new forms of information gathering and dissemination, data handling, data visualization, and journalistic entrepreneurship.

I don't want to be too one-sided here; I am all too aware that someone recruited from higher education who possesses a doctorate is unlikely to fare better. Maybe we should be hiring some digital entrepreneurs in their late twenties who never completed college and think about information provision in completely different ways.

Regardless of how journalism departments go about it, faculty certainly need to change the way they think about the content of teaching. We need to be teaching how to write and produce content for multiple digital platforms for which audiences have different requirements. We need to teach how to understand audiences and how to use the avalanche of user data that is overwhelming news organizations. We need to help students prepare for new types of journalistic employment. We need to teach them to be digital developers and how to be problem solvers.

Journalism education must do better.

Some Winds of Change Are Already Evident

Some journalism educators and stakeholders are already working to change the ways journalism is taught.

A great deal of support is being given the "hospital model," which combines university journalism education with actual practice. Despite the enthusiasm for the concept, it is hardly novel. Many journalism programs have for a century had students working on newspapers, magazines, and radio and television stations they operate. Many were early creators of web-based news sites. Others have used structured internships to achieve similar results. The primary reason the teaching hospital concept is gaining traction today is that established news enterprises are promoting it so that students will be placed in their enterprises as unpaid or poorly paid workers. It is not about education, it is about commerce. Journalism educators should not take part in projects that exploit their students, so the hospital model must be approached with caution.

A number of foundations are pursuing their own visions for digital and specialized journalism and are providing small amounts of money to support them. Many of these programs, however, will not solve the problems of journalism because they remain steeped in normative twentieth-century views of what journalism ought to be rather than what it is today.

Entrepreneurial journalism courses are becoming fashionable, but few are being taught by anyone who has ever been an entrepreneur. Many are primarily teaching students to be freelancers. Few are teaching them what is necessary to establish and operate successful small news enterprises in the twenty-first century.

Courses on the economics and business of media are proliferating, and they can help students navigate the emerging news ecosystem. Unfortunately, few are being taught by faculty with much understanding of either economics or business. Students are primarily being given a shallow understanding of catch terms such as “business model,” “monetization,” and “return.”

Digital journalism courses are now common, and out of self-interest, outside stakeholders are continually trying to influence the choice of hardware and software used in those courses. Large media companies are trying to influence the content of those courses so that they will produce employees that fit their narrow needs for specific skills in digital media.

Though their importance is recognized, the number of specialty journalism courses remains limited, primarily because few faculty members have the skills to teach them. Also, they tend to be offered as small, optional courses, which are expensive for journalism programs to provide.

Journalism education must do better.

Where Does Journalism Education Need to Move in the Next Five to Ten Years?

I can see more of you baring your fangs at me, but I want to forge ahead and consider the question of where journalism education needs to move in the next decade.

In terms of education, we need to teach students how to be strategic and flexible in serving audiences across multiple distribution platforms. We need to teach them to focus on the environment and processes of information provision, not merely information creation. We need to teach them to be more oriented to the needs of their readers, listeners, viewers, and users.

We need to help journalists become more specialized rather than generalized. We need to teach students how to find data and information created by others and how to create stories from that data and information. We need to teach them how to analyse and explain what public developments mean and what readers can do to prepare for what is coming next.

The transformation needed to offer this type of education is problematic for many journalism programs because it means breaking down the silos in order to train students for print, broadcast, or the web. It also means offering wider education that encompasses advertising, media management, and media effects. It requires challenging entrenched self-interests and defensive attitudes whose intent is to protect academic fiefdoms and ways of doing things.

Journalism education can only survive and succeed if it becomes much more aggressive in seeking change. It has to become far more innovative than it ever has been. It is not a matter of thinking outside the box, because the box no longer exists. What is required is deciding what will replace the box or how to get along without one.

And as it changes, journalism education must find ways to provide greater quality and educational value than in the past. If it does not, there is no reason for it to continue to exist and most of its functions will shift online to journalism training courses more appropriate for craft and trade approaches to journalism.

Journalism education must do better. Thank you.

To Turn or to Burn: Shifting the Paradigm for Journalism Education

Ivor Shapiro

Journalism education means preparation for a career in journalism: true or false?

The best answer is, sometimes. This paradigm – *journalism education is preparation for a career in journalism* – has been self-evident to most educators, students, and others since the discipline's beginnings. Yet it has long been equally self-evident that a substantial number of journalism students' futures lie elsewhere than in journalism careers. Certainly, the number of journalism graduates far exceeds even the most optimistic number of feasible entry-level jobs in journalism. Indeed, a substantial number of "journalism" undergraduates have, by the time of graduation, no intention of pursuing careers in journalism.

This paradigmatic tension matters because a program's success is most usefully evaluated against its own core mission. An engineering degree, for example, is clearly intended to produce competent and trustworthy engineers, and its success or failure should be evaluated in a way that is consistent with that mission. A history degree has a different paradigm: producing historians (i.e., history scholars) being one of several desirable outcomes of a good history program, especially at the undergraduate level, dedicated history teachers would happily judge their success according to the knowledge and understanding of history with which students are left.

In arguing that journalism education's paradigm deserves to be revisited and revised, I will acknowledge two unproven assumptions, each based at least as much on personal experience and peers' anecdotes as on hard evidence.

First, I assume, based on my nearly fifteen years as a journalism educator, that most peers nationally, like most of those with whom I have personally worked and exchanged ideas, currently see the training of future journalists as our collective core mission.

Likewise, I assume that a significant number of journalism graduates will not become journalists. Beyond what my own school knows about graduates' career paths, there is fair reason to consider this assumption safe on a national scale. In 2007, Knox and Goodrum identified forty-five journalism schools in Canada, including twenty-six based in community colleges and nineteen in universities. (These numbers included eight hybrid university–college programs.) Combined, these programs reported an estimated 4,802 enrolled journalism students, and 1,606 graduates per year; 39.4 per cent of these graduates were from universities. (Knox and Goodrum 2007) A very few small programs have been closed or suspended since that time (Coulson 2014; Reid 2014), but to the author's knowledge, based on information exchanged among j-school chairs and directors, the Knox–Goodrum estimates remain roughly correct. (Academic leaders do report steady reductions in application numbers for undergraduate and graduate programs, but these reductions have only to a much lesser extent affected actual enrolments[1] or, at least according to informal reports from some leading schools, the quality of student bodies as measured by incoming grades or achievement.)

Nor is the population of journalists known with precision. According to Statistics Canada's occupations survey, approximately 13,000 Canadians defined themselves as journalists in 2011; this included those who were employed in news or other organizations, whether full-time or part-time, and the self-employed (Skelton 2013). My own current research (not yet published) suggests that roughly 4,000 people are on salary as English-language journalists with news organizations, large and small, on all media platforms combined; with some justifiable but not verifiable guesswork, this might support an estimate that somewhere between 10,000 and 13,000 Canadians earn at least part of their living by doing journalism in any language. Reductions in the number of actual journalism jobs are, while not yet convincingly documented, unlikely to be disputed by an informed observer. The Canadian Media Guild estimated in 2013 that 10,000 jobs had been lost in the broadcast and print media industries (three-fifths of them in print, the rest in broadcast), but those jobs include both journalists and non-journalists (Wong 2013).

Given all these rough numbers, it would seem foolhardy to suggest that a significant majority of journalism graduations translate as the beginning of professional journalism careers.[2] Conversely, and a little brutally, it seems safe to suggest that journalism educators' current sense of mission is driven by the realistic career aspirations of what may be a minority of their students. There is another, more positive, way to state this: that the range of journalism graduates' realistic career prospects is significantly more diverse than the range of paths encompassed by the usual meanings of "journalism" work.

Whichever way one prefers to think, the paradigmatic challenge is clear: if we see our mission as training people for a specific career, and around half of those whom we train have no realistic chance of working in that field, then we fail in our core mission about as often as we succeed. On the other hand, if we think (as I believe most journalism educators *do* think) that we do effective work with young people regardless of whether they proceed to work as journalists, then our mission cries out for a restatement.

The alternative – holding course with the current paradigm – is, in my view, approximately as wise a tactic as it would be for a pilot who, flying blind through cloud with dead instruments, knows that a mountain lies straight ahead.

"Turn!" this steadfast captain's co-pilot might suggest, with restrained frenzy.

"Why?" the pilot might respond. "Flying straight has worked out pretty well so far."

"But – the mountain!"

"True," quoth the pilot, "but there are other mountains."

"Captain, we must turn!"

"Perhaps, but which way?"

With luck, we may find an answer before flames engulf us.

Popular Adjustments to the Paradigm

The fact that many journalism graduates proceed to careers other than journalism is neither new information nor any more innately problematic than the fact that few history, political science, or psychology graduates make a living as historians, politicians, or psychologists. But while an academic program's success is not best judged by graduates' career paths, a different logic is demanded of programs that teach professional skills and habits; these "preparation" programs, as Stark terms them, must and do live in the shadow of graduates' career paths, and the way educators discuss such programs' goals, curriculum, and success, day by day, is profoundly different from the discourse of social science and humanities teachers. We may or may not think of ourselves as running "trade schools," but our curricula are clearly and obviously driven by the teaching of a trade – the skills, values, and habits that pertain to the doing of journalism. As Stark put it: "Faculty in the preparation programs teach academic content, necessary professional skills, and the context of the profession, thus preparing the graduate to enter practice at a basic competency level" (Stark 1998).

Do all law school graduates go on to practise law, and all nursing students to be nurses? Of course not, but if, in fact, the ratio of practitioners to non-practitioners among their graduates should turn out to be as low as appears to be true for journalism graduates, then I would argue that those schools, too, were due for a paradigm check, notwithstanding that those disciplines, too, are excellent preparations for a variety of walks of life.

One common response to the paradigmatic challenge is the "vote with your feet" argument, which runs this way: these are journalism programs, so if students don't want to be journalists or are not suitable for that career, they should not be admitted those programs, or, once admitted, they should understand they are in the wrong place – and leave. This response, while strictly logical, is unlikely to be written into a journalism school's business plan, and it is also a rather harsh message to deliver to, say, a twenty-one-year-old undergraduate with two years' worth of more-or-less untransferable professional credits already under her belt.

More commonly, educators acknowledge that a professional program should indeed be guided by the presumed requirements of its graduates' realistic career trajectories, while taking a broad view of those trajectories. Classically, this response will prominently include the word "transferable" in regard to skills learned in a journalism program: research, interviewing, communication, and more.

There is no disputing the transferability of learned journalism skills: while carrying out increasingly complex journalistic tasks, students learn how to ask strangers for information, to conduct in-depth research, to think sceptically, and to craft raw information into effective stories using multiple media forms. These are indeed valuable competencies for diverse careers (public policy, investment analysis, scholarly and applied research, teaching, law, public relations, nongovernmental advocacy and more), and to study and work in a place where these skills are learned and practised daily is not just a challenging, stimulating, and useful educational experience for all concerned; it's also enormous fun.

One conclusion that might be drawn from the foregoing description of journalism study is that the variety of career outcomes is best ignored, because practical pedagogy depends on a pragmatic focus for its effectiveness. Therefore, in this view, the individual student's realistic career goals and capacities are largely irrelevant to curricular development. At its baldest, this argument states that the realistic career prospects of the majority of our students are *accidental side-effects of how we spend our time and energy as teachers*! Few would be comfortable with saying such a thing out loud, whether to students, their bill-paying parents, or academic colleagues in other disciplines. Or, for that matter, to taxpayers: many professional programs, including journalism, rely on substantially smaller class sizes than do arts courses – a greater cost than can easily be justified without arguing that the professional degree is more *useful* than the arts degree. And such an argument is patently damaged by what can only be termed a "career-agnostic professional" (!) approach.

For these reasons, however pragmatically appealing it may be to believe that diverse career paths should not be an active consideration for curriculum, such a course is inconsistent both with accountability (how we measure success) and with transparency (how we justify and market our schools). What might replace the lucky-accidents paradigm for journalism education's mission? In the remainder of this paper, I will argue for the following answer: *journalism is an approach to knowledge, not just a job, and journalism education is therefore about teaching a distinctive epistemology that enjoys broad professional utility.*

Journalism as an Approach to Knowledge (Not a Job)

Knowledge is a "true belief that has been justified and not defeated" (Lyne 1981, 146; Lehrer and Paxson 1969, 225). For convenience, we might give a one-word name to this process of becoming convinced of a belief's authenticity: let us call it *factualization*. Factualization lies at the heart of various kinds of scientific work, of course, but it is also close, at least, to the heart of what journalists do. As Zelizer put it, journalists are "preoccupied" with ideas about truth; they exhibit a "reverence for facts" that frequently attracts justified criticism as displaying indifference to factualization's cultural context (2004, 187). Of course, every discipline rests on some kind of epistemological framework, whether explicit (as in more academically oriented areas) or implicit (as in more practical or "trade"-based education). What makes journalism's approach to factualization distinct can be described under at least three headings: its scope or subject matter, its purpose, and the nature of what passes for fact.

Regarding the subject matter of journalistic factualization, Park's description of news as a set of transient, ephemeral, and isolated events continues to resonate. Today's journalist, at least, pays substantially more attention to causality and context than Park contemplated, but he was right to distinguish journalism from history precisely by their distinct stances with respect to connections drawn across time: the journalist, he said, is "concerned with the past and future only in so far as these throw light on what is actual and present" (1940, 675).

With an eye to purpose, a journalist's job may be seen as knowledge transportation: she moves pieces of information, one by one, from private places, where they are "known" to a few, to public places, where they will become "known" to many. This impulse to publicity seems so fundamental to the profession as to merit part of the definition of journalism itself, as I have suggested previously: "The word journalism is not used for insider-to-insider communication within organizations and closed communities; rather, journalism seeks, by definition, to broaden the boundaries within which information is known and understood. Implications of this idea include that journalists prefer plain language and engaging media forms, and that they see themselves as accountable not just to employers or peers but to a broader public" (Shapiro 2014, 560).

Beyond its timely, event-driven subject matter and its driving impulse toward engagement with wider audiences, how discrete is the way that journalists think about factualization? Here we arrive at the root epistemological question: What counts as truth in journalism? In a much reprinted and cited work, Ettema and Glasser sought to establish a binary difference between two different journalistic epistemologies. They depicted the daily reporter as something of a simple-fact-channelling bureaucrat, less concerned with veracity than with accurate attribution, whereas the "investigative" journalist pores through a wide array of types of facts, assessing their quality and connecting the dots to "justify the larger truth of the story" (1985, 188, 202) It seems doubtful that journalistic knowledge ever fell so neatly into just two baskets; certainly, in the contemporary newsroom, daily reporting may include investigative aspects, and investigations must sometimes be completed on deadline; besides, the *n* of self-styled journalists includes workers in the fields of sports, arts, and lifestyle, and others whose approaches to knowledge likely fall somewhere on the spectrum between the Ettema–Glasser types.

A 2013 study led by Colette Brin and myself suggested that journalists' reconstructions of their approaches to and processes for verifying facts seemed driven only in part by the professional locus of the reporter and the presence or absence of deadline pressure. At least as significant was the type of "fact" being interrogated (or not): the spelling of a proper name, for instance, assumed more importance than aspects of a source's personal history (unsurprisingly, demonstrable accuracy in defamatory material was most important of all) (Shapiro et al. 2013). This suggests that journalists adopt a pragmatic, utilitarian approach to factualization.[3] When a journalist thinks about how she knows what she knows about current events, her concern is neither abstract nor ideological; she lives, as Carey put it, in "a world of practices" rather than "disembodied ideas" (1997, 331). Indeed, all journalism is a "concrete discursive practice situated in a particular place and time" (Charron and de Bonville 2004, 33).

Journalists, then, are not much concerned with the idea or nature of "knowing," yet they are preoccupied with the quest to know. Their "knowing" is event-driven and time-sensitive, motivated by an impulse to engage broad audiences with information that is useful insofar as it is reliable. Their epistemological homeland is the swath of ever-shifting sands lying between the city of Belief and the village of Proven Fact. Journalists wander this dust-blown landscape, little interested, professionally speaking, in either town; beliefs are mere questions, at best, and by the time something is a known "fact," the journalist's attention has long roamed elsewhere.

But journalists share this wild midland territory with fellow-travellers. The journalistic approach to knowledge – temporal, pragmatic, and outwardly focused – is also the approach of others whose professional interests include understanding and explaining current events, and who therefore may frequently adopt a similar epistemological stance. And this is why journalism education may redefine itself legitimately as broad career preparation – not accidentally (as a side effect of training for a particular job) but paradigmatically (as the teaching of a particular approach to acquiring, parsing, and mobilizing knowledge about current events).

Given its scope, motive, and pragmatism, how may this "particular" approach to knowledge be recognized and learned? I have previously argued that the practice of journalism comprises, by definition, the array of activities intrinsically connected with "an independent pursuit of accurate information about current or recent events and its original presentation for public edification" (Shapiro 2014; see also Brethour et al. 2012) If so, then journalism itself may be seen as built upon four key epistemological principles according to which knowledge of current events (1) may practically be pursued independently, (2) is rendered reliable through a process of verification, (3) may aptly be understood as comprising narratives, and (4) is efficiently disseminated through clear and engaging styles and formats.

None of these statements is self-evident; each deserves more extensive analysis than is possible here, but I will nevertheless explain a little more fully what I mean by them.

(1) Knowledge about current events may practically be pursued independently

It has long been established that an "objective" representation of events is impossible, that many journalists continue to aspire to some version of this impossibility as an ideal, and that the adoption of objective "voice" in journalistic performance has aspects of insidious ritual (Broersma 2010; Deuze 2005, 446–47; Tuchman 1972; Soffer 2009). But from an epistemological (rather than performative) perspective, the idea of "independent pursuit" is both more modest than either ontology or ethics, and, in a sense, more scientific – or at least science-inspired. Just as a reputable piece of science must be conducted in the absence of biasing factors, so is it "definitive," as I have previously argued, that "journalists seek information … based on that information's interest to themselves and to their audiences, rather than their, their employer's, or their sources' interests in [achieving] a particular outcome" (Shapiro 2014, 560). When an airline's public relations officer interviews a maintenance manager about safety procedures, the PR man's interest in the obtained information's becoming more widely known (or not) is directly aligned with that of the manager, or at least of the manager's employer: if the airline prospers from the result of the work, then so, in principle, will the PR man. A journalistic investigator conducting the same interview might benefit from a particular line of inquiry (e.g., her reputation might rise through a scandalous discovery), so she is far from "objective," but her stake in the outcome is definitively distinct from (independent of) the consequences for source and company.

This independence is substantially less than perfect (compared, for example, to that of a double-blind clinical study conducted by medical researchers using arm's-length funding) but may be seen as an effective pragmatic stance toward the collection of information that, in combination with the following additional elements, is likely to produce a broadly acceptable degree of factual reliability.

(2) Knowledge about current events is rendered reliable through a process of verification

Kovach and Rosenstiel famously described the "discipline of verification" as the "essence" of journalism (2007, 12–13). Those authors are among others who have redirected the conversation about journalistic objectivity from the journalist's state of mind to her method of inquiry (Turner and Kearns 2010; Ward 2004; Figdor 2010). Epistemologically, this translates into a statement that the extent to which beliefs about current events are legitimated as knowledge will reflect the degree of rigour with which the inquirer (e.g., the journalist) brings scrutiny to bear on alleged facts. As an intellectual activity, this investigative approach to available information may (with unsatisfactory imprecision, in my view) also be described as critical thinking. The standards for this process of examination operate not only on a wide spectrum of acceptable degrees of factuality (see the Shapiro–Brin study referred to above) but also on a spectrum of acceptable depth from "mere" accuracy (the correctness of individual facts) to contextualized factuality, which implies relevance to the purpose and social importance of the inquiry.

(3) Knowledge about current events may aptly be understood as comprising narratives

A unit of journalistic work is most commonly termed a "story," and G. Stuart Adam has argued persuasively that an approach to narration must be counted among the essential elements or principles that make up works of journalism. Although forms of narrative will vary among different "story" types and media, Adam writes that the narrator in journalism uses the same devices as do all storytellers: "plot, characterization, action, dialogue, sequencing, dramatization, causation, myth, metaphor, and explanation." Part of what makes the journalistic approach to knowledge distinct from that of much science, including social science, and from most humanitarian work, is that it places a premium on sorting information into these building blocks of character and action, whether this story is delivered as the simple who-what-where-when-why of the basic news story or in a deeper form that foregrounds more complex elements of causation, character, and context (2006, 358–60).

(4) Clear and engaging styles and formats are efficient methods of disseminating knowledge about current events

The roots of this point, once again, have been classically articulated by Adam: "Whatever else might be said about the language of journalism, it is fair to say that it is disciplined by its public and empirical character. Its vocabulary is the vocabulary of public discourse. It may strive to represent scientific ideas or the abstract notions of philosophy, but it … always uses a vocabulary that can be understood in the street or in the marketplace" (2006, 358).

The preference for plain language is no mere habit of journalistic practice; it goes to the very purpose of knowledge within journalism's epistemic framework, which is, as noted above, the transfer of understanding from insider-knowers to outsiders who might thus become knowers (Shapiro 2014, 560).

The Journalistic Epistemology as a Paradigm of Journalism Education

Given what has been said about journalism as an epistemology, it follows that the operating paradigm of journalism curriculum might be redefined without reference to job training, and without loss of substance, as follows:

> Journalism education is the teaching of an independent approach to the discovery, interpretation, and communication of knowledge about current events that seeks to identify and convey demonstrably accurate facts in the form of engaging narratives for public edification.

This paradigm may be parsed into five key elements. First, the *subject matter* of journalism's epistemological framework is, by definition, restricted to knowledge of current events, not, for example, conditions of nature, philosophical arguments, or historical inquiry. Second, the *stance* of the seeker of knowledge is similarly definitive: the inquirer adopts a position, with respect to the knowledge sought, that is independent of the consequences of the discovery or dissemination of such knowledge. Third, the seeker adopts a critical *lens* with regard to alleged information, which involves a questioning attitude and the submission of obtained information to some form of verification, although the investigative norms adopted will vary from one situation to another. Fourth, the seeker's task will be focused on finding and constructing *narratives* about people, rather than "bare facts" or abstract accounts. And finally, because the entire effort of inquiry is strategically oriented toward *dissemination* for a wider audience, the narrative techniques adopted will be calculated to achieve maximum clarity and engagement with non-knowers.

It is no accident that the logic of this paradigmatic approach (subject matter >> independent stance >> critical lens >> narrative focus >> engaging technique) echoes the process of the journalistic craft (roughly: topic choice >> sourcing and research >> verification >> story-shaping >> production). Nor, therefore, should it surprise that the logic of a curriculum driven by the proposed epistemology-centred paradigm would, in some large measure, reflect that of the existing craft-centred paradigm. Nevertheless, the change of paradigm would (or at least should) make a practical difference to learning and teaching.

One thing that would shift is discourse, both within and outside the classroom. To the extent that ideas about knowledge are present in current journalism-education discourse, these ideas tend to be items of rhetorical rather than curricular interest– that is, the conversation tends to be about making the argument for journalism education, rather than about what we teach or how we teach it. When journalism educators discuss course changes, describe existing courses, plan course delivery, or hire for course teaching, they tend to divide courses into two quite distinct categories, often called "theory" and "craft." The theory courses may or may not address general epistemological issues related to journalism; the craft courses rarely do so, at least not explicitly. So we may talk *about* journalists' approaches to knowledge, in theory, and we may teach future journalists *how* to do things that have epistemological implications or roots. But we rarely connect the dots between *about* and *how*.

A new paradigm would change discourse in two ways. First, to some degree, the presence of such a paradigm should encourage teachers of craft to lead their students in reflection about questions such as what it means – at least for the purposes of journalism – when we say that something is "known." This is by no means alien territory; many journalism students are, I am sure, frequently enjoined to ask questions that are essentially epistemic, such as, "How do sources of alleged information know what they say, or think they know?" Or, "What story does this set of information seem to tell?" Or, "How may this knowledge be shared with other people in a clear and engaging way?" But the more important dialogical transformation would be in frame of reference: instead of speaking about journalism as *the* career for which we are training, we would be speaking about professional journalism as an example – even the archetypal example – of knowledge work for which our students are being prepared. This would not be much different from the idea of education in history or chemistry: every student and instructor in such programs knows that some archetypal graduates will become professional historians or chemistry researchers, even as most students expect to use the knowledge and habits learned in other ways (as teachers, lawyers, politicians, health-care practitioners, engineers, and more).

Similarly in a journalism program, a future lawyer should not feel like a second-class beneficiary of side-effect education. Today, the journalism freshman's first exit from the classroom to interview people is seen as boot-camp training for a future based outside the newsroom; tomorrow, the same activity might be seen as more like a gross anatomy class for most first-year medical students: even though few will become surgeons and fewer will be pathologists, they cut up cadavers because it is a pragmatically effective way to begin understanding how the human body works and thinking about it unsentimentally and mechanistically. No less do journalism students need to develop new habits of thinking and discovery, from the get-go.

The skills learned in the course of a knowledge-centred program would be skills already recognizable among quality career-centred journalism programs today – skills like news-driven story-focusing, inventive sourcing, exploratory interviewing, fact-checking, plain writing, arresting photography, data analysis and visualization, multimedia production, and many more. For the future investment analysts, lawyers, policy advisers, researchers, and, yes, producers and reporters and editors whom we teach, the writing of a news report or a feature article, or the production of a broadcast news item or documentary, or the interactive, questioning engagement with knowledgeable people and ordinary people, or the compiling of data into a current graphic, or the understanding of what makes a "story" new or fresh will be seen and described as practical tools for gaining and disseminating knowledge about current events. But, under the new paradigm, the content of craft courses might, as students gain experience with basic news forms, branch out to trying the epistemological tools associated with "non-journalism" pursuits such as social policy research or public opinion polling, as well as experimentation with wholly new tools and forms.

There is a potentially (but not necessarily) problematic flip side to this prospect: at the moment, journalism educators often see themselves as in partnership with, and even accountable to, the news industry. Some teachers may even see their core task as being to mirror industry practice in the classroom. Industry partners might not be enthusiastic about an approach to education that takes a broader approach to its purpose and accountability. Changing these widespread expectations of industry mimicry would not be easy.

At the same time, I suspect, reconceived journalism degrees might a little more closely resemble the humanities and social sciences than other so-called professional programs. Understanding of society, its history, economics, politics, and culture, would no longer be seen as something to be learned in the student's academic elective courses but as part of core program curriculum, just as calculus and biology are core knowledge for engineering and medicine, and macroeconomics for political science. Assignment descriptions might be slightly tweaked to draw more explicit emphasis to knowledge questions, thus:

- "How badly damaged is the clinic that burned on Mulberry Street yesterday, and how will this affect medical care downtown? Give your findings in the form of a 400-word news report (or 90-second video news report)."
- "How have sale prices for new and used cars risen and/or fallen since the Saudi King's death, and why? Answer this question in a news feature based on a minimum of four expert interviews plus bibliographic research."
- "Is sexual harassment of men by women more or less frequent now than in the past? How much? How does it compare to the harassment of women by men? Your 5-minute audio mini-documentary should reflect the weight of published research data, and a range of informed opinion, and be supplemented by an annotated bibliography ready for web-publication."

At a certain point, roughly equivalent to the point at which a major needs to be locked in within many general arts programs, I suspect that students would stream themselves into specialization either in the professional application of the news epistemology (i.e., journalism craft) or in broader reflection on the nature of knowledge of current events (in preparation for non-journalism careers or graduate studies in a related disciplines). It is at this point that the weight of "theory" and "practice" might shift toward one pole or another of the praxis continuum.

These thoughts on a paradigm adjustment's curriculum effects are merely speculative. Curriculum revision is complicated, as anyone involved in it can attest, and its possibilities are interwoven with too many variables (involving logistics, human and financial resources, and institutional context) for any single voice in the process to mean as much as outsiders might imagine. But one thing would necessarily change, perhaps profoundly, as a result of the kind of paradigm adjustment floated here: the articulation and measurement of success in curriculum design and delivery. "Success" for a journalism educator, course, or program would need to be described in terms of learning outcomes, not hiring patterns. If a graduate were demonstrably able to articulate a clear research question on a matter related to current events, to plan a research strategy that included appropriate verification measures and engagement with people's stories, and to disseminate the knowledge gained in a form that widened the realm in which knowledge of these matters were appreciated, then that graduate would be a success story, no matter where she ended up, career-wise.

Conclusion: A Turn for the Better?

Relying on learning outcomes rather than career paths as a benchmark for success would pull journalism programs subtly closer in purpose to the humanities and social sciences. This movement would be reinforced by other effects of paradigm change, including a more cohesive integration of theory with practice than in past years (Gasher 2005). But the non-fiction story in all its forms (e.g., news, feature, documentary, multimedia, live blog) would remain the principal form of focusing, crafting, and disseminating the fruits of knowledge about current events. And the ways in which students gain adeptness in the seeking and dissemination of knowledge will continue to feel practical, challenging, and fun.

All students – not just those bound for journalism careers – would potentially benefit from this refocused approach to program. But this does not mean that the transition would be simple; to the contrary, our carefully turned aircraft would likely confront obstacles that could be higher, even, than the avoided mountain. The most obvious of these obstacles include current faculty members' preparedness to teach a curriculum that has been conceptualized around knowledge rather than craft, and the daunting challenge of articulating and "selling" a program that groups hitherto diffuse career paths into a single category. One especially important rhetorical and promotional puzzle concerns naming: What are we to call a program that is conceived around an epistemological framework rather than a readily identifiable discipline or career? One of my colleagues recently suggested that our own journalism school offer a "BA in Non-Fictional Representations of the World of All Kinds." I am not fully certain he was joking about the name, but he was implicitly floating a paradigm shift not greatly dissimilar from the one proposed here.

Another problem with the new paradigm is especially ironic, given that its motivation is at least in part an attempt to close the gap between curriculum focus and realistic career prospects. It is a truism that a substantial number of journalism graduates see their education as excellent preparation for public relations or various other types of professional communications work. Indeed, intimacy with journalists' workflow will benefit any career involving media relations. That intimacy will continue to be inculcated by any practice-based journalism program, including one built upon the paradigm proposed here. Yet a more canonical emphasis on independent stance and critical lens will hardly help attract potential students, or comfort current ones, who are bent on PR careers.

On the other hand, that same canonical rigour will keep us honest and untie our aspirations from the exigencies of failing business models. In moving away from mirroring current industry practice as a universal norm for classroom practice, programs would almost automatically foster greater intellectual risk-taking and experimentation with forms and approaches (Stephens 2000). Too often, industry practices are of the lowest-common-denominator type, driven more by commercial considerations, such as productivity, than by what Stephens calls "quality" or "wisdom" journalism, by which he means journalism that goes beyond bare reporting, laying out the five W's in clear writing, to the production of "stories that are interpretive, informed, intelligent, interesting and insightful" (2009).

I suspect that many journalism educators consider themselves to be already on that journey. The paradigm shift I have suggested may or may not be the right turn to take, but turn we must, lest our fate be similar to those faced by news companies that denied the looming crash until they, too, felt the flames

NOTES

[1] My own j-school, Ryerson, voluntarily reduced new enrolments by 20 per cent effective September 2015 to maintain admission standards in the face of declining applications.

[2] This paper attempts no distinction between the ideas of "professional journalism" and "journalism craft" and uses the term "professional education" to distinguish between purely academic programs and those focused on career preparation. It therefore intentionally avoids the enduring controversy over whether or not journalism is usefully described as a profession. (Aldridge and Evetts 2003; Allison 1986; Banning 1999; Beam, Weaver, and Brownlee 2009; Davis 2010; Deuze 2005; Singer 2003)

[3] Brin and I suggested that journalists' descriptions of verification echoed Tuchman's (1972) idea of "objectivity" as a "strategic ritual"; that is, verification might function as a pragmatic norm that legitimizes a journalist's distinct social role.

REFERENCES

Adam, G. Stuart. 2006. “Notes Towards a Definition of Journalism: Understanding an Old Craft as an Art Form.” In *Journalism: The Democratic Craft.* Edited by G. Stuart Adam and Roy Peter Clark. 344–70. New York: Oxford University Press.

Aldridge, Meryl, and Julia Evetts. 2003. “Rethinking the Concept of Professionalism: The Case of Journalism.” *British Journal of Sociology* 54, no. 4: 547–64. doi:10.1080/0007131032000143582

Allison, Marianne. 1986. “A Literature Review of Approaches to the Professionalism of Journalists.” *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 1, no. 2: 5–19.

Banning, Stephen A. 1999. “The Professionalization of Journalism: A Nineteenth-Century Beginning.” *Journalism History* 24, no. 4: 157–63.

Beam, Randal A., David H. Weaver, and Bonnie J. Brownlee. 2009. “Changes in Professionalism of U.S. Journalists in the Turbulent Twenty-First Century.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 86, no. 2: 277–98.

Brethour, Patrick, Tim Currie, Meredith Levine, Connie Monk, and Ivor Shapiro. 2012. “What Is Journalism?” *Canadian Association of Journalists Ethics Advisory Committee / J-Source*. 17 July. http://j-source.ca/article/what-journalism

Broersma, Marcel. 2010. “The Unbearable Limitations of Journalism.” *International Communication Gazette* 72, no. 1: 21–33. doi:10.1177/1748048509350336

Carey, James W. 1997. “Afterword: The Culture in Question.” In *James Carey: A Critical Reader*. 308-400. Edited by Eve Munson and Catherine Warren. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Charron, Jean, and Jean de Bonville. 2004. “La Notion de Paradigme Jounalistique: Aspects Théorique et Empirique.” In *Nature et Transformation Du Journalisme. Théorie et Recherches Empiriques*. Edited by Colette Brin, Jean Charron, and Jean de Bonville. 33–55. Québec: Les Presses de l’Université Laval.

Coulson, Melanie. 2014. “Journalism Program on Hold Another Year at uOttawa.” *J-Source*. 5 March. http://www.j-source.ca/article/journalism-program-hold-another-year-uottawa

Davis, Michael. 2010. “Why Journalism Is a Profession.” In *Journalism Ethics: A Philosophical Approach*. Edited by Christopher Meyers. 91-102.New York: Oxford University Press.

Deuze, Mark. 2005. “What Is Journalism?: Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered.” *Journalism* 6, no. 4:: 442–64.

Ettema, James S., and Theodore L. Glasser. 1985. "On the Epistemology of Investigative Journalism." *Communication* 8: 183–206. doi:0305-4233/85/0802-0183S25.00/0

Figdor, Carrie. 2010. "Objectivity in the News: Finding a Way Forward." *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 25, no. 1: 19–33.

Gasher, Mike J. 2005. "Commentary: It's Time to Redefine Journalism Education in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 30, no. 4: 665-672.

Knox, Paul, and Abby Goodrum. 2007. "Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope." Paper delivered to World Journalism Education Congress, Singapore, June 2007 (unpublished).

Kovach, Bill, and Tom Rosenstiel. 2007. *The Elements of Journalism: What Newspeople Should Know and the Public Should Expect*. 1st rev. ed. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Lehrer, Keith, and Thomas Paxson, Jr. 1969. "Knowledge: Undefeated Justified True Belief." *Journal of Philosophy* 66, no. 8: 225–37.

Lyne, John Russell. 1981. "Rhetoric and Everyday Knowledge." *Central States Speech Journal* 32, no. 3: 145–52. doi:10.1080/10510978109368090

Park, Robert E. 1940. "News as a Form of Knowledge: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge." *American Journal of Sociology* 45, no. 5: 669–86. doi:10.2307/2770043

Reid, Brennan. 2014. "St. Lawrence College Suspends Its Two-Year Journalism Diploma." *J-Source*. 16 November. http://www.j-source.ca/article/st-lawrence-college-suspends-its-two-year-journalism-diploma

Shapiro, Ivor. 2014. "Why Democracies Need a Functional Definition of Journalism Now More Than Ever." *Journalism Studies* 15, no. 5: 555–65. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2014.882483

Shapiro, Ivor, Colette Brin, Isabelle Bédard-Brûlé, and Kasia Mychajlowycz. 2013. "Verification as a Strategic Ritual." *Journalism Practice* 7, no. 6: 657–73. doi:10.1080/17512786.2013.765638

Singer, Jane B. 2003. "Who Are These Guys?: The Online Challenge to the Notion of Journalistic Professionalism." *Journalism* 4, no. 2: 139–63. doi:10.1177/146488490342001

Skelton, Chad. 2013. "No Fewer Journalists Today Than 10 Years Ago: Statistics Canada." *Vancouver Sun*. 19 August. http://blogs.vancouversun.com/2013/08/19/no-fewer-journalists-today-than-10-years-ago-statistics-canada

Soffer, Oren. 2009. “The Competing Ideals of Objectivity and Dialogue in American Journalism.” *Journalism* 10, no. 4: 473–91.

Stark, Joan S. 1998. “Classifying Professional Preparation Programs.” *Journal of Higher Education* 69, no. 4: 353–83.

Stephens, Mitchell. 2000. “A J-School Manifesto.” *Columbia Journalism Review*, October, 63–65.

– . 2009. “Beyond News: The Case for Wisdom Journalism.” Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics, and Public Policy. http://www.hks.harvard.edu/presspol/publications/papers/discussion_papers/d53_stephens.pdf

Tuchman, Gaye. 1972. “Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen’s Notions of Objectivity.” *American Journal of Sociology* 77, no. 4: 660–79.

Turner, Brian, and Judith Kearns. 2010. “Pragmatic Objectivity in Practice: Reading the *Globe and Mail* Columns of Christie Blatchford.” *Canadian Journal of Communication* 35, no. 1: 63–83.

Ward, Stephen J.A. 2004. *The Invention Of Journalism Ethics: The Path to Objectivity and Beyond*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill–Queen’s University Press.

Wong, Jan. 2013. “Canadian Media Guild Data Shows 10,000 Job Losses in Past Five Years.” *J-Source.ca: The Canadian Journalism Project*. 19 November. http://j-source.ca/article/canadian-media-guild-data-shows-10000-job-losses-past-five-years

Zelizer, Barbie. 2004. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

A Foucauldian Foray into How Power Operates When Journalists and Public Relations Officers Meet

Chantal Francoeur

This paper addresses two pressing questions facing journalists and journalism educators today: What are we to make of the ever-increasing presence of the public relations industry on the contemporary journalistic landscape? And how can we modernize our teaching so that it accurately reflects the current relationship between these two professions? This paper proposes a theoretical framework that will help us unpack these questions and that contains within it a dynamic and generative understanding of power – a crucial component of the relationship that reporters and PR officers share. For though journalists and PR officers work together, interacting on a daily basis, their agendas are not the same: the former claim to serve the public interest; the latter work on behalf of a client's "best" interests. In a context in which many organizations are setting up websites that look like journalism to promote their activities, and where forms such as sponsored content (i.e., native advertising) are experiencing rapid growth, the boundaries between journalism, advertising, and PR are becoming more difficult to delineate. What is lacking is a theoretical framework that is complex enough, and nuanced enough, to shed light on the workings of power within this tangled relationship.

I will be applying a Foucauldian theoretical framework to the interaction between journalism and the PR industry in order to demonstrate how a journalistic discourse that produces truth/knowledge, and hence generates power, not only has the capacity to work *against* PR but in fact is more likely to work *alongside* PR. More importantly, I argue that the journalistic discourse cannot work *without* PR – PR, in this context, being itself a "knowledge system, a discourse technology, a power effect and a subjectifying practice" (Motion and Leitch 2009, 92). Foucault (1982), in describing how a power relationship functions, puts his finger on the dynamics: "Every power relationship implies, at least in potentia, a strategy of struggle, in which the two forces are not super-imposed, do not lose their specific nature, or do not finally become confused. Each constitutes for the other a kind of permanent limit, a point of possible reversal" (794). It is precisely this "permanent limit," this "point of possible reversal," that I want to focus on here, to show not only how it is constitutive of the relationship between journalism and the PR industry

– each acting as a permanent limit, a point of possible reversal, to and for the other – but also how it underlies and informs journalism's determined struggle to not "become confused" with PR.

In the first section of this paper I review the scholarly definitions of these two professions and how they intersect and interact. I then detail how PR manoeuvres its way into and through the journalistic profession. I also unpack the journalist's role as gatekeeper and suggest how gatekeeping allows journalists to exert powers of their own. Delving, next, into official documentation issued by the Quebec Federation of Professional Journalists (FPJQ) and the Quebec Society of PR Professionals (SQPRP), I highlight the similarities between these two sets of texts and discuss why they matter when it comes to analysing and assessing how power operates in the relationship between these respective professions. In the latter part of the paper I link these observations to Foucault's work. I then outline how the resulting theoretical framework can be applied to a range of research questions pertaining to the relationship between PR and journalism. For example, I am currently using it for a research project examining how Quebec reporters talk about their relationship to PR (Boulay and Francoeur 2013, 2014; Francoeur 2015).

Two Professions Interacting

The Definitions

There is no single definition of PR. Some refer to it as "communicating to serve a client's needs" in order to convince or influence various publics (Grunig and Hunt 1984; Maisonneuve 2010). For others, its primary obligation is to defend a client's point of view and reputation at all costs, even if that means lying (Dagenais 2011). Still others talk about PR as an enterprise devoted to the "control of information" (Charron 1994; Davis 2002), or they liken it to a "propaganda machine" (Stauber and Rampton 1995; McChesney, cited in Sullivan 2011). More recently, PR has been dubbed "responsible communication" or "fair communication" (Durif and Corriveau 2012).

In the same way, no single all-encompassing definition exists for journalism. Sometimes it is referred to as the fourth estate. Journalists themselves have been described variously as gatekeepers, agenda setters, and democracy watchdogs (McCombs and Shaw 1972), or as professionals working either in the public interest or in the interests of the elite (Chomsky and Herman 1988).

The Work

Though their personal job descriptions and broader mandates might differ, journalists and PR officers are closely connected. Press releases and other communications issued by PR sources take up a significant amount of space in the news (Davis 2002; Manning 2008; Sullivan 2011; Sissons 2012). In 2008, in a British study, Lewis, Williams, and Franklin found that 54 per cent of print stories and 58 per cent of broadcast news stories "are informed by PR" (10). Twenty years earlier, Tremblay and colleagues (1988) had studied the same phenomenon in Quebec and concluded that 47 per cent of regional news stories were derived from what they termed “le discours promotionnel” (promotional discourse) (16).

Given the dramatic changes over the past decade in how news is produced, these percentages are probably increasing. Reporters have less time to research their own stories. With more deadlines to meet and more platforms to feed, reporters are increasingly treating PR material as “ready for online” content (Lewis, Williams, and Franklin 2008; Francoeur 2012). The Pew Research Center’s (2010) study of Baltimore’s media “ecosystem” found, for example, that “as news is posted faster … official press releases often appear word for word in first accounts of events, though often not noted as such.”

The Product

Explanations vary as to why journalists are using press releases and other PR-based communications more and more often in their news stories. Some attribute this to a lack of meaningful independent journalistic activity (Lewis, Williams, and Franklin 2008); others talk of a “colonization of news discourse by PR” (Erjavec 2005, 173); still others see it as a sign and/or symptom of “alienated journalism” (Larsson 2009, 132). Davies (2008) has coined the word “churnalism,” while Davis (2002) speaks of “public relations democracy.” Then there are those who suggest that PR officers and journalists are “co-constructers” of the final news product (Heath 2000; Maisonneuve 2010).

Clearly, the links between PR and journalism are receiving a good deal of scholarly attention. At the same time, a new lens through which to assess and analyse the relationship in the post-convergence age is badly needed. Such a lens must be sensitive to the workings of power within this relationship; it must also lend itself to the development of a theoretical framework that can adequately account for the nuances inherent in all power relationships. In the next section I show how PR can manoeuvre its way into what I will describe later as the *technology* of journalism discourse.

PR Here, There, and Everywhere versus Journalists as Gatekeepers

From choosing a topic and an angle, to gathering sounds and/or quotes, to sourcing and collecting appropriate images, PR professionals know all about newsrooms’ routines. They can step in at any stage of the process, passing out press releases, putting journalists in contact with sources, arranging reporters’ access to people, locations, documents, and so on, and in so doing, advancing their own agendas. With their “ready for publication” material that can easily be transformed into news, the PR industry is able to infiltrate, influence, transform, and exploit the newsroom’s routines and formats.

The job of journalists is to cast doubt, to double-check, to look for the contradictions, to refute, to supplement, to reject the information that comes to them from PR. Reporters are in fact *required* to be sceptical and critical. Articles 2 and 3 of the Fédération professionnelle des journalistes du Québec (FPJQ)

Code of Ethics state that “a journalist’s work is based on fundamental values, such as thinking critically and by extension, questioning everything,” which means “applying rigorous standards to the collection and verification of any information they use”.[1]

Furthermore, it is journalists who ultimately decide what gets broadcast, printed, or posted online. It is journalists who make that final editorial decision as to what makes it into a news story. To quote Article 5(d) from the FPJQ’s (1996) Code of Ethics: “Journalists are under no obligation to broadcast or publish information in accordance with the wishes of a source. It is up to individual journalists to decide what information is pertinent, has merit and is in the public interest.”[2] In other words, journalists have a crucial role as “gatekeepers” (Shoemaker 1991). Gatekeeping not only gives journalists a means of imposing their own limit on PR but also ensures that the PR industry does not, to use Foucault’s (1982) term, “super-impose” itself on journalism.

Here is Cottle (2003) on the subject of this journalistic dance: “Here, then, a *processual* view of ritual is opened up, one in which the script is not thought to be exclusively owned by any one party whether news producers or particular sources, and where ‘ritual’ is often mobilised and contested in an unfolding ‘social drama’” (17). Cottle’s unpacking of the “processual view of ritual” bears a striking resemblance to Foucault’s “strategy of struggle” as it unfolds in the context of a power relationship; likewise, Cottle’s “script” that is not “exclusively owned” is another way of talking about Foucault’s “two forces” that are not “super-imposed”; finally, Cottle’s “unfolding ‘social drama’” with its mobilization and contestation of “ritual” resonates with Foucault’s own site of struggle: a site where each force becomes, to and for the other, as much “a kind of permanent limit” as “a point of possible reversal” (1982, 794).

The ongoing power struggle between these two professions does not end there, however. The struggle also takes place across a textual terrain – that is, in the official documentation that describes the playing field and designates the positions taken up by the players in each profession. In the following section, we examine documents produced by the associations representing these two professions in Quebec: the FPJQ (1996) for journalism, the SQPRP (2014) for the PR industry. What emerges from this brief survey will be incorporated into the Foucauldian theoretical framework developed later on in the paper, when the *apparatus* of journalism discourse will be discussed.

Turning the Spotlight on Textual Practices

Journalism as *PR: Articles 1, 2, and 3 of the* FPJQ Code of Ethics

The FPJQ represents 1,972 journalists; the SQPRP has only 600 members.[3] At first glance, what is striking about these associations’ official documents is how similar they are, from the general layout, to the descriptions of tasks, ethical codes, and standards, to the very vocabulary used. The documents issued by these associations define who their members are and what they do, for whom.

The FPJQ (1996) states in Article 1 of its Code of Ethics that "the term 'journalist' refers to anyone who works as a journalist for a news media institution." It then gives a dozen or so examples of what that work might consist of: researching, reporting, interviewing, editing, assigning, managing (the newsroom), and so forth.[4] As for the purpose of this work, it is laid out in the preamble to the FPJQ's Code of Ethics: "The primary role of journalists is to accurately report, analyze and comment upon what is happening around them so that their fellow citizens can learn more about the world they live in, and have a better understanding of that world."[5]

PR officers, for their part, are described in the SQPRP's Code of Ethics (2014[6]) as "professionals" who are "experts in managing organizations' relationship to their environment" and who help a particular organization reach its goals by providing "quality analysis" and by proposing "communication strategies and communication means that are both pertinent and effective." The document goes on to explain how PR professionals go about this task, placing a particular emphasis on their communication skills: "They manage an organization's communication requirements with a view to narrowing the gap between an organization's knowledge, perceptions and attitudes, and those of their public."[7]

Both professional associations also provide details of the institutions on which their members rely and from which they derive their legitimacy. Thus, the lifeblood of the journalist has its source in democratic values. Terms like "freedom of the press" and "the public's right to know" crop up frequently in FPJQ documents; its members, the association's Code of Ethics emphasizes, work in "the public interest," acting as "watchdogs" when it comes to safeguarding democracy and curtailing abuses of power. Journalists are seen by the FPJQ as having core values, among these, fairness, rigour, honesty, exactitude, integrity, and truthfulness.

The SQPRP documents make similar resort to democratic values, in particular "the right to free speech." They also call for recognition of the "professionalism of the PR practice." The keywords found throughout the SQPRP's Mission Statement and Code of Ethics are much the same as those found throughout the FPJQ documents. Besides possessing the same "core values" as journalists, PR professionals are described by their association as demonstrating excellence, leadership, innovation, and confidentiality. And like journalists, SQPRP expects its members to "work in accordance with the public interest when exercising their profession."[8]

With regard to both the FPJQ and the SQPRP, membership is not mandatory for practitioners, nor are journalists and PR officers in Quebec obliged to comply with the Codes of Ethics issued by their respective professional associations. In fact, in legal terms, neither is even a profession. Anybody can call herself a "journalist" or a "PR officer"; nothing exists to protect either job title. The FPJQ makes this very clear in the foreword to its Code of Ethics: "Given the particular nature of journalism in Quebec, whereby membership in a professional order is not mandatory, neither the title of 'journalist' nor the activity known as 'journalism' is reserved for a specific group of people. The world of journalism is an open world."[9] In practical terms, this means that if a reporter violates the FPJQ Code of Ethics, a citizen can lodge a formal complaint with the Quebec Press Council. The latter is an honorary tribunal with no formal disciplinary powers. The Quebec Press Council's decisions are public, however, and the council can issue an "official" warning that could lead to a reporter being publicly held to blame for the violation.

No similar tribunal exists in the PR world, but the SQPRP clearly states that one of its members (though not an ordinary citizen) can denounce a fellow member who is believed to be violating the association's Code of Ethics. If that should happen, "any offense will be dealt with by the Public Relations Profession society directly concerned, or passed on to the Canadian Public Relations Society (CPRS), depending on what the National Ethical Committee decides."[10] There is, however, no requirement for the SQPRP (or the CPRS) to make such a decision or the ensuing disciplinary process public knowledge.

This brief survey of documents suggests that there is little in either association's Code of Ethics that would help us distinguish between the two. This renders journalism even more susceptible to "infiltration" by the PR industry. Both professions produce copy intended to serve the best interests of "the" public (or at least, of "a" public). Add to this, journalists and PR officers often work together: the former chase down the latter for access to, or a statement from, a source; the latter often use the former to reach a wider audience. All of which only fosters the idea that they overlap substantially.

But journalists and PR officers are not the same: they do not share common goals, and their intentions are different. They have neither the same relationship with the public nor the same obligations toward that public. They each have their specific nature: journalists work on behalf of citizens, and their primary purpose is *to serve* the public interest; PR officers work for their clients, practising their profession *in accordance with* the public interest. How, then, do journalists make sure they are not being confused and conflated with PR practitioners? The answer is found in Articles 5 and 9 of the FPJQ Code of Ethics.

Journalism Is Not PR

Article 9(a) of the FPJQ Code of Ethics clearly states: "Journalists should abstain from engaging in certain communication-related activities that fall outside of the journalistic domain: among these, public relations, advertising, promotion, motivational speaking events that teach techniques for dealing with the media …"[11]

Article 5(d) in the same document is equally clear about the distinction between news and publicity material: "News copy and advertising copy are not the same, and should not be confused. Journalists do not write infomercials, for example. If they do, they must never put their signature on this kind of material."[12] Here, journalism is marking out its territory and distinguishing it from that of the publicist and the PR officer. The public must be left in no doubt that the information they are consuming bears the journalistic stamp: that it has been produced by a reporter, that it conforms with the profession's Code of Ethics (whether or not that "code" is legally binding), and that it is in the public interest. One could say that this "checklist," like gatekeeping, serves to maintain and reinforce journalism's power – that it pushes back against the PR industry's efforts to *act on* journalism; that it draws a clear boundary between itself and the PR industry to create "a kind of permanent limit" so that journalism "does not finally become confused" (Foucault 1982, 794) with PR. With these thoughts in mind, let us turn now to some basic Foucauldian concepts.

Journalism as a Discourse That Produces Power/Knowledge

Discourse, in this context, suggests construction – that is, construction of meaning, construction of signification, the kind of construction that "structures the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking" (Rose 2007, 142). Discourse, when used in the Foucauldian sense, is embodied in "sets of statements that form the objects, concepts, subjects, and strategies within the discourse" (Motion and Leitch 2009, 87). Discourse has its rules and its conventions, and it relies on those institutions within which and through which it is produced, circulated, reaffirmed, and reinforced.

In other words, discourse has power: the power to produce subjects, objects, ways of thinking, and ways of acting; the power to structure institutions. The power of discourse is not a repressive kind of power. Rather, it is a productive power – a power that ultimately produces knowledge and truth.[13] Discourse emanates from powerful social institutions (themselves already created by discourse) that diffuse and spread "truths." Their processes of production and circulation – their very routines and practices – all serve to confirm that particular discourse's "truth." So truth is "linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it" (Motion and Leitch 2009, 133).[14] This is how Foucault (1980) summarizes how discourse works: "We are subjected to the production of truth through power and we cannot exercise power except through the production of truth" (93).

Medical discourse, for example, refers to the specific language and vocabulary of medicine, to the specific knowledge that medicine produces, and to the professional institutions and social spaces that medicine occupies. It also refers to identities, occupations, and professions (i.e., to doctors, nurses, and patients) and to sickness itself. The medical discourse "constructs" what a doctor is and what a doctor does; likewise, the nurse and the patient; likewise, what qualifies as sickness and what does not. In the same way, journalistic discourse "constructs" what journalism is, who the journalist is, what the journalist does, and what constitutes news. Journalistic discourse defines what a "good" story is, how that story is put together and presented, who that story's appropriate sources are, and which institutions produce the "good" stories, when, and in what circumstances. Journalistic discourse also establishes what journalism is for, what its place in society is, and how it fits with other societal institutions. Each journalistic story confirms journalistic discourse. The same with journalistic institutions such as professional associations, those associations' Codes of Ethics or Charters, laws that incorporate terms like "freedom of the press" or "the public's right to information," and the ombudsmen and Press Councils and regulatory boards that enforce and uphold those laws. Each and every one of these constructs and confirms journalistic discourse. So do notions like fairness, transparency, rigour, protection of sources, and public interest; so do those routines that underlie production in a newsroom. Journalistic discourse produces truth/knowledge about itself, which gives that particular discourse power. That power, in turn, ensures and enables the production of more truth/knowledge.

Seen through a Foucauldian lens, everything previously analysed in this paper amounts to journalistic discourse. It is all there: the rules that govern the formation of "the objects, concepts, subjects, and strategies within the discourse" (Motion and Leitch 2009, 87); the rules that determine what can be said, how it can be said, who can speak, after which procedures, in what context, under whose authority, from which position, with what viewpoints, in whose interest, within which institutions, and, in every case, why. In other words, we have seen how power functions in the journalistic discourse, and we have seen how the journalistic discourse produces truth/knowledge. For the purposes of this paper, we have conducted our journalistic discourse analysis with the aim of ascertaining the place of the PR industry in journalism and establishing the relationship of the one to the other. Framing this relationship in Foucauldian terms, we have seen that journalism's power derives from its production of subjects, objects, institutional structures, and ways of thinking and acting; PR, as "a knowledge system, a discourse technology, a power effect and a subjectifying practice" (Motion and Leitch 2009, 92), exercises its power through its ability to infiltrate, transform, become part of, manoeuvre within, take advantage of, and act upon journalism.

In the next section, it will become clear that PR makes use of journalism's *technology* and *apparatus* and has the ability to subjugate journalists. It exercises its power in journalistic discourse precisely in the way that Foucault (1982) describes this process: "The exercise of power consists in guiding the possibility of conduct and putting in order the possible outcome" (789).

Reassessing Journalism's Relationship to the PR Industry through a Foucauldian Lens

According to Foucault, an institution functions at two levels: at the level of its *apparatus* and at the level of its *technology*. An institution's *apparatus* includes many forms of truth/knowledge as evidenced by its regulations, its philosophical underpinnings, its moral codes, its laws. As for an institution's *technology*, it refers to those *practices* that are used to exercise the power linked to truth/knowledge production: methods, processes, strategies, manoeuvres, and mechanisms.

The links between an institution's apparatus and technology, along with the "strategic imperative" (Andersen 2003) underlying those links, create what Foucault calls a *dispositif.* The *dispositif* reveals how a discourse is monitored as well as how it self-regulates – that is, regulates itself from within. The impact of the *dispositif* on each individual within an institution is to subjugate that individual: individuals are produced by an institutional discourse, the individual in turn reproduces that discourse, individuals are therefore "caught" – trapped – within the *dispositif* of an institutional discourse, which means that individuals end up in a position of *subjugation.* Thus, closer scrutiny of the apparatus, technology, *dispositif*, and subjugation process inherent in the journalistic discourse sheds important light on the PR industry's presence in and effect on journalism.

Apparatus

Documents issued by a professional association like the FPJQ are part of the journalistic discourse. By constructing, as they do, what journalism is, who journalists are, what journalists do, what journalism is for, and where journalism fits into the wider society, texts like these *materialize* the apparatus of those institutions associated with journalism.

Comparing the FPJQ Code of Ethics with that of the SQPRP revealed marked similarities between the two texts. But the latter document suggests a desire on the part of the PR industry to integrate the power/knowledge of journalism so as to be seen as a profession, as just like it, whereas the FPJQ makes a concerted effort in Articles 5 and 9 of its documentation to distinguish journalists from PR officers. By way of an explanation, Article 9(a) insists that the kinds of tasks undertaken by PR officials generally "serve private interests and send a partisan message to the public." The FPJQ maintains that journalists are not in a position to serve up "partisan information one day and impartial information the next" and points out that to do so would "create confusion" for the public and cast permanent doubt on the "credibility and integrity" of the journalistic profession."[15]

One could venture that Article 9(a) sets up a "permanent limit" between the profession of journalism and that of PR. But that "permanent limit" becomes, in fact, a Foucauldian "point of possible reversal": by insisting on the difference between the two professions, by going so far as to mention PR in its own Code of Ethics, the FPJQ – a key institution in Quebec's journalistic discourse – gives PR a central role in its very apparatus. For when a journalistic text goes to such lengths to point out that PR and journalism are not the same profession and do not serve the same purpose, it becomes clear that journalism in fact needs PR in order to define itself. By integrating PR into its discourse in order to distinguish itself from PR, journalism defines itself in relation to PR; it also demonstrates that it cannot achieve what it wants to be without PR. In other words, a journalist becomes a journalist by not being a PR officer. And by extension, the parameters or limits of journalism – where journalism begins and ends – end up being determined with and by PR.

This point is crucial to our analysis of the power relationship between the two activities. As Foucault (1982) suggests, no understanding of how power operates is possible until we take into account "the system of differentiations which permits one to act upon the actions of others: differentiations determined by the law or by traditions of status and privilege." And he goes on to argue that "every relationship of power puts into operation differentiations which are at the same time its conditions and its results" (792). Journalism, for example, differentiates itself from PR through its laws (or its rules), its traditions, and its status – in large part because it needs to make sure it does not become confused with PR. But the system of differentiations that journalism puts into place also permits PR to "act upon the actions" of journalists – with greater efficacy and success, in fact, precisely because PR officers are not journalists. Since they are neither the subjects of, nor subjected to, journalistic discourse, PR officers are under no obligation to comply with its codes and rules, to conform to its institutional demands. PR officers can look like journalists and act like journalists, but they have none of the responsibilities that go along with being a journalist. In an ironic twist, journalism's concerted and deliberate effort to escape being associated with PR merely ends up handing a lot of power over to PR. This is the first disturbing discovery that a Foucauldian theoretical framework reveals about the relationship between PR and journalism.

Technology

As already discussed, PR can manoeuvre itself into each and every step of the journalistic process. This action on the part of PR – this ability to influence the selection, the tone, and the content of a news story – involves participation (in Foucauldian terms) in the technology of the journalistic discourse.

PR officers play a significant role in deciding which stories make it into the news, which angles those stories take, and which sources are called upon to back up those stories. PR officers also know how to play one reporter off against another, as well as how to adapt their press releases and communiqués to fit with the different styles and needs of a wide range of media. This is partly because journalistic discourse has strict rules of diffusion and distribution – what Foucault (2004) would term "framing superimpositions." The fact is that almost every utterance in the news is an utterance "to which certain rules of acceptability apply" (Andersen 2003, 3). These rules – these "framing superimpositions" – regulate the approach that journalists take when producing stories. They also regulate journalists' relationships with others and with their surroundings (Andersen 2003). The very fixedness of these rules provides PR officials with yet another avenue along which to exercise their power over journalism –

guiding, to borrow from Foucault (1982), the "possibility of conduct" of journalists and the "possible outcome" of journalism (789).[16] This, then, is the second discovery that the Foucauldian theoretical framework helps reveal.

The third disturbing discovery resides in journalism ethics: in those core values such as fairness, balance, integrity, impartiality, and rigour. These values are integral to journalistic texts and thus to the journalistic apparatus. And in their capacity as tools and strategies, they qualify as journalistic technology. These core values help journalists play their role as gatekeepers. But these core values also encourage the subjugation of journalists: journalism's ethics end up benefiting PR by creating an effective surveillance *dispositif*.

Dispositif

Foucault's (1993) notion of a *dispositif* is developed most fully in his study of prisons and punishment. Prisons, he argues, gave birth to a new form of architecture: Jeremy Bentham's[17] "panopticon." It is a building that allows prison guards to keep watch over prisoners without being seen. A panopticon is the surveillance *dispositif* par excellence, and its brilliance lies in its invisible yet all-pervasive presence – it leads prisoners to think they are always being watched, that they can never hide, and as a result, prisoners become their own guards, so to speak – the ultimate exercise in self-discipline.

The panopticon is effective as a means of surveillance because its power is automatic and effortless. Prisoners, from one moment to the next, cannot know whether they are being watched, but they know they could be being watched – and that, alone, is enough to turn them into "model" prisoners. Their relationship to power might be based on a fiction, but its effects are very real. Successfully applying this particular *dispositif* to other institutional contexts – to the school, for example, or to the factory, or hospital – Foucault (2004) insisted that with just a few "necessary modifications," it could reveal important insights into the workings of power within any establishment where, in a limited space, a group of people were being subjected to some form of surveillance (531).

When applied to journalism, the surveillance *dispositif* functions like this: Journalists work in a specific and precise space – the media. It is easy to watch them, to make them feel as if there is a surveillance *dispositif* at work, that they have no choice but to submit to the exigencies of "power through transparency" – an expression used by Foucault (1980, 154). This *dispositif* is made up of those ethical obligations with which journalists must comply. The FPJQ (1996) Code of Ethics states, for example, that journalists must be "fair" – that is, treat everyone equally and with respect. They must also produce "balanced" news stories in which a range of viewpoints are given fair representation (Article 2). Failure on the part of a journalist to uphold the ethical obligation of "fairness" means that the Quebec Press Council, or the ombudsman, can step in with a warning or a reprimand. Journalists can also be sued for libel.

These ethical and legal obligations mean that journalists have to consult with, or interview, anyone who is negatively implicated in their story. A PR officer can turn this obligation to his or her own advantage by forcing a reporter to include a client's point of view or a client's reaction. A PR officer can also impose his or her own rules: deciding who gets to speak, how long an interview will be, and which questions can or cannot be asked. A PR officer can also refuse to give an interview, which places the reporter in an ethically awkward position. These examples point once again to how journalistic ethics, simply by virtue of their existence, give power to the PR industry. From the perspective of the surveillance *dispositif,* the power itself could be said to come automatically – to require no effort on the part of the PR officer. All of this suggests that fairness, balance, and diligence are not only ethical obligations on the part of the journalist; they are also "windows of surveillance" (Foucault 1980) that act as control mechanisms within this particular *dispositif,* that impose self-disciplining regimes on journalists and prompt them to feel – watching the PR officer maybe watching them – much like prisoners in the panopticon.[18]

Subjugation

This surveillance *dispositif* is so effective that it can lead to the subjugation of journalists. As discussed earlier in this paper, subjugation happens when journalists are not only transformed into subjects by the *dispositif* but do so willingly, submitting themselves voluntarily to, in this case, the power of PR, opting for the easier and less costly route, which here amounts to "following the source" and complying with PR's way of doing things. Taking on a PR officer's press release or communiqué, reproducing it word for word in a news story, is a form of subjugation that a journalist doesn't have to work hard to justify. The PR officer goes away satisfied, and the journalist can rest easy, secure in the knowledge that all the boxes in the journalistic ethical code – fairness, balance, impartiality, rigour, and so on – have been ticked off, at least in the eyes of one party: the PR officer's client. It takes a lot of energy and confidence to confront a source, to refuse to replicate or use PR material, or to find other sources. This is what Foucault (2004) means when he talks about the "effectiveness" of power. Seeing how power works, coming to know it through being subjected to it and opting *in* to its binding force: all of this is part of the process of becoming the master of one's own subjugation (527).

In other words, journalists can end up doing more than merely complying with PR. Journalists can end up becoming PR. In interiorizing the "inspecting gaze" of the PR officer, journalists "thus exercise this surveillance over, and against, themselves" (Foucault 1980, 155). And thus, too, PR's power circuit comes full circle: moving its way through the journalistic discourse, infiltrating journalism's apparatus and technology, making sure the surveillance *dispositif* does its work on journalists and journalism, and watching the process of subjugation.

A Fertile Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework developed here provides a revised picture of the relationship between PR and journalism. Something that was quite unexpected and impossible to foresee came up. Journalism, initially understood as a practice largely defined by its ongoing struggle not to become confused with PR, was suddenly in the throes of becoming PR – and mainly because of this very drive towards self-definition. Moreover, journalism ethics – seen from a textual vantage point as a key signifier of journalism's integrity and distinctiveness as a profession – in fact turned out to be an ally of PR. Peering deep into the inner workings of a surveillance *dispositif* taught us that much.

New questions and new ways of asking questions also arise from the Foucauldian theoretical framework. Among these: When, as a power effect operating within the journalistic discourse, does PR become too effective? For example, would it not be in PR's best interests to occasionally refrain from "putting in order the possible outcome" so as to ensure a more lasting and sustainable outcome for journalism and, by extension, for itself? After all, the primary reason the PR industry is keen to ingratiate itself with the journalistic discourse is because, "first, publication in the media has a higher level of credibility than other communication channels do. Second, compared to advertising, media publicity is a cost-effective method" (Larsson 2009, 34). So is there a moment when the PR industry should consciously step back and stop exercising its power over journalism?

For journalists, too, important questions emerge when the profession is squeezed through the wringer of a Foucauldian theoretical framework. For example: What kind of manoeuvring is available to journalists within the journalistic discourse? Is this a different space for news reporters? public affairs reporters? investigative journalists? And how does it vary from beat to beat – if you're covering, say, the cultural sector? the health sector? education? Under what circumstances might a reporter choose not to be in a relationship with PR officers and PR material? Should journalists systematically speak out about their relationship with PR, exposing it for what they believe it to be? How can journalists best exercise their own power? How can they be more than mere gatekeepers? What suffers because journalism is infiltrated by the PR industry? And at what point do PR's "squatting rights" render journalism a valueless entity?

As for journalism educators, it is in their interest to integrate this line of questioning into their courses – when dissecting the journalistic process, for example; when addressing the journalist's need to scrupulously check his or her facts or systematically cross-examine what a source is saying; or when talking about the power relationship that exists between journalists and their sources. Journalism educators should also generate and encourage classroom discussions that look into the similarities and differences between professional communicators and journalists and that get to the bottom of just whom journalism is serving these days, and to what ends. Other group reflections should address whether the traditional idea of the journalist as the "watchdog of democracy" is still relevant in today's journalistic climate, and in what ways is it a lot less feasible than it used to be. In addition, journalism educators should be initiating and animating creative thinking sessions that provide students with opportunities to develop concrete tools and techniques that they can use to challenge and/or sidestep the official discourses circulating out there: more independent research, developing expertise in one or two beats, diversifying and enlarging the circle of sources, practising ethnographic journalism, and so on. Through all of this, journalism educators have to walk a fine line: ensuring, on the one hand, that the contributions made by professional communicators to the realm of journalism are recognized, and guaranteeing, on the other, that the distinction between the two professions is both clarified and maintained.

These are crucial questions for journalism, for PR, and for the public in general. As Cottle (2003) says, "who secures media access and why and how, inevitably raises fundamental questions about the nature of media participation, processes and forms of mediated citizenship, issues of media performance and the play of power enacted between the news media and their sources" (3). It is towards that "mediated citizen" that some might turn the Foucauldian lens next.

Conclusion

There is no mention of the words "journalism" or "journalist" in the SQPRP's Code of Ethics; nor are either of these words mentioned in the CPRS's Code of Ethics. The same is true of these two association's mission statements. The profession with which the PR industry is most constantly in contact – most intertwined with and most dependent upon -- Maisonneuve, Tremblay and Lafrance (2004) state that 77% of PR professionals work daily with journalists – does not make an appearance in its core texts.

In a world where everything seems to have been said about the relationship between PR and journalism, yet where such silences still exist, what has been proposed in this paper is a fresh lens through which to view it, a robust set of images and concepts with which to better understand it, and a solid theoretical framework in which to work with it. The step-by-step detailing of how this theoretical framework can be mobilized to shed light on relationships built around power provides media scholars, practitioners, and educators with an essential map as they set off on their own Foucauldian research journey.

Foucault (1982) insists that power exists "only when it is put into action, even if, of course, it is integrated into a disparate field of possibilities brought to bear upon permanent structures" (788). This is what has been rendered tangible in this paper: the disparate field of possibilities where PR power can be put into action upon the permanent structures of journalism.

NOTES

[1] My translation of Article 2: « Les journalistes basent leur travail sur des valeurs fondamentales telles que l'esprit critique qui leur impose de douter méthodiquement de tout.»; and 3: « Les journalistes ont l'obligation de s'assurer de la véracité des faits qu'ils rapportent au terme d'un rigoureux travail de collecte et de vérification des informations. »

[2] My translation of: « Les journalistes ne s'engagent pas auprès de leurs sources à diffuser l'information que celles-ci désirent […] Les journalistes jugent de la pertinence de diffuser une information selon son mérite, son intérêt public et en tenant compte des autres informations disponibles. »

[3] These figures are clearly not representative of the total number of journalists (4,000) and PR professionals (13,000) said to be working in Quebec in 2011 (Emploi Québec 2011).

[4] My translation, taken from: « Dans ce Guide le terme 'journaliste' réfère à toute personne qui exerce une fonction de journaliste pour le compte d'une entreprise de presse. Exerce une fonction de journaliste la personne qui exécute […] une ou plusieurs des tâches suivantes: recherche de l'information, reportage, interview; rédaction […] affectation, pupitre, direction des services d'information.»

[5] My translation of: « Le rôle essentiel des journalistes est de rapporter fidèlement, d'analyser et de commenter le cas échéant les faits qui permettent à leurs concitoyens de mieux connaître et de mieux comprendre le monde dans lequel ils vivent. »

[6] SQPRP documentation does not state when their Code of Ethics was written. The committee in charge of putting it together was created in 2001.

[7] My translation, taken from: « Les professionnels en relations publiques sont les experts en gestion des relations des organisations avec leur environnement. Ils contribuent à l'atteinte des objectifs de leur organisation par la qualité de leurs analyses et par la pertinence et l'efficacité des stratégies et des moyens de communication qu'ils proposent. »

[8] My translation of « Les membres doivent exercer leur profession conformément à l'intérêt public. »

[9] My translation of: « Au Québec, il n'existe pas de regroupement obligatoire des journalistes au sein d'un ordre professionnel. Ni le titre de journaliste, ni l'acte journalistique ne sont réservés à un groupe particulier de personnes. Le milieu journalistique est un milieu ouvert et les journalistes le veulent ainsi. »

[10] My translation of: « Toute infraction au Code sera traitée soit au palier national, soit au palier de la Société membre, selon ce qu'en décidera le Comité national de déontologie. »

[11] My translation of: « Les journalistes doivent s'abstenir d'effectuer, en dehors du journalisme, des tâches reliées aux communications: relations publiques, publicité, promotion, cours donnés sur la façon de se comporter devant les médias. »

[12] My translation of: « L'information et la publicité doivent être séparées. Les journalistes n'écrivent pas de publireportages. S'ils sont tenus de le faire, ils ne les signent jamais. »

[13] "Knowledge," here, can be understood as each affirmation (implicit or explicit) of a discourse; "truth" is all the knowledge that constitutes a discourse.

[14] Power and truth/knowledge are thus intertwined and have a circular effect on each other. For the rest of the paper, I twin these two concepts as Foucault does – as power/knowledge.

[15] My translation, taken from: « Ces tâches servent des intérêts particuliers et visent à transmettre un message partisan au public. Les journalistes ne peuvent pas communiquer un jour des informations partisanes et le lendemain

des informations impartiales, sans susciter la confusion dans le public et jeter un doute constant sur leur crédibilité et leur intégrité. »

[16] The word "possible" is important here: as we have seen, gatekeeping, which is also part of the technology of journalism, provides journalists with a strong counter-power when it comes to limiting the influence of the PR industry on journalistic discourse.

[17] Foucault (1980, 148) says that Jeremy Bentham, the late-eighteenth-century English philosopher and social theorist who designed the panopticon, "invented a technology of power designed to solve the problems of surveillance."

[18] The surveillance *dispositif* at work here is rendered all the more effective because of the disproportionate ratio of PR officers to journalists. Moreover, since the 1980s PR officers have had access to highly efficient communication technologies. See Cottle 2003; Lavigne 2005; Franklin, Lewis, and Williams 2010. As Stauber and Rampton (1995, 186) observed nearly two decades ago, "in theory, journalism is a 'watchdog' profession, which serves the public by finding and reporting on abuses of power. In practice, reporters live under closer scrutiny than the people they are supposed to be monitoring."

REFERENCES

Andersen, Niels Akerstrom. 2003. *Discursive Analysis Strategies*. Bristol: Polity Press.

Boulay, Sophie, and Chantal Francoeur. 2014. "Donner priorité aux données: adopter l'induction au cours d'une recherche sur les relations publiques et le journalism." *Approches Inductives* 1, no. 1: 38–69.

– . 2013. "Les liens entre journalisme et relations publiques." *Research Report,* GRICIS. http://www.gricis.uqam.ca/recherches

Canadian Society of Public Relations (CSPR-SCRP). 2001. *Manuel d'agrément des relations publiques*. http://scrp.ca/accreditation

Chomsky, Noam, and Edward S. Herman. 1988. *Manufacturing Consent*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Charron, Jean. 1994. *La production de l'actualité*. Montréal: Boréal.

Cottle, Simon. 2003. *News, Public Relations, and Power: Mapping the Field*. London: Sage.

Dagenais, Bernard. 2011. *Est-ce qu'un relationniste peut faire carrière sans mentir?* SQPRP. http://www.sqprp.ca/contenus/rp-com

Davies, Nick. 2008. *Flat Earth News*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Davis, Aeron. 2002. *Public Relations Democracy*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Durif, Fabien, and Nancy Corriveau. 2012. "Tableau de bord de la communication responsable." *Observatoire de la communication responsable*. http://consommationresponsable.ca

Emploi Québec. 2012. *Personnes en emploi en 2012*. Gouvernement du Québec. http://imt.emploiquebec.net

Erjavec, Karmen. 2005. "Hybrid Public Relations News Discourse." *European Journal of Communication* 20: 155–79.

Fédération professionnelle des journalistes du Québec (FPJQ). 1996. *Code de déontologie*. http://www.fpjq.org

Foucault, Michel. 2004. *Philosophie: Anthologie*. Paris: Gallimard.

– . 1993. *Surveiller et punir: naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.

– . 1982. "The Subject and Power." *Critical Inquiry* 8, no. 4: 777–95.

– . 1980. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings.* New York: Random House.

Francoeur, Chantal. 2015. "Les répertoires interprétatifs des journalistes discutant de leurs liens avec les relations publiques." *Communication et Organisation* 46: 225–48.

– . 2012. *La transformation du service de l'information de Radio-Canada*. Québec: Presses de l'université du Québec.

Franklin, Bob, Justin Lewis, and Andrew Williams. 2010. "Journalism, News Sources, and Public Relations." In *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism.* Edited by S. Allan. 202–12. London: Routledge.

Grunig, James E., and Todd Hunt. 1984. *Managing Public Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Heath, Robert L. 2000. "A Rhetorical Perspective on the Values of Public Relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 12, no. 1: 69–91.

Larsson, Larsåke. 2009. "PR and the Media: A Collaborative Relationship?" *Nordicom Review* 30: 141–47.

Lavigne, Alain. 2005. "Journalisme, relations publiques et publicité." *Les cahiers du journalisme* 10: 182–97.

Lewis, Justin, Andrew Williams, and Bob Franklin. 2008. "A Compromised Fourth Estate?" *Journalism Studies* 9, no. 1: 1–20.

Maisonneuve, Danielle. 2010. *Les relations publiques dans une société en mouvance.* Québec: Presses de l'université du Québec.

Maisonneuve, Danielle, Solange Tremblay and André Lafrance. 2004. *Research Findings - The State of Public Relations in Québec - Highlights*. Chaire en relations publiques, UQAM

Manning, Paul. 2008. "The Press Association and News Agency Sources." In *Pulling Newspapers Apart: Analysing Print Journalism.* Edited by B. Franklin. 247–55. London: Routledge.

McCombs, Maxwell E., and Donald L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36, no. 2: 176–92.

Miller, David, and William Dinan. 2007. "Public Relations and the Subversion of Democracy." In *Thinker, Faker, Spinner, Spy*. Edited by D. Miller and W. Dinan. 11-20. London: Pluto Press.

Motion, Judy, and Shirley Leitch. 2009. "On Foucault: A Toolbox for Public Relations." In *Public Relations and Social Theory*. Edited by O. Ihlen, B. van Ruler, and M. Fredriksson. 83–102. London: Routledge.

Pew Research Center. 2010. *How News Happen: A Study of the News Ecosystem of One American City*. http://www.journalism.org/analysis_report/how_news_happens

Quebec Society of Public Relations Professionals (SQPRP). 2014. *Code de déontologie*. http://www.sqprp.ca/La-societe/sqprp-en-bref.aspx

Rose, Gillian. 2007. *Visual Methodologies.* Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Shoemaker, Pamela. 1991. *Communication concepts 3: Gatekeeping*. Newbury Park, Ca.: Sage.

Sissons, Helen. 2012. "Journalism and Public Relations: A Tale of Two Discourses." *Discourse & Communication* 3, no.6: 273-294.

Stauber, John, and Sheldon Rampton. 1995. *Toxic Sludge Is Good for You: Lies, Damn Lies, and the Public Relations Industry*. Monroe: Common Courage Press.

Sullivan, John. 2011. *PR Industry Fills Vacuum Left by Shrinking Newsrooms*. ProPublica, 2 May. http://www.propublica.org/article/pr-industry-fills-vacuum-left-by-shrinking-newsrooms

Tremblay, Gaetan., Michel Saint-Laurent, Armande Saint-Jean, and Enrico Carontini. 1988. *La presse francophone québécoise et le discours de promotion*. Montréal: FPJQ.

A Mobile Responsive Expertise: Learning Outcomes, Journalism Education, and the "Teaching Hospital" Model

Mary Lynn Young and Janet Giltrow

Much of the curricular discourse over the past decade around innovation in journalism education in North America has focused on developing and expanding learning outcomes related to digital media and online journalism environments. These developments, while generally fruitful for students' ability to recognize, know, reproduce, and apply journalism technologies, have occurred against a backdrop of` deinstitutionalization of news and mainstream media organizations (Picard 2014) and generational anxiety among the professoriate about emergent journalism practices and identities, and about the role of journalism education in a digital era when educators have uneven experience in digital media environments (Nikunen 2014; Zelizer 2004). As a result, the conversation about innovation in j-education has been hijacked by one theme – a story that has been constructed as a technological/economic problem. This paper examines how we might be able to think more broadly about teaching, learning, and innovating in journalism education.

Specifically, this paper critically examines the learning outcomes ascribed to a teaching hospital model of journalism education – a model that has emerged as a best-practice example of what is needed to train "employable" journalists today (Newton 2013). We define the "teaching hospital" model to include the recent professional/j-school collaborations as well as j-school online newsrooms; both have strong roots in student newsrooms, and, in different ways, both incorporate authentic news production. Teaching and learning spaces that closely resemble the environments in which students will be participating as professionals have long been identified as necessary for journalism students. When these spaces are framed as teaching hospitals (Newton 2013), journalism students are seen as somewhat like medical interns in terms of their learning environment. For Newton (2013), the challenge facing the teaching hospital model of journalism education is how to combine “technological expertise,” “entrepreneurial spirit,” and “community service” in a way that produces “better news than the commercial news stream does.” Outcomes identified by Youngstown State University’s teaching hospital model, which is a collaboration among northeastern Ohio public universities and media partners, include the ability “to identify talent, give students a valuable experience, encourage interest in *The News Outlet*, and develop a larger pool of possible content for it” (Francisco, Lenhoff, and Schudson 2012, 2687). *The News Outlet* emerged from discussions about the state of the program between Youngstown State students and faculty: “Everything was on the table, and needed to be – our curriculum, our pedagogy, our mission. Our sanity. We worried. But we felt we had no choice but to change. Every day brought a new story of yet another news organization downsizing” (2012, 2683).

The recent enthusiasm for teaching newsrooms in North American journalism schools could be construed as one sign of their success. But are their goals more aligned with existing journalism norms and practices, as well as resistance to downsizing? Or are they preparing students to be on the leading edge of their profession? This paper explores the learning outcomes identified by teaching hospital newsrooms in North American journalism schools, with a focus on the role of technology. We suggest it is time for journalism educators to respond to change by focusing on closing the gap between research and practice in teaching and learning instead of reimagining ideologically satisfying models of vocational training (Deuze 2005; Lowrey, Daniels, and Becker 2005). We draw from the literatures on efficiency in teaching and learning (Hatano and Inagaki 1984; Schwartz, Bransford, and Sears 2005) and on genre theory (Lindgard and Haber 2009), and suggest learning outcomes that might do more to help students become resilient, adaptive learners, researchers, and journalists on the leading edge of the profession, with the capacity to deal with real world innovation. We argue that there are both opportunities and challenges to spur innovation in journalism through “situated,” “authentic” teaching and learning (see Freedman, in Lindgard and Haber 2009, 161).

We suggest moderating the focus on socio-technical and economic problems of journalism -- how technologies generate new social roles and professional identities and, in turn, the possibility of radical challenges to traditional business models -- and including other perspectives. We recommend the perspectives offered by the literature on learning and teaching, as well as by genre theory’s analysis of the teaching hospital. Both these perspectives focus on student outcomes more than industry survival. They also open up a critique of the teaching hospital model: this situated, authentic experience may be good for replicating current journalistic practice, but is it good for generating innovation and an understanding of what students will be able to do on graduation as vectors by which new knowledge – rather than replicated practice – enters the profession?

Developing the Tools for "New Interpretations"

For beginning learners, "innovative experiences may be particularly important" (Schwartz, Bransford, and Sears 2005, 42–43). According to Schwartz and colleagues (2005), "they help learners develop new interpretations instead of assimilating new experiences to old ways of thinking" (43). But helping learners "develop new interpretations" can be more difficult in a professional teaching and learning context. For example, the literature on efficiency in teaching and learning suggests that professionals tend to have two kinds of expertise: routine and adaptive/innovative (Roll 2014). For an example of a routine expert, Roll (2014) offers a dentist, from whom we expect impeccable routine skills. An innovator, by contrast, is "adaptive" – someone who can, as Hatano and Inagaki (198) suggest, "not only perform procedural skills efficiently, but also understand the meaning of those skills and nature of their object" (Hatano and Inagaki 1984, 28). Thus the range of skill development towards innovation is expected to move from "replicative" to "applicative" to "interpretative" (Broudy, in Schwartz, Bransford, and Sears 2005, 13).

In the teaching hospital model, this ability to distinguish and locate practice, journalistic ways of knowing, and professional ideologies is not high on the list of learning outcomes. But it should be, given evidence from the literature on genre theory. That literature suggests that while *in situ* learning is optimal for learning a genre, ironically, expertise and socialization as practitioners can inhibit teachers from preparing students to learn to interpret and therefore innovate. For example, that literature indicates that in starting to write in a genre, one takes on the "feelings, hopes, uncertainties, and anxieties" associated with its practice (Bazerman 2002, 14). In this framework, one would want to be careful to ensure that this shaping is as explicit as possible if the goal is for students to demonstrate adaptive knowledge and competencies – not simply apply existing practice and absorb the "feelings, hopes," and so on. Scholars like Lingard and Haber (2009) have identified a gap between explicit knowledge in medical teaching hospitals and tacit knowledge, finding that much of the learning takes place implicitly. This is not to say that implicit learning and tacit knowledge are ineffective; rather, it is to question *how* effective such knowledge is for fostering an understanding of "the meaning of … skills and nature of their object" (Hatano and Inagaki 1984, 28). It is to ask about those dimensions of professional practice that are left unexamined as newcomers to the field tacitly absorb traditional professional know-how.

The tacit/explicit challenge has arisen in a teaching hospital course model in which one of the authors team-teaches: the Integrated Journalism (iJ) teaching news platform at the University of British Columbia. The course publishes an online news website three times a year focused on Vancouver issues and events. The faculty members, all former journalists, act as hands-on editors. A question often heard during the editing process is: Why does one faculty member identify something as a news story, but another does not? Not surprisingly, as masters in a certain genre and/or substantive area, instructors will have integrated knowledge within their own interpretative frames. This raises a second question: How does one slow down enough to effectively unpack professional knowledge – both implicit and explicit – to the benefit of students' conceptual learning, so that they are able to both produce news and understand the values and conceptual knowledge related to practice? The concept of "slowing down" might be anathema to journalistic ways of being and knowing, but without it, we risk developing the skills and competencies for more "dentists" (to continue the Roll analogy) than innovators.

Learning Outcomes and Approaches for the Future

A first step toward integrated learning outcomes related to creating a learning context that prioritizes being on the leading edge of the profession would be to think about an appropriate balance between students' ability to demonstrate "efficient" transfer of knowledge/skills (i.e., how quickly they can "replicate and apply," as in producing news), on the one hand, and their ability "to learn to solve novel problems and engage in other kinds of productive activities" that build their interpretive and conceptual abilities, on the other (Schwartz, Bransford, and Sears 2005, 60–61). Schwartz and colleagues (2005) suggest prioritizing learners' interpretive contexts in addition to relating with other types of expertise (42). The need to work with other university researchers has been articulated in the teaching hospital model context, but often in a more instrumental than generative manner, as a way to "import" their expertise as opposed to co-creating new journalism knowledge (Newton 2013).

For example, the audience/news relationship has recently been cast as a journalism problem. A 2014 *New York Times* report on innovation identified the audience as in need of attention. The problem(s) should not come as a surprise, given that scholarly analyses of audience and readership patterns in the United States have long suggested that "reporters and editors live by audience lore, not by any coherent body of facts about their readers" (Leonard 1995, 219) – not, that is, by findings attested by methodologically disciplined research. Leonard (1995) notes that popular culture representations of audiences tend to pathologize readers, producing for the newsroom a folk image of readership rather than a research-attested one. Both the emergent need and the ability to connect with audiences in new ways through social media and online comment have opened up new areas of research, as well as methods such as analytics to measure that interaction. Journalistic practice and knowledge can work in tandem to generate approaches that are relevant to current questions.

One might first identify as a learning outcome the ability to analyse how journalists have viewed their audience in the past; one might then integrate related literatures and research traditions that approach questions about audiences, such as political economy, analytics, collective intelligence, and social media studies. One could encourage combining research about interpersonal relationships with research conducted by other disciplines such as psychology (into cognition, emotions, online relationships), political science (into participatory democracy), and/or linguistics (into people's background knowledge and how this shared knowledge works to build "common ground," the basis for communication) (Clark and Marshall 1981). One could also invite students to think about their own experience with audiences through social networks. We suggest that when we integrate other research contexts with journalism research and take a less conservative approach to teaching and learning, opportunities arise for educators to provide students with a learning context that explicitly supports adaptive and innovative thinking and learning. With its focus on both the replicative and the generative, and on newcomers' learning of styles of expression, rhetorical genre theory can contribute to our reasoning about journalism education.

Rhetorical Theories of *Genre*: Applications to Journalism Education

In recent decades, the term genre has been applied far more broadly than in the past. Researchers and theorists in applied linguistics, rhetoric and writing studies, systemic functional linguistics (SFL), and critical discourse analysis (CDA) have applied the term to a wide range of professional, public, workplace, and personal occurrences of writing and speaking. It has also seen a high-profile revival in leading-edge literary studies. Common among these applications is the notion that the phenomenon of genre – roughly, for the moment, the recurrences of recognizable forms of expression – is relevant far beyond the literary domain (and in fact may not find its best application in that domain). Less common and often in dispute is the measure of form, as in "forms of expression." While some genre studies programs focus on form or on a form/function coupling, rhetorical genre studies have disavowed form as the signal of genre and turned instead to notions of "exigence" (Bitzer 1968, 1980; Miller 1984), motive (Burke 1969) and sphere of activity (Bakhtin 1986): when mutually engaged in a sphere of activity (the newsroom would be a sphere of activity), language users share the experience of a certain kind of thing needing to be said now. Formal regularities follow – with great unevenness – this sensation of exigence, this motive to speak or listen. As a simple demonstration of this principle, we can point to writers finding it difficult to learn a genre just by being told formal rules for it, when they have had no experience of the sphere of activity in which it is embedded. So, for example, we would know not to expect a newcomer to the news genres to get the hang of writing news by being told about the form the "lead" or opening sentence should take, or the style for identifying quoted speakers – or even the criteria for news, which can include timeliness, proximity, impact, controversy, usefulness, and emotion (Lanson and Stephens 2007). We know not to expect facility in the genres to follow immediately from this kind of formal instruction. Yet we do to some degree engage in formal dictates.

In teaching hospital online news sites, the stakes are sufficiently high for all participants when student journalism becomes public (see Newton 2012 for a discussion of legal concerns such as libel). In the teaching hospital model, students are called out on formal grounds ("these are the rules, we told you the rules") as they prepare their news stories for publication when the real issue can be the editor's silent assumptions, prejudices, and interpretations. Of course, resort to formalism is far from new, and far from exclusive to online newsroom pedagogies. Adam's (2001) definition of journalism is helpful here: it includes "linguistic, narrative and representational technique" (324) with the "editor's voice and lexicon" (318). An article published by Lewis in 1993, but revived on Twitter in 2015, addresses precisely the "futility of journalism instruction" that we are trying to discuss – an overt formalism masquerading as transparency. In this article, a journalist reports on a journalism class at Columbia University and identifies the way the instructor is trying to teach the class how to write a news story: the instructor starts with a "creative thinking" exercise about a baseball cap, then moves on to critique student work at a style/spelling level (Lewis 1993). Students then get criticized for "factual," grammatical, stylistic, and form errors (the latter can be highly subjective and located in the instructor) (Lewis 1993). Rhetorical theories of genre would target the fallacies in these formalist approaches to educating newcomers about the genres of this professional sphere of activity.

Rhetorical genre theory disavows form as genre's prior condition. From this has emerged the observation, noted earlier, that most genre knowledge is "tacit" – that is, absorbed by language users through their experience in a sphere of activity and through their interactions with others similarly experienced in the orientations, values, and identifications of that sphere. This observation has led to radical critiques of classroom teaching of writing (Freedman and Medway 1994 is an early influential critique). Such critiques challenge explicit, formalist, rule-governed instruction and call for students to be introduced to the authentic rhetorical situations of a sphere of activity, and guided to motivated participation in those situations. We could say that the teaching hospital newsroom model of journalism education – situated in a sphere of activity, more or less authentic – has evoked lessons beyond formalism, even as formalism may have crept into the teaching newsroom through handy rules and rehearsed rubrics. Rhetorical genre theory would recognize the student-journalist-writer's taking up of the ways of the professional sphere, through interaction with others in that field of practice and values; in its purest form, rhetorical genre theory would not predict the mixing of formalism (explicit rules, rubrics, templates) with the tacit transmission of genre know-how through mutual practice in a sphere of activity. But the theory is able to capture this mix for observation, and for inquiry into professional education.

Challenging formalist notions of genre knowledge and advancing social-interactional ones, rhetorical genre studies have hosted many studies of professional acculturation. Among these have been studies of social workers (Paré 1988), physicians (Lingard and Haber 2009), engineers (Artemeva 2011), central bankers (Smart 2006), students in graduate programs (Berkenkotter and Huckin 1995), and eighteenth-century traders/naturalists (Giltrow 2011). Throughout these studies, which focus to some degree on writers' identifying with the motives of a sphere of activity rather than simply copying extant forms, the tacitness of genre knowledge has been a theme, as has been the difficulty of making explicit the know-how that genre users share. This is not to say that people do not talk about genres. Many genres are attended by metagenres (Giltrow 2002) – that is, by dense prescriptions for writing (often including some formalist rubrics), along with warnings and advisories about what not to write, and by rationales, manifestos, and (often) ethical claims about the genre and its mission. Although they are epiphenomenal and not essential to the substance or survival of a genre, metagenres can take on a life of their own, doing their own work hosting ideological assumptions that obscure or are misaligned with actual practice. At the same time, in some cases, metagenres, despite their epiphenomenal status, can play an active role in professional formation. Metagenres can be profoundly misleading to learners – for example, handbooks and teachers tirelessly trumpet rules against passive voice in academic writing by students, when in fact passive voice is used widely and indispensably throughout academic genres and beyond (e.g., in novels written by or in the style of Jane Austen). The false rule is supported by moral claims for honesty and against subterfuge in proper writing. So even as some metagenres are misleading and confounding, they may also establish an *esprit de corps* among practitioners in a sphere of activity – a sealed and sacred distinction.

While professional formation – both the acquiring of tacit genre knowledge and the recruitment to the prevailing metagenre – has been the object of genre-theoretical rhetorical inquiry in many fields, it has not been investigated by these means in journalism. Genre study of journalism has been principally text-focused and taken up mainly by SFL-tending CDA, a relatively formalist approach. The less formalist and more deeply phenomenological approaches of rhetorical genre theory have not been brought to journalism and journalism education. In other words, the challenges to journalism education outlined earlier in this paper – issues arising from the teaching hospital tradition and from the focus on technological adaptation – are open to investigation from the perspectives of rhetorical genre theory. How has the sphere of activity been conceptualized by current pedagogies? What is the profession's metagenre, and what role does it play in journalism education? And most crucially, can journalism education be designed so as to broach the tacitness of genre knowledge, to bring to light for critical, expert examination the values, interests, and assumptions silently embedded in this sphere of activity? Can journalism education be reconceived to produce a disciplined and disciplinary expertise that can respond to the questions people have about journalism itself and its role both historically and currently in shaping the social order? This kind of investigation – challenging the silent know-how of the profession – would contribute not only to reasoning about journalism education but also to rhetorical genre theory. So far, rhetorical genre theory has taken satisfaction in observing the membrane of tacitness around genre know-how. Since genre is not form alone, and sometimes scarcely form at all, it evades attempts to state its features: the complex of experiences, intentions, motives, and mutually recognized exigences that compose genre know-how cannot be contained in explicit dictates (and, as teachers, we know that a student who says *just tell me what to do* has not taken up the interests and values of the activity). But what if explicitness were manifested not as prescription but as preliminary to examining the assumptions and unspoken values of a sphere of activity, that examination constituting a professional expertise?

"One Digital Roof"

The sphere of practice for the teaching hospital model of journalism education has been largely conceptualized as a multiplatform newsroom, an immersive situated journalism experience for students in which they create news for audiences, using evolving digital journalism tools such as blogs, data visualization, and social media. Programs in Canada that incorporate the teaching hospital model of journalism education include the University of British Columbia Graduate School of Journalism's online news website, *The Thunderbird*, http://thethunderbird.ca. In addition to direct public access, some journalism education institutions partner with professional media organizations to produce news content. Newton (2013) defines the "teaching hospital model" as "learning by doing that includes college students, professors and professionals working together under one 'digital roof' for the benefit of a community." Goals that have been identified include increasing the "quality and impact" of journalism (Newton 2013), creating "more and better" journalism in order to supplement and support a declining industry (Lemann 2009; Mensing and Ryfe 2013), encouraging an opportunity for journalism schools "to become anchor institutions in the emerging informational ecosystem" (Anderson et al. 2011), and supporting innovation (Newton 2013).

> Our goal should be for the teaching hospital to provide better news than the commercial news stream does. The goal should be to provide greater community engagement and service. Somewhere within the hospital, clinical trials should test new techniques and technologies, with results made widely known. The ultimate teaching hospital can be the engine of change for journalism education and for journalism. No longer would journalism programs be a training caboose driven around by industry. (Newton 2013)

Francisco, Lenhoff, and Schudson (2012) point out that the teaching hospital model in journalism education has a long but not widely taken-up history. Others, such as Anderson and colleagues (2011), suggest that an important part of journalism education has long included different kinds of immersive professional experiences, from internships at professional journalism outlets to campus media outlets. In this sense, professional identity formation for journalists has contained some component of situated experience, which, as genre theory suggests, is likely to transmit the indigenous genres[1] through participation in the field of activity as well as the tacit accumulation of knowledge. In this sense, the current teaching hospital newsroom model can be recognized as participation in journalism's updated field of activity for digital conditions. This sphere offers unique characteristics, which include inexpensive and direct access to audiences and the possibility of learning and adapting to new technologies concurrently occurring in the field of practice (Pinch and Bijker 1989).

Thus the teaching hospital model of teaching newsrooms appears to be a necessary generative learning context for the professional formation of journalists to understand journalism and its spheres of activity, which may be particularly relevant in a digital media ecology given the intersection with and pace of technological change. Yet, as discussed above, from genre studies and the teaching and learning literature we know that interpretation is important and that situated learning leaves unexamined assumptions that occur at the tacit level (something is news, something else is not, this much is known among practitioners even as the "news" principle is unstated), and through metagenre (rules and ethical claims). How do we also interrogate the tacit accumulation of knowledge and create the context for students to emerge as self-motivated adaptive thinkers and journalists?

"A Supply Side Theory of Journalism"

An underlying, unattended gap we will focus on in this section involves an explicit learning outcome in the teaching hospital model of journalism education – the value that there is a moral and economic/professional obligation to increase the amount and quality of news. The quantity/quality principle that more news and better news is optimal fits the economic context of the recent past during which news was a replicable product. In this context, journalists tested and judged their professional capacity among other journalistic insiders, which became a proxy at times for an independent assessment of news quality (Ehrlich 1997; Young forthcoming; Zelizer 2004). It is difficult to argue with the proposition that more quality news is beneficial; however, public concerns about the homogenization of news, for example, make it clear that "quality" is a key journalistic assumption that needs to be examined much more carefully. As we have discussed, situated experiences in spheres of activity, according to genre theory, involve the tacit production of professional subjectivities in which important histories, assumptions, and values can go unquestioned and take on a life of their own. These experiences also host ideological assumptions that may obscure and/or be misaligned with actual practice and at the same time, in some cases, may play a crucial role in professional formation. It seems relevant to review some current questions/public concerns around the quantity/quality principle and consider the damage we may already be doing in the teaching hospital model of journalism education – and end with possibilities for addressing this consequence of teaching through situated experience.

Analysts of the news suggest that a homogenization of news content has been taking place; Boczkowski and de Santos (2007) define homogenization "as the extent to which different media focus on the same stories during a particular news cycle" (168). Scholars have identified this trend towards homogenization of news content as reflecting economic, technological, sociological, and professional components (Boczkowski and de Santos 2007; Picard 2008). According to Picard (2008), "contemporary news processes and practices produce a significant homogenization of news and opinion." This is the result of a combination of forces that include dominant approaches to defining news, as well as journalistic practices that create "economies of scale in the collection and distribution of news" (221). These tendencies have also emerged in the online space (Boczkowski and de Santos 2007; Friend and Singer 2007). Boczkowski and de Santos (2007) examined content overlap in leading online and print newspapers in Argentina and found that "technical practices or how journalists use the technology to make news" amplified existing problematic trends vis-à-vis homogenization of news, with a concomitant impact on the diversity of public affairs journalism (76). Meanwhile, Friend and Singer (2007) suggest that despite significant innovation in online journalism in the United States and an increase in its quality, "many news sites remain morgues for wire copy, secondhand material and recycled stories from the morning paper or evening newscast" (33).

The assumption that journalists need to create more news of a certain kind and use that content to achieve market ascendance needs to be challenged and exposed within the hospital model of teaching newsroom. In this regard, Mensing and Ryfe (2013) refer to "a supply-side theory of journalism" in the teaching hospital model in which "society will improve if we increase the supply of high quality, credible information" (2). They ask whether this approach merely replicates a broken economic model of news, and they identify an antidote: "entrepreneurial journalism," which they define as journalism education with an "orientation to change" (Mensing and Ryfe 2013, 7). They argue that an "entrepreneurial journalism" model would replace old values with newer, more relevant orientations, and they propose four main shifts: a focus on demand (audiences) rather than supply, on social networks rather than institutional ones, on reflexivity rather than habit, and on experimentation rather than practice and formalist writing drills largely limited to style and structure. Their paper asks useful questions and suggests new possible interpretations of journalism practice. It also provides evidence of some uneasiness with suggestions for remedy. The remedies – here, entrepreneurial journalism – may themselves rely on unexamined assumptions, in the absence of a methodologically disciplined means of developing and assessing alternatives.

Exposing and inspecting the values embedded in professional identity formation – here, that more and higher-quality news is better – and juxtaposing it with the public critique about the repetition of news items across formats opens up an opportunity to move beyond replication towards interpretation, and to imagine what adaptation might look like in a digital field of practice. When we fail to challenge the assumptions behind a metagenre value of more and better-quality news, and allow the teaching newsroom to cultivate a consciousness of that value – *to think this way is part of being a professional journalist* – we limit the range of opportunities for journalists who operate in today's contexts to create new interpretations and to adapt. For example, how are we to understand and support criteria that would eliminate the endlessly reiterated news items on the basis of their rhetorical, informational, socio-political profiles, rather than on the basis of their origins and distribution?

Thinking this way about more news as better news, the professional journalist may also miss the opportunity to do the work that Ericson (1998) and Picard (2015), for example, call for when they identify deficiencies in the definition of news. In modern times, journalists require greater independence of thinking – a greater capacity to inquire and conceptualize – when it comes to assessing what news is. They also need to recognize the impact of past interpretations of and assumptions about news on the present (see also Gasher 2005; Lowrey, Daniels, and Becker 2005, and Adam 1989 for their critiques of the quality of journalism curricula). For example, using these questions as teaching opportunities to encourage the development of students' ability to interpret could support their capacity to generatively raise questions about the role of the audience, and about what is news, and to adapt to emergent economic, technological, and intellectual spheres of activity. Other current concerns include the need for journalists to be able to distinguish between news, information, and knowledge in a digital environment (Picard 2015). However, these shifts are not possible when making visible the tacit values and assumptions embedded in previous professional subjectivities is not a clearly articulated goal of journalism education. Such rendering visible is the foundational condition of independent thinking.

A Mobile Responsive Expertise

We end with a discussion about how we might intervene to change the subjectivity of journalists and journalism's disciplinary formations through learning outcomes. We suggest that identifying a learning outcome for the teaching hospital model of journalism education as including "a mobile responsive expertise" would recognize the historic importance of *in situ* learning in journalism education and professional formation through practice, while also identifying the need to create interpretative capacity to expose assumptions of professional formation through an awareness of how other disciplines have studied journalism. We suggest that there will always be professional subjectivity in journalism: arguably, all professions are constituted first in the subjectivities of their members – the values, identities, orientations, and conscientious activities that compose a professional identity. We propose here, however, that graduates of professional schools, including journalism, need to incorporate more of the subjectivity (values, interests, orientations) generally characteristic of other disciplines, and especially characteristic of the disciplines that already take journalism itself as an object of inquiry. They must be able to create news and information content and understand the ramifications of practice through exposure to other disciplinary approaches such as those taken by history, media studies, economics, and technology so that they will be able to act independently and to intervene in professional identity formations. In these senses, journalistic expertise would be mobile (i.e., drawn and refreshed from relevant disciplines) as well as responsive (i.e., alert to the findings and questions these disciplines present about journalism itself). Currently, some of these approaches are being integrated into the UBC teaching hospital model in class assignments and courses outside the multiplatform newsroom. This highlights the opportunities and tensions of bringing a more adaptive, reflexive approach to the model.

The recent case of NBC news anchor Brian Williams embellishing past experience about an assignment covering the Iraq war in 2003 is an example of a journalism issue that graduates should be able to respond to because of the questions it raises about professional identity formation in television news. One prominent academic commentator has suggested that the case lends itself to questions about trust in media:

> A leader of a network news division that is still dependent, for better or worse, on the archaic anchorman system would recognize that the architecture of trust that places the lead anchor in both the glamour and the "stress" positions — head of state and prime minister, as it were — can crumble instantly if the anchorman himself cannot be trusted in telling the story of his own experience. (Rosen 2015)

This commentary emerges from value-laden terms and metagenre common to the professional subjectivity of journalism – "trust" and storytelling – and common, too, to the reporting of the story itself. Are there no other terms for inquiry into this episode? What about the demands of television formats that expose the journalist as "staged authority" in which that staging is inevitable because of technical challenges and the "need to appear normal and natural through … retakes, reenactments and the use of stock footage" (Ericson 1998, 89–90)? Can journalists themselves not find those terms? Journalism's independence is only a "putative independence" if students do not have a research sensibility, which, in our culture, is one of the most independent means of asking and addressing questions. This independence would have generated from the profession a range of responses to the Brian Williams case different from those that were most widely published – different, that is, from reiterations of the traditional metagenre on trust and reliability, and more methodically inquisitive, more research oriented, more responsive to the questions the public has about journalism and its role in making public knowledge, more attuned to perspectives already established by research methodologies in disciplines that take journalism as one of their objects of inquiry.

Conclusion

In this paper we have taken up rhetorical genre theory as an instrument for viewing journalism education: What are the rhetorical features of the teaching-hospital/teaching-newsroom model? We suggest that the teaching hospital model of journalism education is a generative environment for digital technologies and possibilities that needs the support of an explicit and consistent examination of past professional interpretations in relationship to other disciplinary knowledge in order to be effective at supporting innovation as a learning outcome for students. With this lens, we have isolated the supply-side focus of teaching newsrooms as an example of a vehicle of unexamined assumptions – a vehicle of which the teaching newsroom is a driver. But there are no doubt many other assumptions mobilized by the professional interactions activated in the teaching newsroom, at each of which we might pause. In the pause, we might bring to bear disciplined modes of inquiry to examine these assumptions. This pause would also allow journalism educators to create the space to add to replicative learning with opportunities for adaptive and innovative thinking and learning in productive ways that would provide students with the outcomes to engage generatively in the leading edge of their profession.

NOTES

The first author would like to thank Alfred Hermida and Kathryn Gretsinger, her long-standing team teaching colleagues at the UBC Graduate School of Journalism, for being so willing to experiment with being on the edge of teaching and learning journalism.

[1] Giltrow (2012) distinguishes between genres indigenous to a sphere of professional activity and those which are artefacts of classroom activity. The teaching hospital model of journalism education, by most if not all accounts, avoids classroom genres and engages students in genres indigenous to the profession. In other formats of journalism education, we may indeed find classroom genres, such as the reflection on the baseball cap reported above.

REFERENCES

Adam, G. Stuart. 2001. “The Education of Journalists.” *Journalism* 2, no. 3: 315–39.

– . 1989. “Journalism Knowledge and Journalism Practice: The Problems of Curriculum and Research in University Schools of Journalism.” *Canadian Journal of Communication* 14: 70–80.

Anderson, C.W., Tom Glaiyser, Jason Smith, and Marika Rothfeld. 2011. “Shaping 21st Century Journalism: Leveraging a ‘Teaching Hospital Model.’” *New America*. https://www.newamerica.org/oti/shaping-21st-century-journalism

Artemeva, Natasha. 2011. “An Engrained Part of My Career: The Formation of a Knowledge Worker in the Dual Space of Engineering Knowledge and Rhetorical Process.” In *Writing in knowledge societies*. Edited by Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Anthony Paré, Natasha Artemeva, Miriam Horne, and Larissa Yousoubova. 321–50. Fort Collins: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1986. “The Problem of Speech Genres.” In *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays.* Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, translated by Vern W. McGee. 60–102. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Bazerman, Charles. 2002. “Genre and Identity: Citizenship in the Age of the Internet and the Age of Global Capitalism.” In *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre: Strategies for Stability and Change.* Edited by Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, and Tatiana Teslenko. 13–35. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Berkenkotter, Carol, and Thomas Huckin. 1995. *Genre Knowledge in Disciplinary communication: Cognition/Culture/Power.* Northvale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bitzer, Lloyd. 1980. “Functional Communication: A Situational Perspective.” In *Rhetoric in Transition: Studies in the Nature and Uses of Rhetoric.* Edited by Eugene E. White. 21–38. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

– . 1968. “The Rhetorical Situation.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1, no. 13: 1–14.

Boczkowski, Pablo, and Martin de Santos. 2007. “When More Media Equals Less News: Patterns of Content Homogenization in Argentina’s Leading Print and Online Newspapers.” *Political Communication* 24, no. 2: 167–80. doi:10.1080/10584600701313025

Burke, Kenneth. 1969. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clark, Herbert H., and Catherine Marshall. 1992 [1981]. “Definite Reference and Mutual Knowledge.” In *Arenas of Language Use.* Edited by Herbert H. Clark. 9–59. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Deuze, Mark. 2005. “What Is Journalism?: Professional Identity and Ideology of Journalists Reconsidered.” *Journalism* 6, no. 4: 442–64. doi:10.1177/1464884905056815

Erhlich, Matthew. 1997. “The Competitive Ethos in Television Newswork.” In *Social Meanings of News*. Edited by Daniel Berkowitz. 301–20. London: Sage.

Ericson, Richard. 1998. “How Journalists Visualize Fact.” *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 560: 83–95.

Francisco, Tim, Alyssa Lenhoff, and Michael Schudson. 2012. “The Classroom as Newsroom: Leveraging University Resources for Public Affairs Reporting.” *International Journal of Communication* 6: 2677–97.

Freedman, Aviva, and Peter Medway. 1994. “Locating Genre Studies: Antecedents and Prospects.” In *Genre and the New Rhetoric*. Edited by Aviva Freedman and Peter Medway. 2-18. London: Taylor and Francis.

Friend, Cecilia, and Jane B. Singer. 2007. *Online Journalism Ethics: Traditions and Transitions*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.

Gasher, Mike. 2005. “It’s Time to Redefine Journalism Education in Canada.” *Canadian Journal of Communication* 30, no. 4: 665–72.

Giltrow, Janet. 2012. “Landscaping with Indigenous Species.” Keynote address to the Dawson College Writing Symposium, McGill University, Montreal, 8 November.

– . 2011. “’Curious gentlemen’: The Hudson’s Bay Company and the Royal Society: Business and Science in the Eighteenth Century.” In *Writing in Knowledge Societies*. Edited by Doreen Starke-Meyerring, Anthony Paré, Natasha Artemeva, Miriam Horne, and Larissa Yousoubova. 53–74. Fort Collins,: WAC Clearinghouse and Parlor Press.

– . 2002. “Meta-Genre.” In *The Rhetoric and Ideology of Genre*. Edited by Richard Coe, Lorelei Lingard, Tatiana Teslenko, 187-206 Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

Hatano, Giyoo, and Kayoko Inagaki. 1984. “Two Courses of Expertise.” In *Research and Clinical Center for Child Development Annual Report*. Hokkaido University Collection of Scholarly and Academic Papers no. 6: 27–36. http://eprints2008.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/bitstream/2115/25206/1/6_P27-36.pdf

Lanson, Jerry, and Mitchell Stephens. 2007. *Writing and Reporting the News*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lemann, Nicholas. 2009. “Journalism Schools Can Push Coverage beyond Breaking News.” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 15 November. http://chronicle.com/article/Journalism-Schools-Can-Push/49115

Leonard, Thomas. 1995. *News for All: America’s Coming-of-Age with the Press*. London: Oxford University Press.

Lewis, Michael. 1993. “J-School Confidential.” *New Republic*, 18 April. http://www.newrepublic.com/article/j-school-confidential

Lindgard, Lorelei, and Richard Haber. 2009. “Learning Medical Talk: How the Apprenticeship Complicates Current Explicit/Tacit Debates in Genre Instruction.” In *The Sage Handbook* *of Rhetorical Studies*. Edited by Andrea Lunsford, Kirt Wilson, and Rosa Eberly. 155–170. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lowrey, Wilson, George Daniels, and Lee Becker. 2005. "Predictors of Convergence Curricula in Journalism and Mass Communications Programs." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 60: 32–46. doi:10.1177/107769580506000108

Mensing, Donica, and David Ryfe. 2013. "Blueprint for Change: From the Teaching Hospital to the Entrepreneurial Model of Journalism Education." International Symposium on Online Journalism. https://www.academia.edu/3412374/Blueprint_for_Change_From_the_Teaching_Hospital_to_the_Entrepreneurial_Model_of_Journalism_Education

Miller, Carolyn. 1984. "Genre as Social Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70, no. 2: 151–67.

Newton, Eric. 2013. "The Teaching Hospital – a Goal for Journalism Education." Knight Foundation, 22 November. http://www.knightfoundation.org/press-room/speech/teaching-hospital-goal-journalism-education

– . 2012. "Promise, Peril of Teaching Hospitals." *International Journal of Communication* 6: 2670–73. http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/viewFile/1845/816

Nikunen, Kaarina. 2014. "Losing My Profession: Age, Experience, and Expertise in the Changing Newsroom." *Journalism* 15, no. 7: 868–88.

Paré, Anthony. 1998. "Discourse Regulations and the Production of Knowledge." In *Writing in the Workplace*. Edited by Rachel Silka. 111–23. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

Picard, Robert. 2015. "The Critical Distinctions among News Provision, Information Provision, and Journalism." *The Media Business*, 27 January. http://themediabusiness.blogspot.ca/2015/01/the-critical-distinctions-among-news.html

– . 2014. "Twilight or New Dawn of Journalism?" *Digital Journalism* 2, no. 3: 273–83.

– . 2008. "The Challenges of Public Functions and Commercialized Media." In *The Politics of News*. 2nd ed. Edited by Doris Graber, Denis McQuail, and Pippa Norris. 211–29. Washington: CQ Press.

Pinch, Trevor J., and Wiebe E. Bijker. 1989. "The Social Construction of Facts and Artifacts: Or How the Sociology of Science and the Sociology of Technology Might Benefit Each Other." In *The Social Construction of Technological Systems: New Directions in the Sociology and History of Technology*. Edited by Wiebe Bijker, Thomas Hughes, and Trevor Pinch. 17–44. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Schwartz, Daniel, John Bransford, and David Sears. 2005. “Efficiency and Innovation in Transfer.” In *Transfer of Learning: Research and Perspectives*. Edited by J. Mestre. 1–15. Greenwich: Information Age.

Smart, Graham. 2006. *Writing the Economy: Activity, Genre, and Technology in the World of Banking.* Oakeville: Equinox

Innovation. 2014. *The New York Times*.

http://www.scribd.com/doc/224332847/NYT-Innovation-Report-2014.

Roll, Ido, e-mail message to author, 19 May 2014.

Rosen, Jay. 2015. “Brian Williams Has Not Led. What’s an Anchor For?” *Jay Rosen’s Pressthink: Ghost of Democracy in the Media Machine*. 6 February. http://pressthink.org/2015/02/brian-williams-has-not-led-whats-an-anchor-for/

Young, Mary Lynn. Forthcoming. “‘Scoop Was King’: Media Competition, Crime News, and Masculinity.” In *Covering Canadian Crimes*. Edited by Chris Richardson and Romayne Fullerton-Smith. 356–97. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Zelizer, Barbie. 2004. *Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy*. Thousand Oaks: Sage**.**

Interrogating Our Past Practice as We Scale the Walls of the Box We Call Journalism Education

Sally Haney

Introduction

Many journalism educators in Canada arrive in the academy with deep, varied, and direct journalism experience. This paper examines some potential impacts of our mainstream media experiences on the seemingly urgent need to reimagine journalism education. Drawing on industry and academic research, interaction with students and colleagues, and twenty-plus years working as a journalist, I invite colleagues to explore with me some of the ways our industry experiences may be hindering our work as journalism educators. My central argument is that working journalists tend not to reflect deeply on what they're doing while they're doing it. This lack of reflexivity can become entrenched and has potential to hinder our teaching and student learning.

In this paper, I share some of my experiences as both a journalist and a teacher. The reflections about my journalism practice are meant to provide some insights into what I now consider to be examples of flawed thinking in the areas of ethics and critical thinking. I will also explore some related experiences in my role as a journalism educator that showcase some of my previously unexamined assumptions about teaching and learning. The sharing of personal reflections is meant to inform my overall claim that if we are to advance an effective plan for journalism education by 2020, we must do a more careful job of probing our past practice and its impact on our work as journalism educators.

The paper then turns to two approaches that could help us think about new ways to interrogate past experience. Both are rooted in reflective practice and may benefit journalism educators charged with reimagining the curriculum. The first is a pedagogical model titled "Decoding the Disciplines" (Middendorf & Pace 2004) that offers a structured way to interrogate and challenge how we have come to know what we know as experts in our field. The second provides a framework to support our development as critically reflective teachers. As Brookfield (1995) and Larrivee (2000) discuss, developing a critically reflective practice involves more than simply talking about what we do as teachers. It requires an *active* interrogation of our own assumptions, judgments, and beliefs with the long-range goal of transforming our work with students. The work is circular, incremental, and ongoing. Larrivee's framework takes us through the stages of developing a reflective practice, a brief summary of which is offered later.

This paper may be of interest to professionals who after significant time "in the field" now find themselves teaching students in myriad disciplines such as law, education, interior design, social work, justice studies, and medicine. The intended audience, however, is the journalism educator, who over the past thirty years has had to navigate the choppiest of waters with respect to the shifting media landscape that is journalism today (Carnegie-Knight Initiative 2011; Huey, Nisenholtz, and Sagan 2013; Lynch n.d.; Singer 2010; Webb 2015). A literature review supports my concern that the deeper we immerse ourselves in the complex issues facing journalism, the more anxious, confused, and arguably defensive some of us become. The scholarly narrative suggests that we journalism educators are resistant to pedagogic change (Massé and Popovich 2007), not especially adept at calculating the impacts of technological change (Huey, Nisenholtz, and Sagan 2013), not enjoying a good fit within the academy (Zelizer 2004, 2009; Hamilton 2014), in disagreement with one another (Blom and Davenport 2012), and at odds with those in industry about what should constitute a journalism education (Finberg and Klinger 2014). Attendees at the May 2014 Toward 2020: New Directions in Journalism Education conference in Toronto, out of which this volume emerged, heard media scholar Robert Picard say that our "curriculums have been designed to produce news factory workers who can be dropped into a slot at a journalism factory".[1] We realize, of course, that many of these factories are downsizing, if not closing. Yet it is inside these factories that many of us honed and mastered our ways of thinking and doing. Yes, we learned a complex array of skills on the job, many as important today as they were decades ago – keenly observing our surroundings, developing creative ideas, conducting research, interpreting data, interacting with and evaluating information from sources, verifying our findings, producing stories to benefit the public. But in these same factories we also adopted some deeply ingrained and potentially problematic approaches that guided our practice, and eventually our pedagogy. The breaking news and quick-turnaround settings in which we worked required (and still do require) a type of thinking that is on some level incongruent with the critical reflexivity associated with exemplary teaching. The aim of this paper, then, is to pry open the door to conversations that may help us better identify the role our ingrained professional practices are playing as we work, as we teach, and as we together plot the future of journalism education.

From the Newsroom to the Classroom

To understand where we're going, it's important to look back. My path into journalism education will likely sound familiar to many colleagues. In 1988, while obtaining a bachelor's degree in journalism, I began working as a television reporter for the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation. For the next twelve years, I worked in television and radio doing a mix of reporting and editing in both daily news and current affairs formats. In the early 2000s, I ventured into post-secondary teaching while continuing to work as a freelancer. In 2010, during my college's transition to a university, I obtained an MA in Communication and Technology, and in 2011, I became an assistant professor of journalism. My entry into the academy was not without challenges. At first, my inexperience translated into distorted expectations of students and not much knowledge about effective teaching methods. I expected of students an intrinsic ability to articulate and pitch rich story ideas, shoot coherent video sequences, adhere to strict deadlines, and deliver polished, industry-standard work. I also expected of them a deep level of detachment with respect to their sources, which must have been confusing to them given that I also wanted them to exude a type of passion for the stories in which these sources appeared. Despite my own challenges in translating for them my knowledge of journalism into quality teaching, some students produced excellent projects. But I confess that in those early years, when they faltered, I quietly blamed them. How had they missed my clear instructions on the need for focus? Why had they missed the central conflict in the story? How had they allowed a self-serving source to so heavily influence their thinking? More than a dozen years later, I still find myself apologizing whenever I see members of those early cohorts who were subjected to my ill-defined understanding of "experiential learning," which was a messy "I have shown you, now get out there and do it" approach to teaching. This approach may have provided some benefits to students, but it was also lacking. I had done little to expand my understanding of how students learn, and I had not subjected my assumptions, values, and beliefs about journalism practice to any sort of critical review.

Rushed Journalists as Educators

Over time, I have created more space to investigate many aspects of my own journalism practice, as well as my teaching practice. This type of reflexive work is ongoing and pulls in many directions, but the areas I find myself most drawn to are ethics and critical thinking. My colleagues and I talk about ethics, a lot. Like several journalism programs, we offer an ethics course in year two, taught by a seasoned journalist-professor and designed to help students better navigate their journalism practice through a careful examination of key principles. During our faculty's ongoing discussions about course offerings, I have supported keeping the ethics course, for it offers students time to read rich case studies and to discuss rigorously the ethics of journalism. There are times, however, when I have wondered whether we should dismantle the course and leave the teaching of ethics solely to the journalist-teachers in practice-based courses, who have always helped students navigate ethical dilemmas in real time. I have little doubt that it is within these partnerships that our students do most of their learning about what it is to be a journalist, including what it means to navigate difficult ethical terrain. But in production courses, most of which are housed within the tight strictures of the semester system, we engage in a rushed approach that can mirror the newsroom environments of our pasts. This rushing tends to obscure for students some important thinking that should be happening at every decision point along every project continuum. For example, when they pitch a story, do we systematically help situate for them where their story fits into the larger social agenda? In other words, does that story in any way question or disrupt the grand narratives at play? Do we routinely help them locate and name their biases and world views in an effort to assess how such things impact the projects they propose? And do we actively negotiate where and how the student-journalists' own personal and professional voices will be heard? Sometimes we do these things. But in deadline-driven environments, we can find ourselves glossing over naming and discussing the intellectual moves our students are undertaking. I contend that this is because many journalist-teachers have had little practice at slowing down enough to distill into explicit chunks their own thinking and doing.

Our Engagement with Sources

Let us look at the more specific issue of how we coach students to engage with sources. While this coaching is often positively influenced by our own experience in the field, sometimes our negative yet deeply ingrained habits have followed us into the journalism classroom. These habits include settling on sources not because they represent the best journalistic choices but because they're available in advance of pressing deadlines; prescriptively crowbarring a set number of sources (three seems to be the magic number) into common formats; finding sources who reinforce the he-said-she-said approach to news; and repeatedly going back to the same sources rather than seeking out new or more diverse ones. Of all of these habits, among the more concerning relates to how we go about convincing inexperienced or vulnerable sources to take part in our reporting projects. Our students do well when it comes to finding sources, and over time, they show high levels of organization and determination in securing people to talk, on the record. But sometimes things go sideways with those sources. As a faculty co-editor of our online news publication, I have been directly or peripherally involved in reviewing a handful of cases in which sources launched complaints. Most arose from people who were inexperienced sources. Their concerns can be captured by statements such as:

I didn't know this interview would be published online.

I was taken out of context.

I agreed to the interview, but now I regret my participation.

I agreed to the interview, but the story wasn't what I would have written.

When people search my name, they see this story.

Less frequently, we run into another type of complaint: sources tell us they thought they were participating in a student's school assignment as opposed to a public reporting project. In most cases, our students have been able to produce evidence that they identified themselves as journalists and provided sources with links to our news publications. Nonetheless, inexperienced sources often recall these exchanges differently. In most cases, complaints are quickly resolved. But they speak to the larger issue of how we teach our students to engage with sources who sometimes lack understanding about what we do. What we are modelling to our students may be at the centre of the issue. I invite journalists-now-educators to examine how we went about managing our own relationships with sources. Many of us were experts at manipulating them into participating as characters in our stories. The use of the word "manipulate" may rankle, but it is deliberately used to describe situations in which we skilfully sold inexperienced sources on the benefits of participation. We used phrases such as "the public good" or "face of the story" or "let others know they're not alone" as ways to nudge sources into telling us their compelling and often highly personal stories. In most cases, these sources seemed pleased with the outcomes. But I confess that as a journalist, I spent little time contemplating whether sources' participation might have been in any way harmful to them, nor did I see evidence that my editors were engaging in this type of contemplation. The only times I had extended conversations with editors about sources was when I interviewed subjects who had requested anonymity, said something potentially libellous, or threatened legal action after publication. The following recollection is an example of how I engaged with one particular source, early in my career as a television journalist:

> I profiled a teenager in the early 1990s who had been forced to work in prostitution. Her accounts of being forced to have sex with many men, often one after the other, were chilling. The assaults happened in "flop houses" in which mattresses were placed on the floors of locations secured by pimps. The story took the audience inside the child exploitation scene. At the time I had no qualms about including this teenaged girl as my source. She was, after all, willing to be the "face" of the story. She was also encouraged to participate by a local police vice unit and a service agency that advocated for former sex trade workers. Both agencies appeared supportive of her as she tried to move forward. We protected her identity for ethical and legal reasons. In the months after the story aired, I would occasionally call her. I wanted to see how she was doing, and sometimes called to seek her opinions on developments in the local child exploitation

> industry. She eventually asked me to stop calling. I don't remember her exact words. But she no longer wanted to be associated with a story that narrowly defined her as both victim and child prostitute. She needed to move on. Only years later did I contemplate that her inclusion in this high-profile story might have been damaging to her. This teenager was never afforded a clear account of the factors to consider in advance of her participation. Looking back, the one mitigating factor is that my work was not published online. It aired on local television and disappeared into the dusty broadcast archives. Had I produced this story in the last decade, its shelf life would have been much longer.

Not until a few years into teaching did I begin to actively work through questions of source well-being. Others have done a much better job on this front, including former CBC journalist Meredith Levine.[2] She argues in her thesis, "Consent and Consequences: Journalists' Duty to Inform Subjects of Potential Harms" (2010), that journalists – and by extension journalism in general – would be well served by assessing the risk of participation using approaches found in human research ethics models adopted by health and social science researchers. As Levine (2010) writes, it's really about providing sources (in a non-bureaucratic way) with enough information that they can make a good decision about participation.

> In journalism practice, as in much of health and social science research, avoiding unnecessary harm should require first and foremost, disclosure of potential significant negative consequences, and then let the subject decide for herself her course of action. The potential subject in journalism then must be conceived of as not only a person with information to share, but also a person who is herself in need of information. (96)

Levine concludes that it is the journalist's duty to inform vulnerable and inexperienced sources of potential harm; yet there is a deep resistance in the field to doing much beyond clearly identifying oneself as a journalist. This divergence of opinion was captured in a formal discussion paper (English, Enkin, Levine, and Sher 2014) published by the Canadian of Association of Journalists in which Levine, a professor at Western University, argued for significant change in journalists' approach to sources. The remaining panellists – Toronto Star public editor Kathy English, CBC ombudsman Esther Enkin, and Julian Sher, senior producer for CBC's the fifth estate – largely defended the status quo of clearly identifying oneself as a journalist, although they also supported developing more training and asking more questions around the issue of vulnerable sources.

Such training often falls to the journalism educator (and so it should). Problems arise, however, when we aren't able to step back from some of our deeply ingrained practices. It wasn't that long ago that I routinely instructed students that all they needed to say (to their sources) was that they were reporting for our publication. In recent years, however, several colleagues and I have worked much harder to provide our student journalists with clearer ways to more fully inform sources. One is through a detailed electronic e-mail signature that identifies our students as reporters, identifies our publication as both print and online, and explains the publication's relationship to the university. These are small changes that probably don't go far enough to inform inexperienced sources about the possible impacts of participation. Should we not also be talking to sources about the indelible nature of online publishing? Online stories are easy to search, cache, and share. Online stories are also easy to incorporate into new works by people who have no connection to the original sources or context. Online stories have no expiry dates. Many of us may not be spending enough time educating our students or our sources about the impacts of the extended shelf life of journalism content. That said, if we were to coach journalists into entering prolonged conversations with sources about the possible benefits and drawbacks of participation, we could witness the collapse – at least temporarily – of many fine reporting projects, although in her thesis and in the CAJ discussion paper, Levine suggests there is no evidence to support this concern. Furthermore, in an era during which journalists are already struggling to access information (captured by my colleague Sean Holman's work on freedom of information in Canada: visit http://seanholman.com/), what would happen if they were required to develop a detailed consent form each time they approached someone for an interview? This uncertainty should not interfere with giving our students more explicit instruction about the need for transparency when obtaining consent from sources, who, after all, are the lifeblood of our work. The challenge will be whether we can collectively dissect some of our past thinking about sources in an effort to do better as we move forward.

Critical Thinking in the J-Curriculum

Another related area of concern is how our industry-driven experiences can lead to problems in the ways we conceive and teach critical thinking in journalism education. We are in the university. Through our mission statements, mandates, program descriptions, and course descriptions, and even through assignments, we say we want our students to become critical thinkers. Yet even the definition of critical thinking is deeply contested, with scholars reminding us that conceptions of critical thinking are rarely agreed upon and are also deeply influenced by academics' epistemological beliefs (Petress 2004; Pithers & Soden 2000; Geng 2014). Geng's analysis of sixty-four definitions of critical thinking found eight common elements: "judgment, argument, questioning, information processing, problem solving, metacognition, skill and disposition" (127). My concern is that in journalism education, we may at times fail to adequately name and weave these elements into our students' everyday learning. Reasons for this may include the habits of mind we developed as news workers, so that we now conflate critical thinking with asking tough questions, or taking a narrowly sceptical view to our reporting endeavours. This narrow approach may explain why some journalism educators resist the explicit teaching of critical thinking. Geisler highlights part of the problem in her column for the Poynter Institute, written in 2005 and updated in 2014.

> Newsroom managers tell me they want the journalists on their teams to use better "critical thinking skills." My question is: just what do they really mean by that? For some, it means being skeptical – the time-honored school of "If your mother says she loves you, check it out." That's a start at critical thinking. For other news managers, I fear it simply means: "Have the ability to read my mind and know exactly how I would do the story." That's pretty much the end of critical thinking. It is just emulation.

Taking a questioning stance in journalism practice is, as Geisler suggests, a good starting point. Those of us who have engaged in complex journalism endeavours, such as producing documentaries, authoring books, managing newsrooms, and conducting major investigations, have most certainly gone further – engaging in an intricate array of mental manoeuvring that goes far beyond asking questions. Perhaps the bigger issue is that as journalism professors, we don't always clearly break down for our students how we learned or activated such critical thinking skills in the field. Some of us may not even know, at least in explicit terms, how we developed and carried out the mental moves that served us well. The good news is that for the uninitiated, there is a deep literature in place to help us better incorporate the lessons and language of critical thinking in higher education. An excellent resource is the Foundation for Critical Thinking (www.criticalthinking.org), a US-based not-for-profit that works with individuals and organizations, including universities.

The foundation makes a strong case for "excellence in thought" by first outlining the problem with unexamined thinking:

> Much of our thinking, left to itself, is biased, distorted, partial, uninformed or down-right prejudiced. Yet the quality of our life and that of what we produce, make, or build depends precisely on the quality of our thought. Shoddy thinking is costly, both in money and in quality of life. Excellence in thought, however, must be systematically cultivated. (www.criticalthinking.org/pages/defining-critical-thinking/410)

The Foundation goes on to define critical thinking as

> that mode of thinking – about any subject, content, or problem – in which the thinker improves the quality of his or her thinking by skilfully analyzing, assessing, and reconstructing it. Critical thinking is self-directed, self-disciplined, self-monitored, and self-corrective thinking. It presupposes assent to rigorous standards of excellence and mindful command of their use. It entails effective communication and problem solving abilities, as well as a commitment to overcome our native egocentrism and sociocentrism. (ibid., 411)

This definition makes me wonder to what extent journalism educators are engaging in the type of reflexivity proposed, let alone facilitating this mode of thinking in the classroom. One issue may relate to our habits as practising journalists. Many of us working in daily news environments were focused on deadlines and deliverables. "You're only as good as your last story" was a common refrain that conditioned us to privilege expediency over reflection. I confess that, in the field, my intellectual and even procedural reactions to new ideas sometimes privileged efficiency over depth, he-said-she-said formats over appropriate weighting of conflicting claims, and narrow angles over big-picture thinking. How much stronger would my early journalism have been had I been exposed in my undergraduate training to a practice of intentional critical thinking marked by a more systematic way of managing my assumptions and situatedness in relation to each story? The following reflection from my time as a young journalist offers a view to what I now consider to be flawed thinking:

> I was in my late twenties. It was the early 1990s. A couple invited me into their home where I met their child, who was on the autism spectrum. The parents were excited about "breakthrough" technology they were using to help their non-verbal child communicate. Using an alphabet board, the father as facilitator rested his hand over his child's hand, and began asking questions. After each question, their conjoined hands would float from letter to letter. The father would then translate his child's answers for me. I recall feeling tormented as I continued to watch their hand-on-hand traversing across the board. They struck me as good caring people, genuinely excited and eager to share their story. Yet I was also aware through some preliminary research that this type of facilitated

> communication was largely discredited in the scientific community. A growing number of studies indicated it was the facilitators who were guiding the movements. Preparing for our first interview, I knew that my questions needed to end up in the show-me-evidence arena. But my journalism education and training in the field had prematurely catapulted me into this line of questioning. I hadn't the maturity or the thinking skills to give myself (and these sources) permission to explore the rich space of what they were experiencing in their attempts to communicate with their child. My time was restricted, as was my approach. I started the interview, quickly demanding proof of their claims. Our conversation ended abruptly, and I "bailed" on the story. I can only assume that exposure to more critical thinking training in my undergraduate journalism degree, more mentoring in my newsroom, and more time to investigate their claims from multiple standpoints would have led to a better result for all involved.

As a twenty-something journalist, I might have argued that my research into claims about facilitated communication was enough reason to reject the family's belief that their child's communication skills were improving through its use. But I hadn't had the intellectual training for that, nor had I time to step back and ask what else might have been going on in that suburban living room. I never thought to ask to what extent regular touch between parent and child was creating a more conducive environment for communication. What impact had the couple's intensive search for solutions had on the quality of their relationship with their child? What effect did sharing their story with other families and the media have on their ability to hope for their child's future? Mine was then a journalism practice devoid of the multiple perspective-taking we expect of our students today. The problem of course was that I had little formal training in higher-order thinking. I don't recall ever discussing, at least in explicit terms, critical thinking with any producers, colleagues, or journalism professors. Years later, and in a different setting, I'm not convinced much has changed. I hear students complain about professors whose red-inked demands for more evidence of critical thinking rarely contain precise instruction about what they're looking for. The students' complaints are directed not only at us but also at teachers from a cross-section of academic fields. Their complaints leave me searching for ways to effect positive change.

Going Deeper with Critical Thinking Instruction

Infusing our curriculum with more formalized critical thinking instruction is an important part of the solution. But this would require that we decompress our courses, thereby leaving room to build in more opportunities for students to learn and practise the explicit intellectual steps associated with excellence in thought. This is no easy task, given our backgrounds and our workloads. In practice-based courses, we already devote much time to scrutinizing student projects, including those shared in the public sphere. We help them develop and hone their ideas. We strategize with them about who and what will comprise their investigations. We also carve out time to teach them how to operate specialized equipment and how to engage audiences using ever-expanding platforms. We ensure as best we can that their work is meeting ethical, legal, and editorial standards. It is easy to understand why the journalism teacher might resist adding to her fourteen-week course a deep dive into lessons of explicit critical thinking.

It is also easy to understand why journalism professors might deem adequate some of the extant approaches to teaching journalistic critical thinking. Take for example the good work of Benedetti, Kierans, and Currie, who in their textbook *The New Journalist: Roles, Skills, and Critical Thinking* (2010) unpack important lessons. In their chapter devoted to critical thinking for journalists, Benedetti[3] and Kierans spell out the "basics" through an exploration of three questions: 1. What is being claimed? 2. What is the evidence? 3. Is the person making the claim an authority? (130). These are significant questions that go a long way towards supporting our students as they undertake complex reporting endeavours in fast-paced environments. However, while the chapter offers the student journalist a useful range of ways to think more critically about sources and their claims, it devotes little space to the type of reflexivity proposed by the Foundation for Critical Thinking. To develop that space, we would need to acknowledge the issue of gaps in our expertise. I assume that many journalism professors (myself included) don't consider themselves experts in critical-thinking instruction. Addressing these deficits will require us to develop a far more comprehensive approach to critical thinking in journalism, not to mention deep programmatic and institutional support to put such inquiry in place. A discussion of what this action and support might look like falls outside the scope of this paper, but there are many models in place to support faculty learning, including communities of practice (Wenger 2000), book studies (Medina, Garrison, and Brazeau 2010), and critical thinking learning opportunities (Stedman & Adams 2012).

Some might argue, however, that our students – particularly those in liberal arts institutions – are already receiving more explicit critical thinking training from other professors in disciplines such as philosophy and English. But do we not weaken our programs when we leave questions of how journalists should be "thinking about thinking" to others? The question is not meant to undermine the value of interdisciplinary learning. It does, however, acknowledge that we have not yet developed a coherent view of what we consider to be key knowledge about critical thinking. Part of the issue may relate to our discipline's age – the journalism school established in 1908 in Missouri was among the first in North America (Cushion 2007), while Canada's first university to grant journalism degrees was Carleton (which awarded three Bachelors of Journalism in 1946). When one is part of a "new" academic field, disciplinary knowledge is subject to intense negotiation, which can lead to much discord. Zelizer's work (2004, 2009) probes these problems of disconnection in our field:

> In that over the years academics have invoked a variety of prisms through which to consider journalism, they have not yet produced a scholarly picture of journalism that combines all of these prisms into a coherent reflection of all that journalism is and could be. Instead, the study of journalism remains incomplete, partial and divided, leaving its practitioners uncertain about what it means to think about journalism, writ broadly. (2009, 30)

Zelizer examines not only the uneasy relationships among journalists, journalism educators, and journalism scholars, but also journalism's uncomfortable fit within the academy. She specifically calls for "a space of reflection, both about the backdrop status of journalism's practice and study and about the degree to which the default assumptions that comprise it correspond with the full picture of contemporary journalism" (2009, 30). These tensions help explain why our attempts to articulate the curricula of tomorrow are riddled with challenges. Shapiro's recent work in *Journalism Studies* (2014) provides an illustrative example of the search for disciplinary coherence as he brings together the very words that define the form and function of what we do.[4] His proposed definition of journalism – which since publication has been amended to include the phrase "or commentary upon" (I. Shapiro, personal communication, spring 2015) – reads: "Journalism comprises the activities involved in an independent pursuit of, or commentary upon, accurate information about current or recent events and its original presentation for public edification" (561). His work, and the works of other journalism scholars – many of whom, like Shapiro, have had careers as journalists – form a growing body of scholarship that needs to be woven through not only our peer-to-peer discussions about the future of journalism education, but also our work with students. This braiding of theory and practice will require ongoing attention, especially from those of us arriving from industry. Through it all, we need to stay committed to interrogating our past experiences as we continue growing into our roles as educators and scholars.

Uncovering Our Blind Spots

There are many ways to conduct such interrogations. I propose two, one of which could help us better understand our roles as teachers/professors, the other, as disciplinary experts. I will begin with the latter, called Decoding the Disciplines, which I first learned about through conference workshops hosted by the International Society for the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning. Developed by a group of American scholars, Decoding the Disciplines (hereafter referred to as Decoding) is a process-driven approach meant to help disciplinary experts surface their tacit knowledge, break it down into steps, model the steps to students, and then provide rich feedback as students practise those steps. The Decoding researchers have developed a seven-step framework, which grew out of work done by a Faculty Learning Community (FLC) at Indiana University.[5] The FLC supported academics from myriad disciplines through intensive ten-day seminars designed to identify and solve “bottlenecks” to student learning. As Middendorf and Pace (2004) explain, the FLC grew from a “strong realization”

> that the mental operations required of undergraduates differ enormously from discipline to discipline, that these ways of thinking are rarely presented to students explicitly, that students generally lack an opportunity to practice and receive feedback on particular skills in isolation from others, and that there is rarely a systematic assessment of the extent to which students have mastered each of the ways of thinking that are essential to particular disciplines. (3)

The Decoding researchers consistently remind us that experts in academic fields tend to have a type of amnesia with respect to their ingrained understandings of how they know what they know in their disciplines. Put another way, these experts – be they biologists, historians, lawyers, or journalists – tend not to remember *how* they have come to know what they consider to be key disciplinary knowledge. At one workshop, the concept was explained in terms of experts passing through a type of portal or wormhole of understanding. Once through, they struggle to remember a time when they did not understand the world from that epistemological view. This buried knowing, which can be deeply problematic for both students and teachers, helps explain why our students sometimes struggle with concepts we consider obvious or innate, such as tracking down sources, or recognizing potential stories.

This “disciplinary unconscious” has the potential to hinder student learning. I came face to face with this realization two years ago, when decoding expert David Pace visited my university to help faculty learn more about decoding. Not long after, I agreed to participate in a research project in which I was decoded by two non-journalist colleagues. That interview was a game-changer. To help illustrate how the method surfaced some of my own ingrained knowledge, I share below a snapshot of my experience, aided by a snippet of the interview transcript. As I prepared for my decoding interview, I was asked to think carefully about a bottleneck to student learning in my classes. My response came quickly – story ideas. For years, I have witnessed students struggle to consistently generate strong journalistic pitches. We show them good work. We provide questions they should address in their pitches. We engage in many conversations with them about audience, story tension, and public interest. We discuss focus, angles, and hooks. Sometimes, in return, we hear them articulate strong ideas. Other times, the ideas are weak. They lack tension, are poorly researched, are much too big or much too small. When the decoders pushed me to define the bottleneck more clearly, I eventually concluded that it related to pattern recognition – that students struggle to recognize the patterns that are often consistent with strong story ideas. The decoders also asked me many questions about what I did as an "expert" to generate my own story ideas. I was repeatedly asked to describe in detail how I went about the process. This hour-long conversation resulted in some key takeaways, including the degree to which my ideas were usually connected to breaks in established patterns. In other words, issues, events, and people typically appeared on my story radar when they struck me as different from the norm. The decoding experience allowed me to see how quickly and often I had taken away the opportunity for students to identify and practise finding these breaks in patterns.

The decoding exercise was both humbling and disconcerting. As a teacher, I recognized that I had to some degree failed to develop a systematic approach to support students with their story idea development. The following excerpt from my decoding interview transcript illustrates my discomfort in trying to explain to non-journalists what my engagement with good story ideas looks and feels like:

> *Interviewer*: And what does that engagement look like?
> *Sally*: [pause] I don't know! Emotionally engaging story idea? [pause] Well, I mean on a first level it is just excitement, I am excited by the idea. I am kind of excited by the notion of, "A-ha! There is something here we are going to bring out, that we are going to surface that has potentially not been surfaced before," so that idea, the big reveal, you know?
> *Interviewer*: So you are excited by that angle of newness?
> *Sally*: Yes … I get excited too when the story doesn't fit what we consider to be a pattern of a predictable story arc.

Decoding (and being decoded) is time-consuming and difficult work. When my interview concluded, I was exhausted. I was also excited about examining my expertise to better assist my students in their learning. At the same time, I felt vulnerable, even embarrassed, because after years of teaching, there I was, struggling to explain a core concept. Middendorf and Pace's seven-step model (2004, 4–10) begins with the essential work of identifying the bottleneck to student learning. On that front, I made some progress during the interview. I have also made some progress on Step 2, addressing how the expert "does these things." Step 3 identifies how these steps can be modelled. While I have begun to think more deeply about how I could model story pitching, I have made less headway in steps four through seven, described by Middendorf and Pace in the form of questions.

Step 4: How will students practise these skills and get feedback?

Step 5: What will motivate the students?

Step 6: How well are students mastering these learning tasks?

Step 7: How can the resulting knowledge about learning be shared?

I have much work left to do on the decoding front. But it is exactly this type of introspective work that I believe will help us improve our teaching *and* student learning in journalism education. The Decoding researchers invite us to probe our expertise and provide a model to begin such work. Similarly, critical thinking scholars invite us to access rich resources located not only in the scholarly literature but also in repositories such as the one overseen by the Foundation for Critical Thinking. I will conclude with a brief review of one such resource – a framework proposed by Barbara Larrivee that could help former journalists become more critically reflective teachers.

We require of our students a great deal of reflection. We tell them that a reflective approach to learning brings deep and lasting gains. Yet few journalist-educators model reflective practice. Larrivee (2000) and others (e.g., Brookfield, 1995) invite us into this practice by identifying and challenging our existing beliefs and assumptions so that we face what Larrivee describes as our “deeply rooted personal attitudes concerning human nature, human potential, and human learning. Reflective practitioners challenge assumptions and question existing practices, thereby continuously accessing new lens to view their practice and alter their perspectives” (296). Yet existing practices are hard to let go. Consider, for example, many journalism educators’ proclivity for familiar formats. Like old sweaters, these formats are comforting, and we assume they are effective. The television producer wraps himself in the documentary, the broadcast journalist in her ninety-second package, the magazine writer in his long-form narrative, the wire service reporter in his razor-sharp headline and lead. Many of us were hired because we had mastered specific formats and related practices. But our proclivity for these familiar ways of doing (and thinking) can impede clear thinking about what journalism education should look like. One can never argue that specialized expertise is a bad thing. But by rigidly embedding our expertise in assignments, classrooms, courses, and specializations, we may be limiting student journalists’ opportunities to make informed choices that support excellence in journalistic thinking.

Larrivee proposes a framework that could help us structure some of the conversations and work we need to undertake as we chart new territory in journalism education. But this type of work can entail significant emotional and cognitive upheaval, which is why she and others stress the need for creating safe and respectful arenas in which we can wrestle with our closely held assumptions. Larrivee offers a way to visualize the stages involved in developing a critical reflective practice, although she suggests that the process is more circular than linear. The first stage is one of examination, where the teacher analyses any behaviour or action with the goal of determining whether it's getting the desired result (304). A personal example is my habit of conducting fast, *efficient* story meetings with my senior students. I have told myself that students appreciate my approach to hearing their ideas and helping them quickly set those ideas in motion. But I can see problems with this approach. Larrivee describes the second stage of developing a reflective practice as the toughest one, marked by chaos and fear. This stage sees the teacher wrestle with letting go of the familiar (yet counterproductive) behaviour or action. Larrivee suggests that in this "struggle stage" (305), it's easy to abandon the change we are trying to make as we cling to our familiar ways of doing things. But she encourages us to weather the storm (305), for the uncertainty and chaos will eventually pass. The next stage is marked by "perceptual shift" (305) and sees us reconcile our shifting views and ultimately change our practice. Only after we have changed our practice do we engage in reflective work that is transformative (306). None of this work should be undertaken alone. We require one another's support as we conduct such personal inquiries, and this can leave us feeling isolated and vulnerable. This is why many reflective practitioners develop spaces to do some of this work together.

Final Words

I have been teaching journalism since 2003. When I began this work in a college setting, few journalism instructors were talking about reflective practice, unexamined thinking, disciplinary knowing, or the careful braiding of theory and practice. Things are changing. Through my college's transformation into a university, through support from numerous scholars, and through my immersion in the scholarship of teaching and learning, I am beginning to envision journalism education differently. In doing so, I hope I am avoiding the kind of auto-pilot thinking and doing that inevitably hinders student learning. I also hope this paper will spark some ideas about how we might better investigate our experiences as teachers and former journalists. I propose that we actively search for models and frameworks that will help us dissect not only our shortcomings in the classroom but also how some of those shortcomings are linked to the unexamined ways in which we carried out our work as journalists.

NOTES

[1] For Picard's essay, see pages 4-10 in this volume.

[2] For Levine's contribution to this volume, see pages 85-93.

[3] For Benedetti's contribution to this volume, see pages 94-104.

[4] For Shapiro's contribution to this volume, see pp 11-27.

[5] The 7-step framework is described at http://www.decodingthedisciplines.org/about.html

REFERENCES

Benedetti, Paul, Kim Kierans, and Tim Currie, Eds. 2010. *The New Journalist: Roles, Skills, and Critical Thinking*. Toronto: Emond Montgomery.

Blom, Robin, and Lucinda Davenport. 2012. "Searching for the Core of Journalism Education: Program Directors Disagree on Curriculum Priorities." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 67, no. 1: 70–86. doi:10.1177/1077695811428885

Brookfield, Stephen D. 1995. *Becoming a Critically Reflective Teacher*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education. 2011. *A Report on the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*. http://www.hks.harvard.edu/presspol/publications/reports/c-k_initiative_2011.pdf

Cushion, Stephen. 2007. "'On the Beat or In the Classroom; Where and How Is Journalism Studied?" *Journalism Practice* 1, no. 3: 421–34.

English, Kathy, Esther Enkin, Meredith Levine, and Julian Sher. 2014. "On the Record: Is It Really Consent without Discussion of Consequences?" http://www.caj.ca/on-the-record-is-it-really-informed-consent-without-discussion-of-consequences

Finberg, Howard, and Lauren Klinger. 2014. "Core Skills for the Future of Journalism." *Poynter Online*. http://www.newsu.org/course_files/CoreSkills_FutureofJournalism2014v2.pdf

Geng, Fuyun. 2014. "A Content Analysis of the Definition of Critical Thinking – ProQuest." *Asian Social Science* 10, no. 19: 124–8. http://search.proquest.com/docview/1614971094/fulltextPDF?accountid=1343

Geisler, Jill. "Critical Thinking: What Do You Mean by That?" *Poynter Online*. http://www.poynter.org/how-tos/leadership-management/44556/critical-thinking-what-do-you-mean-by-that

Hamilton, John Maxwell. 2014. "Journalism Education: The View from the Provost's Office." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 69, no. 3: 289–300.

Huey, John, Martin Nisenholtz, and Paul Sagan. 2013. "Riptide: An Oral History of the Epic Collision between Journalism and Digital Technology, from 1980 to Present." *NiemanLab.org*. http://www.niemanlab.org/riptide

Larrivee, Barbara. 2000. "Transforming Teaching Practice: Becoming the Critically Reflective Teacher." *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives* 1, no. 3: 293–307. http://library.mtroyal.ca:2161/doi/pdf/10.1080/713693162

Levine, Meredith. 2010. "Consent and Consequences: Journalists' Duty to Inform Subjects of Potential Harms." MA thesis, Carleton University.

Lynch, Dianne. n.d. "Above and Beyond: Looking at the Future of Journalism Education." *Knight Foundation*. http://knightfoundation.org/features/journalism-education

Massé, Mark, and Mark Popovich. 2007. "Accredited and Nonaccredited Media Writing Programs Are Stagnant, Resistant to Curricular Reform, and Similar." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 62, no. 2: 141–60. doi:10.1177/107769580706200203

Medina, Melissa, Gina Garrison, and Gayle Brazeau. 2010. "Finding Time for Faculty Development." *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education* 74, no. 10: 179. doi:10.5688/aj7410179

Middendorf, Joan, and David Pace. 2004. "Decoding the Disciplines: A Model for Helping Students Learn Disciplinary Ways of Thinking." *New Directions for Teaching and Learning* 98, no. 98: 1–12. doi:10.1002/tl.142

Petress, Ken. 2004. "Critical Thinking: An Extended Definition." *Education* 124, no. 3: 461–6.

Pithers, R.T., and Rebecca Soden. 2000. "Critical Thinking in Education: A Review." *Educational Research* 42, no. 3: 237–49. doi:10.1080/001318800440579

Picard, Robert G. 2014. *Deficient Tutelage: Challenges of Contemporary Journalism Education*. http://www.robertpicard.net/files/Picard_deficient_tutelage.pdf

Shapiro, Ivor. 2014. "Why Democracies Need a Functional Definition of Journalism Now More Than Ever." *Journalism Studies*, 15, no. 5: 555–65, doi:10.1080/1461670X.2014.882483

Singer, Jane B. 2010. "Journalism Ethics amid Structural Change." *Daedalus* 139, no. 2: 89–99.

Stedman, Nicole, and Brittany Adams. 2012. "Identifying Faculty's Knowledge of Critical Thinking Concepts and Perceptions of Critical Thinking Instruction in Higher Education." *NACTA Journal* (June): 9–14.

Wenger, Etienne. 2000. "Communities of Practice and Social Learning Systems." *Organization* 7, no. 2: 225–46. doi:10.1177/135050840072002

Webb, Amy. 2015. "A Blueprint for How to Make J-School Matter (Again)." *Nieman Reports*. http://niemanreports.org/articles/a-blueprint-for-how-to-make-j-school-matter-again

Zelizer, Barbie. 2009. "Journalism and the Academy." In *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. Edited by Karin Wahl-Jorgensen and Thomas Hanitzsch. Routledge.

– . 2004. "When Facts, Truth, and Reality Are God-Terms: On Journalism's Uneasy Place in Cultural Studies." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* 1, no. 1: 100–19. doi:10.1080/1479142042000180953

E is for Empirical: How Scholarly Business Texts, Blogs, and Trade Journals Conceptualize and Critique Entrepreneurism

Meredith Levine

Read through the modest but expanding literature on entrepreneurial journalism education and you'll discover embedded in the texts a sort of syllogism that unfolds as follows:

A. Innovation is essential for the survival of journalism: "We want to help produce the innovators and innovations our industry desperately needs," writes Jeff Jarvis, Director of CUNY's Tow-Knight Center for Entrepreneurial Journalism, of its educational mission (Jarvis 2012).
B. Journalists need to understand the business and economics of journalism: "It's an imperative in the new digital landscape," observed a participant at a 2010 international entrepreneurial journalism education conference hosted by CUNY (Vazquez Schaich and Klein 2013).
C. Therefore, journalism educators must embrace entrepreneurial journalism: "All agree that entrepreneurship is a way to teach both innovation and business" (Jarvis 2010). This was the unanimous view of the attendees of the 2010 CUNY conference, according to Jarvis, who organized it. At a later international conference of entrepreneurial journalism educators, hosted by the Scripps Howard Journalism Entrepreneurship Institute in January 2012, one participant summed it up: "Entrepreneurship should be an essential element of journalism education from this point forward" (Barrett Ferrier 2013).

Few would argue with the first two claims in this syllogism: the need for innovation and the need for economic literacy among journalists. The question is: How did A plus B come to inexorably lead to C? To the imperative, uttered again and again, that journalism programs must introduce entrepreneurship into their curricula?

Although the move toward entrepreneurial journalism education is happening more broadly and quickly in the United States than in Canada, in just the past few years in this country entrepreneurial journalism courses have been developed at several schools, including Carleton, Ryerson, and University of Kings College (which launched an MA in Entrepreneurial Journalism a few years ago). The promise of entrepreneurial journalism education was also on offer at two recent national journalism education conferences. In 2014, at Toward 2020: New Directions in Journalism Education, hosted by Ryerson University, the keynote speech by Robert Picard included a call for entrepreneurial journalism education.[1] In 2013, this author moderated a panel discussion with the directors of journalism programs on the future of graduate journalism education at the Canadian Communication Association. One panel member argued that j-schools need to provide students with entrepreneurial skills and training, a position that was met with approval from the other panelists.

Few would deny that in the face of rapid technological change and the shrinking and closing of news organizations across the country, journalism schools must adapt and change. This paper, however, asserts that the logic – and evidence – behind the entrepreneurial "solution" is faulty, and that entrepreneurial journalism is not the answer to questions about how to innovate journalism education and protect and support strong, independent media in our country. In fact, research studies on entrepreneurship raise serious questions about its increasing presence in journalism education and about whether this trend is in the best interests of our students, of the profession, and, more broadly, of the public(s) we aim to serve. This conclusion is based on a survey of trade journals, business texts, and entrepreneurship blogs (including several on the *Harvard Business Review* site), as well as on studies by entrepreneurial scholars that "fact-check" claims made about entrepreneurship. It also factors in a review of the emerging scholarly and professional literature on entrepreneurial journalism in practice and education.

Contemporary texts on entrepreneurship almost always invoke innovation – indeed, they tend to use the two terms synonymously or interchangeably (Stevenson and Jarillo 1990). Sledzik (2013) and Allen (1994) place some of the blame for the erroneous blurring of these two distinct concepts at the feet of Joseph Schumpeter, the godfather of entrepreneur scholarship, whose earlier work did not adequately distinguish between the two terms, which triggered "semantic confusion" (Sledzik 2013) that continues to this day.

Schumpeter referred to innovation as "creative destruction" (2003). More recent texts on entrepreneurship often refrain from defining innovation and let the reader infer its meaning from the context in which it is employed. Still, there is little variation in how the word is used; it is linked to idea generation, creativity, and invention – the same descriptors, it should be noted, that so often are paired with entrepreneurship (Anderson, Bell, and Shirky 2014; Baines and Kennedy 2010; Briggs 2012, Carland et al. 1984; Cunningham and Lischeron 1991; Hang and van Weezel 2005; Hunter and Nel 2011; Jarvis 2010, 2012; Sledzik 2013; Stevenson and Jarillo 1990).

"Entrepreneur" and "entrepreneurship" tend to be defined more explicitly in business texts, but alas, there is little consistency in these definitions. In their literature review of the concept, Hang and van Weezel (2005) lament that "offering a specific and unambiguous definition of entrepreneurship is still challenging. This is not because the definition is not available, but because there are too many, and even these definitions rarely agree with each other." However, in the media, the business literature, business school parlance, and trade publications, an entrepreneur refers to someone who starts a business from scratch (i.e., a "start-up") usually based on a creative, innovative, or "new" idea or process. Thus, a successful entrepreneur is someone who generates wealth from these activities (Shane 2008).

"Entrepreneur" is derived from the French word *entreprendre*, "to undertake." In the eighteenth century, French economists appropriated the term to describe those economic actors who could be relied on to "get things done" (Sledzik 2013). It was Schumpeter who rigorously developed the concept – and the theorizing behind it – in the early to mid-twentienth century. His entrepreneur was a heroic risk taker whose ability to create wealth from innovative ideas benefited all of society. In other words, he was an idea generator (innovator) and wealth creator (entrepreneur) all in one swashbuckling guy. "Commentators have often pointed out that Schumpeter developed a romantic and fairly idealistic view of the entrepreneur … His hero has an aristocratic and disinterested touch" (Villette and Vuillermot 2009).

But Schumpeter's later work distinguished between, and separated, the idea generator from the person who makes money from the idea (Schumpeter 2003; Sledzik 2013). The entrepreneur here does not create ideas; rather, he exploits the ideas of others (Carland et al. 1984). Tom Klaff, author of the *Entrepreneurs-in-Residence* blog, writes that "there is a distinct difference between innovation and entrepreneurship. Rarely have I seen innovators and entrepreneurs share the same brain" (2011).

This conclusion is supported by research gathered by Scott Shane, the A. Malachi Mixon III Professor of Entrepreneurial Studies at Case Western Reserve University. His research (2008) found that the vast majority of successful entrepreneurs bought their business from someone else instead of building it from their own invention or idea.

A rigorous and well-received 2005 study on American and French entrepreneurs, *From Predators to Icons: Exposing the Myth of the Business Hero*, by two French business scholars, Michel Villette and Catherine Vuillermot (2009), found too that those who achieved great success as entrepreneurs did not initially strike it rich because of their ability to innovate. The authors did, however, discover a common denominator among this group: predation. In his preface to the English-language edition of *From Predators to Icons*, John Kimberly, the Henry Bower Professor of Entrepreneurial Studies at Wharton, described predation as “a sort of Darwinian scenario in which the success of some is built on the backs of those who are less agile or who simply don’t see opportunity the same way” (Kimberly 2009). Villette and Vuillermot (2009) document in minute detail evidence of questionable ethics in successful entrepreneurs. From this, their conclusion: “No rapid achievement of wealth is possible while respecting both the spirit and the letter of the social ethics of the time … The businessman spends his time getting around the laws and the ordinary conceptions of morality.”

Revisiting the etymology of *entreprendre*, but this time tracing the word back to its origins in the fourteenth century, before it was adopted by economists (most famously by Schumpeter), one finds that back then, it was used to describe attacks on “a person or a castle for pillage or to take prisoners for ransom” (Villette and Vuillermot 2009). Given the common trait of predation among entrepreneurs that Villette and Vuillermot uncovered in their research, this original definition, ironically, seems more accurate than Schumpeter’s, or those found in the contemporary business literature.

More recent evidence does support Schumpeter where he contends that achievement in entrepreneurial endeavours requires “aptitudes that are present in only a small fraction of the population and that define the entrepreneurial type” (Schumpeter 2003). Shane’s data support the claim that successful entrepreneurs are indeed rare. Furthermore, “the typical entrepreneur forms a business that is gone within five years”; only 10 per cent of these businesses ever grow; and entrepreneurs earn 35 per cent less than if they worked for someone else and enjoy fewer job-related benefits. In fact, downward mobility is common among entrepreneurs (Shane 2008). Ignoring and overlooking these grim statistics has contributed to what Morra Aarons-Mele on her *Harvard Business Review* blog has called “entrepreneurship porn,” or the media hyping of the “air-brushed reality” of start-up life (Aarons-Mele 2014). Or as Silicon Valley entrepreneur Eric Reis expresses it, contributing to “the delusion that starting a company is something anyone can do” (Marmer 2012).

This is a sobering message for journalism educators, but one that many seem unable to hear. Instead they repeat the hype, insisting, for example, that “an entrepreneurial attitude is needed to shape the future of an industry in transformation" (Vazquez Schaich and Klein 2013) and that "entrepreneurs will … be the salvation of news … The opportunities are indeed endless" (Jarvis 2012). Of course, some journalism start-ups will flourish. Shane (2008) argues that "entrepreneurship is a lot like gambling. The average outcome is negative … But some people win and they win big." Unfortunately for journalism and for journalism students, these rare occurrences have been falsely recast by entrepreneurial educators as a future available to those willing to participate.[2]

The data are slim, but the early evidence on the financial success of journalism start-ups challenges the certainty and optimism of those promoting entrepreneurial journalism education. Wendy Wallace provides one-week intensive workshops in entrepreneurial journalism at the Poynter Institute. In a survey she conducted in 2011 with over half the alumni from the Poynter program, almost all of the graduates were still involved in entrepreneurial projects. However, half of those who responded expected to lose money that year. An additional 31 per cent "were on track to break even but not pay themselves a salary" (Wallace 2012).

Most disturbing and confounding is the tendency among educators to rebrand underpaid, precarious freelance journalists as independent entrepreneurs (Baines and Kennedy 2010; Barrett Ferrier 2014; Hunter and Nel 2011; Picard 2014; Vazquez Schaich and Klein 2013; Batist 2015). Robert Picard observed that "entrepreneurial journalism courses are becoming fashionable, but … many are primarily teaching students to become freelancers" (2014). Danielle Batist's workshops in the UK on entrepreneurship for journalism students and freelancers seem a case in point. As her website explains:

> Despite the industry's transformation, media remains a popular area of study with tens of thousands of talented graduates joining the field each year. Like those affected by the ongoing redundancies in traditional media, most of them will – by choice or out of necessity – become freelancers … In order to be successful and sustainable, independent journalists need to adopt more business skills and think like entrepreneurs. They need to become journopreneurs.

Changing monikers does not change reality. In 2009, Nicole Cohen (2012) surveyed two hundred Canadian freelance journalists and found that 45 per cent of them reported earning less than C$20,000 before taxes. In terms of global trends, Mark Deuze (2009) paints a bleak picture internationally of the digital freelance life, with downward pressure on wages and quality of work. Baines and Kennedy (2010), who are among the scholars reframing freelance work as entrepreneurship, acknowledge that the current media climate “has heavily disadvantaged freelance[r]s.”

And it heavily disadvantages quality journalism. The independent entrepreneurial journalist (formerly known as the freelancer) lacks the deep pockets for necessary adequate legal protection – a significant obstacle to reporting stories that challenge or question those with money and/or power. For example, Jesse Brown, the self-employed Canadian podcaster who broke the story about Jian Ghomeshi’s alleged history of sexual violence, acknowledges that he gave the story to the *Toronto Star* to publish because he could not afford the legal bills such reporting often generates (Brown 2014).

If the entrepreneurial model of journalism does prove itself to be a path to both economic viability and consequential journalism, is it a model that fits the skills and proclivities of those students who want to be journalists? Hunter and Nel evaluated journalism students in the UK who attended a workshop on entrepreneurial journalism. They found that after the workshop, students still perceived “a marked difference between the skills profile for a journalist and that of an entrepreneur, suggesting that while students were able to recognize, to some extent at least, the importance of skills such as innovation, self-management, and business skills for a journalist, they did not equate [these with] the role of the journalist” (2011). After examining CUNY’s entrepreneurial journalism program the year it opened, Dane Claussen concluded that “student demand for anything business-related continues to be underwhelming, as it apparently always was, and this is true at almost all, if not all, j-schools” (2011).

Perhaps these attitudes among journalism students will change and are in fact changing today. But altering perceptions will not alter the reality of entrepreneurship as uncovered by Shane, Villette and Vuillermot, and others: exceedingly rare is the person who can create a profitable business from his or her own ideas or innovations.

This has led to what Villette and Vuillermot describe as “the naive and misleading view of the entrepreneur current in the academic world, in business schools, and in books on management” (2009). Journalism educators should be added to the list.

Columbia University’s Tow Center for Digital Journalism published a document in 2014 on the state of the industry. In it, the authors note with some concern that “the idea of the ‘entrepreneurial journalist’ is … increasingly encouraged in both teaching programs and within certain news organizations” (Anderson et al. 2014). Although this trend has yet to permeate journalism education in Canada to the extent it has in the United States, it is slowly taking hold. Research into entrepreneurial journalism education is just emerging, yet even in these early days, one cannot help but note the absence of outcome measures and of verified claims about its benefits and potential.

Journalism is in crisis and so too is journalism education. Educators need to respond. A good place to begin would be to reject as faulty be the syllogism of entrepreneurial journalism education and instead focus on building a new set of claims. How about something like this?

A. We need to innovate.

B. We need to equip our students with an understanding of the economics of journalism in the digital age.

C. Therefore we need to research, collect facts, and verify claims about how to achieve these goals before we make any claims about best the way forward for journalism education. To do otherwise is to fail our students and the public(s) we aim to serve.

The next time we hear a seductive spiel about the entrepreneurial education cure, we should think about the words of *Harvard Business Review* blogger and entrepreneur, Morra Aarons-Mele: "It's just not possible that every smart young graduate can launch her own successful enterprise" (2014). It makes no sense to base our programs on a model of education and practice that, according to the evidence, will do little for the vast majority of our students except set them up for failure.

NOTES

[1] For Picard's address, see pages 4-10 in this volume.

[2] For more examples, check out the relentlessly positive and promotional coverage on mediashift.org's special section on entrepreneurial journalism education from its inception in 2014 onward: http://mediashift.org/education/entrepreneurship-education/page/3.

REFERENCES

Aarons-Mele, Morra. 2014. "The Dangerous Rise of 'Entrepreneurial Porn.'" *Harvard Business Review*, January. https://hbr.org/2014/01/the-dangerous-rise-of-entrepreneurship-porn

Allen, Robert Loring. 1994. *Opening Doors: The life and Work of Joseph Schumpeter*, vols. 1 and 2. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Anderson, Chris, Emily Bell, and Clay Shirky. 2014. "Post-Industrial Journalism: Adapting to the Present." Tow Center for Digital Journalism. http://towcenter.org/research/post-industrial-journalism-adapting-to-the-present-2

Baines, David, and Ciara Kennedy. 2010. "An Education for Independence: Should Entrepreneurial Skills Be an Essential Part of the Journalist's Toolbox?" *Journalism Practice* 4: 97–113.

Barrett Ferrier, Michelle. 2014. "Media Entrepreneurship: Curriculum Development and Faculty Perceptions of What Students Should Know." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 68: 222–41.

Batist, Danielle. 2015. "Why Journopreneur." *Journopreneur*. http://journopreneur.me/

Briggs, Mark. 2012. *Entrepreneurial Journalism: How to Build What's Next for News*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Brown, Jesse. 2014. "Q&A: Jesse Brown, the Crowdfunded Journalist Who Helped Get Jian Ghomeshi Fired." *Toronto Life,* October. http://www.torontolife.com/informer/people/2014/10/30/qa-jesse-brown-crowdfunded-journalist-exposed-jian-ghomeshis-secrets

Carland, James W., Frank Hoy, William R. Boulton, and Jo Ann C. Carland. 1984. "Differentiating Entrepreneurs from Small Business Owners: A Conceptualization." *Academy of Management* 9: 354–59.

Claussen, Dane. 2011. "CUNY's Entrepreneurial Journalism: Partially Old Wine in a New Bottle, and Not Quite Thirst-Quenching, but Still a Good Drink." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 66: 3–6.

Cohen, Nicole. 2012. "How Much Do Freelance Journalists Make?" *J-Source*, 12 September. http://j-source.ca/article/how-much-do-freelance-journalists-make

Cunningham, Barton J., and Joe Lischeron. 1991. "Defining Entrepreneurship". *Journal of Small Business Management* 29: 45–61.

Dueze, Mark. 2009. "The People Formerly Known as the Employers." *Journalism* 10: 315–18.

Entrepreneurs-in-Residence. 2011. "Innovation v Entrepreneurship." https://entrepreneursinresidence.wordpress.com/2011/11/16/innovation-vs-entrepreneurship

Hang, Min, and Aldo van Weezel. 2005. "Media and Entrepreneurship: A Survey of the Literature Relating Both Concepts." Paper presented to the 18th Scandinavian Academy of Management Meeting –NFF, Aarhus School of Business, Denmark, 18–20 August.

http://www.paleycenter.org/carnegie-entepreneurial-journalism

Hunter, Anna, and Francois P. Nel. 2011. “Equipping the Entrepreneurial Journalist: An Exercise in Creative Enterprise.” *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 66: 10–24.

Jarvis, Jeff. 2012. Foreword to Mark Briggs, *Entrepreneurial Journalism: How to Build What’s Next for News*. xv–xvii. Los Angeles: Sage.

Jarvis, Jeff. 2010. “Teaching Entrepreneurial Journalism.” *Buzzmachine.com*, 11 January. http://buzzmachine.com/2010/01/11/teaching-entrepreneurial-journalism

Kimberly, John R. 2009. Foreword to Michel Villette and Catherine Vuillermot, *From Predators to Icons: Exposing the Myth of the Business Hero,* ix-xi. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Marmer, Max. 2012. “The Danger of Celebratizing Entrepreneurship.” *Harvard Business Review*, 3 October. https://hbr.org/2012/10/the-danger-of-celebritizing-en

Picard, Robert. 2014. “Deficit Tutelege: Challenges of Contemporary Journalism Education.” *Robertpicard.net.* http://www.robertpicard.net/files/Picard_deficient_tutelage.pdf

Shane, Scott. 2008. *The Illusions of Entrepreneurship: The Costly Myths That Entrepreneurs, Investors, and Policy Makers Live By.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Schumpeter, Joseph A. 2003. *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*. London: Taylor and Francis e-Library. http://digamo.free.fr/capisoc.pdf

Sledzik, Karol. 2013. “Schumpeter’s View on Innovation and Entrepreneurship.” In Management Trends in Theory and Practice. Edited by Stefan Hittmar. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2257783

Stevenson, Howard H., and J. Carlos Jarillo. 1990. “A Paradigm of Entrepreneurship: Entrepreneurial Management.” *Strategic Management Journal* 11: 17–27.

Vazquez Schaich, Maria Jose, and Jeffrey S. Klein. 2013. “Entrepreneurial Journalism Education: Where Are We Now?” *Observatoria (*OBS) Journal* 7: 195–204.

Villette, Michel, and Catherine Vuillermot. 2009. *From Predators to Icons: Exposing the Myth of the Business Hero.* Translated by George Holoch. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Wallace, Wendy. 2012. “The Need for Entrepreneurship in Journalism.” *Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship* 23: 112–14.

The Big Sellout: A Critical Snapshot of the Rise of "Entrepreneurial Journalism"

Paul Benedetti

In January, 2015 Condé Nast, the publisher of *The New Yorker*, *Vanity Fair*, *Wired*, *GQ*, and other magazines, announced it would be using its editorial staff to write advertising copy in a new initiative that would allow marketers to work directly with editors to create "branded content." Branded content, native advertising, and sponsored content are all new terms for advertising that mimics the look and feel of editorial content. Though the Condé Nast announcement "caused a stir in the media world" according to the *Wall Street Journal* (Perlberg 2015), it wasn't much of a stir, since other major publications, including the *New York Times*, the *Globe and Mail*, and the *Wall Street Journal* itself had already announced similar initiatives (Brown 2014; NYT Innovation Report 2014; Mitchell 2014). An idea that was anathema to all journalists for most of the 20th century – that an advertiser could buy the services of a reporter and get a story published – was now being lauded as "innovative," "collaborative," and "strategic" (NYT Innovation Report 2014). "Advertising," as journalist Andrew Sullivan put it, had "defeated Journalism" (Braiker 2014).

This paper will provide a snapshot of the forces and developments that have brought us to this juncture. In the process, it will illuminate – both empirically and theoretically – the inherent contradictions of the current accepted wisdom regarding the future of journalism. It will propose that journalists and journalism educators, instead of embracing "entrepreneurial journalism" and seeking new ways to serve advertisers and maximize page views, should stand firm against new attempts to appropriate journalism as a commercial enterprise enlisted to serve the market instead of the public.

Disruption and Disintermediation

New technology is reshaping the media industry and the practice of journalism. Disruption in the traditional audience/advertiser economic model that fuelled newsrooms for decades has placed increasing financial pressure on legacy media organizations. resulting in widespread job losses and many newsroom closures (Downie and Schudson 2009). In daily newspaper newsrooms alone, the numbers are staggering. A census conducted by the American Society of News Editors revealed that between 2007 and 2011, 13,500 newsroom jobs were lost. That was a decline of 25 per cent (ASNE 2010). The numbers in Canada are similarly bleak: the Canadian Media Guild has reported media job losses (in the newsroom and beyond) of 10,000 over the past five years (Canadian Media Guild 2013).

The advertising model that supported journalism for decades – particularly in print – has broken. So argued Clay Shirky in his seminal piece, “Newspapers and Thinking the Unthinkable” (Shirky 2009). Shirky admitted he had no idea what would come next: “Nothing. Nothing will work. There is no general model for newspapers to replace the one the internet just broke.”

The Restructuring of Journalism

Ironically, the disruptive technological innovations that undermined the business model supporting journalism were simultaneously being heralded as exciting new tools for journalists to create and disseminate their work. Reporters were exhorted to embrace Web-based technologies, which would let them become part of the “conversation” that journalism had now become (Gillmor 2004, xiii). Many online enthusiasts called on journalists to use these tools to build new business models, launch independent initiatives, and soften or remove the “wall” between news organizations’ business and editorial divisions lest they be stranded in shrinking newsrooms. In the face of rapid economic and technological transformation, and of what has been termed “survival rhetoric,” fundamentals in the media landscape began to shift (Coddington 2015).

Media companies, old and new, exploited the technologies and began to build audience and generate revenue through content aggregation, curation, reposting, and repurposing. Much of this content was used without permission or payment to its creators (Shirky 2009). Branding and promotion accelerated the growth, and various media start-ups emerged as nascent business successes. At the same time, technophiles, pundits, and academics began to embrace and promote new, more “inclusive” models of journalism. Journalism became a conversation between journalists and the public; people equipped with Internet access and Web 2.0 tools were transformed from audience members into participants. Viewers and readers became content creators, partners in the conversation that is journalism. Consumption and production merged, and the consumer became the “prosumer,” further blurring the line between journalist and audience (Comor 2010).

In the process, many distinctions became blurred: between news and content; between consumers and producers; between reporting and posting. Labels such as user-generated content, citizen journalism, participatory journalism, journalism as curation, journalism as aggregation, link journalism, and "journalism as an act of pointing" (Somiaya and Kaufman 2009) became commonplace. Concepts such as "random acts of journalism" (Myer 2011) and even "ambient journalism" (Hermida 2010) further eroded definitional boundaries. The result was that journalism became everything. Joe Tacopino, a 2010 graduate of Jeff Jarvis's CUNY class on entrepreneurial journalism, captured the issue succinctly: "I questioned whether some of the 'business ideas' we were creating [in the program] were related to journalism. He [Jarvis] said that journalism could be defined as anything that allows people to communicate with each other" (cited in Abad-Santos 2011).

The contradictions inherent in these ideas were downplayed or ignored, opening the door for the next logical development. If all people can be journalists, and almost everything they do online, from posting on Facebook to tweeting, is journalism, then all content is, in some way, journalism. And if curating and repurposing and linking is journalism, then so is anything that promotes, disseminates, compiles, searches, or expedites the use of content. Quite seamlessly, enterprises such as the *Huffington Post*, *Vice*, *Upworthy*, *Gawker*, *Mashable*, and *BuzzFeed* become part of the discussion about journalism. Tech sites, search engines, celebrity gossip, user reviews, and all manner of content appropriation become part of the new (new!) journalism, increasingly discussed and indeed promoted in j-schools (Jarvis 2010).

In the process, online tools, potentially useful in reporting of stories, are mistaken for journalism. Journalists and journalism students are encouraged – almost coerced – to use these tools lest they miss the wave of technological change washing over the craft. Everyone is being exhorted to blog, tweet, upload, share, and curate in an increasingly accelerated cycle of production (Bartlett 2014).

Survival Above All

The obvious and historic tension between the role and goals of business versus those of journalism became lost in the tired contradictions that characterized the sometimes desperate discussion around the survival of journalism. Journalism, as it was practised for most of the twentieth century, aspired to public service, and the "Chinese wall" served to highlight the newsroom's separation from the demands of advertising (Hackett and Zhao 1998). The ideal of independent journalism in the pursuit of the public good has since its inception been threatened from forces both outside and inside news organizations, but the twentieth-century codification of the routines and practices of factual reporting and the development of professional standards served as a bulwark against these incursions. As Daniel Schiller explains, “The equation of professionalism in journalism with the practice of objective news reporting thus gratified the occupation while simultaneously serving the encompassing need of commercial journalism to legitimate its major institutional role as the self-announced protector of the public good” (1989).

Though this “wall” was widely and justifiably critiqued for at times being easily broached, at least it was there, and honoured in spirit if not always in practice. Now, such a division is not only disregarded but openly mocked. Bryan Goldberg, writing for *PandoDaily*, called the separation of “church and state” “a dogma so brainless and idiotic that the only way it could *possibly* exist in the modern day is because generations of publishers have brainwashed themselves into accepting it” (2013).

Entrepreneurial journalism, by its very nature, calls for a fusion of editorial and business concerns. The pundits don’t apologize for the perceived need to abandon the wall in the face of dire economic reality; they welcome this development as long overdue, a necessary adaptation (Andreesen 2014). As journalist Joe Banks wrote on Canada’s journalism website, *J-Source*: “Major fault lines have existed between advertising and editorial interests since Gutenberg was a startup, the fabled ‘separation of church and state.’ And it needs to end … The church-and-state attitude no longer has a place in the business of media” (2014).

Some in the news business attacked the wall as weak and now utterly anachronistic. More insidiously, they upbraided journalists for not engaging in the business side. Former reporter and media blogger Scott Rosenberg encouraged a new path:

> Let’s take the principles we understand – accuracy and fairness and independence and speaking truth to power – and see how we can ferry them into the new environment. Doing so requires some level of entrepreneurial thinking. You can’t avoid getting your hands a little grubby. You can’t sit back and let somebody else worry about the “dark side” while you keep yourself immaculate. (2007)

Rosenberg is unclear about how one practises journalism that “speaks truth to power” with hands “grubby” from business engagements with sponsors, investors, and advertisers. In journalism education, the refrain is similar, with many educators eager to engage in new, increasingly business-oriented models of journalism. Baines and Kennedy (2010) admit that research indicates that journalists value public service, autonomy, and objectivity, and that they feel they must operate independently of the demands of business. But Baines and Kennedy set this finding aside because surveys suggest that journalism students are less keen on public service and more keen on lifestyle:

> It would seem that ideological factors which might have mitigated against would-be journalists espousing business values are less strong than might appear; that some students are motivated by the ideal of public service, but most who really want to go into journalism do so because it offers an exciting non-routine job with a degree of autonomy – and the prospects of poor wages, routine grind and limited opportunities for creativity turns them off.

Articles on journalistic innovation promote monetization, business models, and promotion. The conflation of innovation and entrepreneurship is sloppy, but perhaps this is by design. It blurs the line between creative ways of employing new technology to report and tell stories, and the leveraging of those tools to monetize content. The result is a drift towards the colonization of journalism and journalism education by the market. And while many enthusiasts have proclaimed these developments as ushering in a new “Golden Age of Journalism” (Blodget 2013), they are ignoring the contradictions inherent in this integrated model.

Erosion of the Elements of Journalism

Concepts that would have been unacceptable to most journalists only a few years ago are now openly discussed and celebrated. Many of those concepts are being included in the calls by some educators for a more entrepreneurial curriculum for journalism students. In July 2014, more than fifty educators, funders, and professionals gathered at the CUNY Graduate School of Journalism Summit for Entrepreneurial Journalism Educators. This was followed by the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication in Montreal last year, during which media entrepreneurship was highlighted. That event’s program included sessions in which “more than 100 attendees learned about innovations across higher education, including the master’s in media entrepreneurship program at American University, new business development classes and their structure at the CUNY Graduate School of Journalism and co-curricular activities like the Scripps Innovation Challenge at Ohio University.” (Ferrier 2014) Rosental C. Alves, director of the Knight Center for Journalism in the Americas at the University of Texas at Austin, participated in both the CUNY Summit and the AEJMC events and commented on the spread of these ideas in the academy:

> I was pleased to see both at AEJMC and at the summit that entrepreneurial journalism has become a discipline widely adopted in journalism schools around the country. I was impressed with the number of colleagues who said at AEJMC that they are considering to teach entrepreneurial journalism or to include it on the journalism classes they are already teaching … Journalism education cannot afford to recycle best practices of an industry in crisis in the midst of the digital revolution. (in Ferrier 2014)

Many of the new entrepreneurial journalism ideas being considered today involve precisely the kind of corruption of the news that the “wall,” so cavalierly discarded by many, was designed to prevent. The first such idea relates to new approaches to the monetization of journalistic content that involve directly connecting that content to page views and, thus, advertising value. The technology that enables audience traffic to be measured has redefined news as well as news judgment. As Kovach and Rosenstiel (2001) point out, journalism has a responsibility to distinguish the important from the merely popular, but the financial incentives to generate more traffic (and hence more advertising dollars) are leading to a rejection of this dictum (242–54). The result? Editors are prioritizing stories that garner page views, and reporters are chasing the sensational or the titillating to drive traffic. This impetus is, of course, not new, but technological advances have accelerated the process and further undermined long-held notions of editorial judgment (Baldasty 1992). When editorial content is linked directly to commerce, many of the fundamental elements of journalism find themselves overridden in the chase for page views. Accuracy, a cornerstone of journalism (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2001, 98–100), is the first casualty in this new entrepreneurial model. Ryan Grim, the Washington bureau chief for the *Huffington Post*, was responsible for reposting several highly popular stories in 2013 that turned out to be fictitious. He told the *New York Times*: “If you throw something up without fact-checking it, and you’re the first one to put it up, and you get millions and millions of views, and later it’s proved false, you still got those views. That’s a problem. The incentives are all wrong” (Somaiya and Kaufman 2013).

Key principles of journalism – fact checking, accuracy, news judgment, and what Kovach and Rosenstiel term “proportionality” (the privileging of stories that are in “the public interest” over those that are merely “interesting to the public”) – are increasingly being jeopardized (Kovach and Rosenstiel 2001, 242–43). As *Slate* reporter Dave Weigel wrote: “Reporters want to publish stories that people read. If there’s great reward, and little downside, to be had in publishing bullshit, the Internet's going to get more bullshit. As one of my colleagues put it, 'Too good to check' used to be a warning to newspaper editors not to jump on bullshit stories. Now it's a business model" (2013).

More insidious than new ways of leveraging editorial content to drive revenue is the implementation of new business models that directly invade the editorial space. These innovations go by many names – sponsored content, native advertising, custom content, and brand journalism – but all have the common feature of leveraging the publication's trusted name to produce advertising content that is virtually indistinguishable from regular news. The Pew Research Center has reported that some television stations have taken to running video news releases – stories that look like real news reports but are produced for commercial clients – without identifying them as such (Golding 2006). Commissioner Jonathan Adelstein of the US Federal Communications Commission noted: "Americans have a legal right to know that what appears to be independent news reports are actually bought and paid for by a private corporation" (cited in Golding 2006). Closer to home, witness the recent revelations about sponsored content on polar research and the Calgary Stampede being presented as independent editorial in *Canadian Geographic* (Brown 2015).

One would think that these assaults on editorial autonomy and integrity would be met by violent opposition from editors. But for the reasons outlined above, these incursions into previously sacrosanct areas are being welcomed by some as innovative new models for journalism. Greg Satell (2015) articulates this view in a recent article in *Forbes*:

> The core challenge in journalism today is that everyone is trying to finesse the problem of Chinese walls without addressing it entirely. Bob Steele at the Poynter Institute says that what we really need is a "picket fence" that allows information to flow through. Others just think we need better rules for branded content.
>
> Both are wrong. The truth is that to create a successful business today, the mission must drive the strategy. For some publishers, that mission will be an editorial mission. For others, servicing the needs of marketers will be primary. Still others will focus on advocating for a particular lifestyle or area of interest. In all cases, the mission needs to be shared across the enterprise and that means killing Chinese walls.

A few critics have voiced opposition to these proposed changes. "None of these gimmicks is on the way out," writes Bob Garfield in *The Guardian*. "Au contraire, they're all growing. Which is terrifying, for what they all have in common is that, to one degree or another, they compromise editorial integrity. Readers and viewers have no way of knowing that they are being marketed to, or that the content is inherently untrustworthy” (2013).

As journalist and blogger Andrew Sullivan plainly stated, commenting on branded advertising, “It’s a huge story: the complete transformation of the economics of journalism in a way that renders the concept of journalism extinct. Advertising snuck into the editorial pages in a way that advertising has always wanted to do. It used to be an axiom that the job of journalists was to be resistant to that and sustain the clear distinction between advertising and journalism. One side has effectively surrendered” (in Braiker 2014).

The Duty of the Journalism Educator

We may be losing our way. In the rush to respond to a virtual collapse of the business model that has for decades supported journalism, we are in danger of abandoning the fundamental principles of journalism. Accuracy and relevance are the casualties when we conflate the exchange value of journalism (business) with the service value of journalism (public good). Somaiya and Kaufman (2013) put the issue succinctly in their article on viral Internet stories: “Truth has never been an essential ingredient of viral content on the Internet. But in the stepped-up competition for readers, digital news sites are increasingly blurring the line between fact and fiction, and saying that it is all part of doing business in the rough-and-tumble world of online journalism.”

The notion that journalism schools should be educating entrepreneurs is very troubling. It is fraught with contradictions, most of them intractable, not “negotiable” as some educators have argued (Baines and Kennedy 2013). The goal of business is to make money, whereas the goal of journalism, as noted by Kovach and Rosenstiel in *The Elements of Journalism* (2001), should be to provide citizens with the information they need to be free and self-governing. Business uses content to drive traffic; mistakes can be corrected later. Journalism is first and foremost a discipline of verification. Business serves its owners, its shareholders, and its customers. Journalism serves citizens, and whereas business’s first duty is to owners and employees, journalism’s first duty is to the truth (49). Journalism educators, perhaps more than anyone else, must strive to uphold the essential values of “independent reporting” (Downie and Schudson 2009).

Like vaccination programs, clean water, fair courts, and stable government, journalism is a necessary public good, a requirement for a liberal democracy. It should not compromise its core mission. If corporations or capitalists are no longer willing to fund journalism, another model must be found. It is beyond the scope of this paper to explore alternative models in any detail, but several could be part of the answer, including non-profit or foundation ownership of media, low-profit limited-liability news organizations, taxpayer-supported public news operations, and other hybrid models (Hamilton 2009; Downie and Schudson 2009). No matter what the market-driven dominant logic of the day is, journalism instruction should not waver. It must teach to the highest standards and impart the highest ethical and professional values. To do less would be to abandon the primary mission of journalism education.

REFERENCES

Abad-Santos, Alexander. 2011. "What It's Like to Learn Journalism from Jeff Jarvis." *The Wire*, 27 September. http://www.thewire.com/business/2011/09/what-its-learn-journalism-jeff-jarvis/42176

Andreesen, Marc. 2014. "Why I'm Bullish on the News: A Silicon Valley Manifesto." *Politico Magazine*, 1 May. http://www.politico.com/magazine/story/2014/05/marc-andreesen-why-im-bullish-on-the-news-105921_Page2.html#.Vj0XN6J31FU

ASNE (American Society of Newspaper Editors). 2010. "2010 Census: Decline in Newsroom Jobs Slows." 4 December. http://asne.org/content.asp?pl=121&sl=150&contentid=150

Baldasty, Gerald J. 1992. *The Commercialization of News in the 19th Century*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Baines, David, and Ciara Kennedy. 2010. "An Education for Independence: Should Entrepreneurial Skills Be an Essential Part of the Journalist's Toolbox?" *Journalism Practice* 4: 97–113.

Banks, Joe. 2015. "Media Musings: Enough about 'Church and State' Separation." *J-source.ca*, 27 January. http://j-source.ca/article/media-musings-enough-about-"church-and-state"-separation

Bartlett, Rachel. 2014. "10 Key Skills for Digital Journalists to Hone in 2014." *journalism.co.uk*, 7 January. https://www.journalism.co.uk/news/10-key-skills-for-digital-journalists-to-hone-in-2014/s2/a555503

Braiker, Brian. 2014. "Andrew Sullivan on Native Ads: Journalism Has Surrendered." *Digiday*, 7 May. http://digiday.com/publishers/andrew-sullivan-native-ads

Blodget, Henry. 2013. "Journalism Has Entered a Golden Age, Business Insider." *Business Insider*, 13 August. http://www.businessinsider.com/a-golden-age-for-journalism-2013-8

Brown, Jesse. 2015. "The Sad Story of Canadian Geographic." *Canadaland*, 21 July. http://canadalandshow.com/article/sad-story-canadian-geographic

– . 2014. "The Globe and Mail's Plan to Force Reporters to Write Ads." *Canadaland*, 14

June. http://canadalandshow.com/article/leaked-memo-confirms-globe-and-mail-wants-journalists-write-advertorials

Canadian Media Guild. 2013. "Preliminary Numbers, 2013." *Canadian Media Guild*, 1 January. http://www.cmg.ca/en/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/Preliminary-numbers-Broadcast-Job-cuts-between-2008-2013-CMG.pdf

Coddington, Mark. 2015 (forthcoming). *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices, and Participation*. New York: Routledge.

Comor, Edward. 2010. "Contextualizing and Critiquing the Fantastic Prosumer: Power, Alienation and Hegemony." *Critical Sociology* 37: 309–27.

Downie Jr., Leonard, and Michael Schudson. 2009. "The Reconstruction of American Journalism: A Report." *Columbia Journalism Review*, 19 October. http://www.cjr.org/reconstruction/the_reconstruction_of_american.php?page=all

Ferrier, Michelle. 2014 "AEJMC Showcases a Leap toward Entrepreneurial Learning at J-Schools." *Mediashift*, 14 August. http://mediashift.org/2014/08/aejmc-showcases-a-leap-toward-entrepreneurial-learning-at-j-schools

Garfield, Bob. 2013. "This Is No "Golden Age" of Journalism." *The Guardian*, 27 March. http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/mar/27/no-golden-age-journalism-news-media-end-times

Gillmor, Don. 2004. *We the Media: Grassroots Journalism By the People, For the People*. Sebastapol: O'Reilly Media.

Goldberg, Bryan. 2013. "The Separation of "Church and State" in Publishing." *Pando Daily*, 19 April. https://pando.com/2013/04/19/the-separation-of-church-and-state-in-publishing

Golding, Jessica. 2006. "Do You Know What's On Your TV News?" Pew Research Center/Journalism and Media, 6 December. http://www.journalism.org/2006/12/06/do-you-know-whats-on-your-tv-news

Hackett, Robert, and Yuezhi Zhao. 1998. *Sustaining Democracy? Journalism and the Politics of Objectivity*. Toronto: Garamond Press.

Hamilton, James T. 2009. "The Road Ahead for Media Hybrids." Report of the Duke Non-Profit Media Conference, 4–5 May. http://www2.sanford.duke.edu/nonprofitmedia/documents/DWC_Conference_Report.pdf

Hermida, Alfred. 2012. "Twittering the News: The Emergence of Ambient Journalism." *Journalism Practice* 6: 659–68.

Jarvis, Jeff. 2010. "Teaching Entrepreneurial Journalism." *Buzzmachine*, 11

January. http://buzzmachine.com/2010/01/11/teaching-entrepreneurial-journalism

Kovach, Bill and Tom Rosenstiel. 2007. *The Elements of Journalism.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Mitchell, Amy. 2014. "State of the News Media 2014."Pew Research Center/Journalism and Media, 26 March. http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/state-of-the-news-media-2014-overview

Myer, Steve. 2011. "Why the man who tweeted Osama bin Laden raid is a citizen journalist." poynter.org, 5 May. http://www.poynter.org/news/mediawire/131135/why-the-man-who-tweeted-bin-laden-raid-is-a-citizen-journalist/

Perlberg, Steven. 2015. "Write Ads? Condé Nast Staff Is Wary." *Wall Street Journal*, 28 January.

Rosenberg, Scott. 2007. "Murdoch, the *Journal*, and the Newsroom Diaspora." *Wordyard*, 1 August. http://www.wordyard.com/2007/08/01/newsroom-diaspora

Satell Greg. 2015. "Publishers Need to Kill Chinese Walls." *Forbes*, 29 March. http://www.forbes.com/sites/gregsatell/2015/03/29/to-save-journalism-we-need-to-kill-chinese-walls

Schiller, Dan. 1989. "An Historical Approach to Objectivity and Professionalism in American News Reporting." *Journal of Communication* 29, no. 4: 46-57.

Shirky, Clay. 2009. "Newspapers and Thinking the Unthinkable." *Shirky.com*, 13 January. http://www.shirky.com/weblog/2009/03/newspapers-and-thinking-the-unthinkable

Somaiya, Ravi, and Leslie Kaufman. 2013. "If a Story Is Viral, Truth May Be Taking a Beating." *New York Times*, 9 December. http://www.nytimes.com/2013/12/10/business/media/if-a-story-is-viral-truth-may-be-taking-a-beating.html?_r=0

Weigel, David. 2013. "If You Want Reporters to Check a Story Before They Publish You're a Hater." *Daveweigel.com*, 3 December. http://daveweigel.com/2013/12/if-you-want-reporters-to-check-stories-before-they-publish-youre-a-hater

What Is Journalism Education For?

Mike Gasher

What we are witnessing in journalism education today is a tug of war over what we call journalism – a struggle over its definition and purpose as well as over who gets to decide these questions. Pulling on one end of the rope is the news industry, which continues to try to appropriate journalism as a commercial enterprise serving markets rather than publics. This is an increasingly corporate, concentrated, and commercial industry struggling to find its place in what has become a crowded and networked field (Hamilton 2004; Heinrich 2008; Van Der Haak, Parks, and Castells 2012; Anderson, 2013). Tugging on the other end is a messy mix of citizens, alternative news organizations, reform advocates, and critical journalists, all of whom are trying to restore to journalism a public service ethos in order to resuscitate the idea that journalism can be a democratic communications system (Gingras 2006; Shade and Lithgow 2009; Mulhmann 2010; Dahlgren 2013; Gasher, Brin, et al. 2016). Meanwhile, journalism educators are looking on, not entirely sure which end of the rope to grab (Skinner, Gasher, and Compton 2001; Gasher 2007; Knox & Goodrum 2007). We are eager to maintain the integrity of the practice and the institution, but we face often contradictory demands from a floundering news industry offering temporary and intermittent contract work, from students who want the employment we are preparing them for, and from our own sense of what journalism should be and will be by the time our students graduate. Once again, we are left asking: What is journalism education for? (see UNESCO 2007; Donsbach 2014).

As a response to this persistent question, I want to draw a number of important distinctions between terms that are too often conflated and thus contribute further to the muddle. This exercise in unpacking terms commonly applied to discussions about the future of journalism education is intended to reveal a number of problematic assumptions that too often lead the discussion astray.

First, I want to draw a distinction between journalism education and journalism training. Journalism education in Canada has taken a largely vocational approach, with an emphasis on students learning about form: news values, story structure, interviewing and research strategies, hardware and software instruction, and storytelling styles (Straw 1984; Skinner, Gasher, and Compton 2001; Johansen and Dornan 2003; Gasher 2007; Knox and Goodrum 2007). These are the kinds of things that many of us who teach journalism learned on the fly in the newsroom. Much less of students' journalism education is about content, that is, the topics journalists tell stories about: politics and government, history, geography, science, the arts, the kinds of things normally associated with post-secondary education. The shift to multiplatform journalism has exacerbated the emphasis on journalism form: students are being taught the most effective presentation styles for each platform, the narrative ingredients these platforms demand, the latest software applications, even computer code (see Spinner 2014).

This emphasis on form over content grants students considerable expertise as news presenters, but it comes at the expense of their ability to produce informed content. When students' understanding of the topics that typically inform news coverage – history, geography, politics, the justice system, science, the arts – is neglected, their store of basic knowledge is compromised, and so is their ability to do proper research and ask informed and challenging questions. They become increasingly reliant on expert sources because they lack the critical skills to evaluate the information those sources provide. The risk is that they are left to practise stenography rather than journalism. Presentation styles are relatively easy to learn – many journalism educators learned them on the job, and our graduate programs cover the basics of storytelling in two or three semesters. Content expertise takes much longer to acquire, and greater emphasis should be placed on it in the education of journalists, particularly in universities (see Mangan 2005; UNESCO 2007).

This relates to a second distinction, between educating journalists and training news workers. Educating journalists should include addressing, and addressing critically, journalism's long-held values, reflecting on what we understand journalism to be – that is, on its role in democracy, its status as an independent institution, its notions of truth, and its methods of verification, as well as on what objectivity means (Hackett and Zhao 1998; Skinner, Gasher, and Compton 2001; McChesney and Nichols 2009; McChesney and Pickard 2011; Ward 2004, 2014). Training news workers in an era of shrinking newsrooms and growing technological dependence means serving industry's immediate needs, which too often include quick story turnaround, single sourcing, newsroom-based reporting, brand journalism, and native advertising; this produces Jacks and Jills of all platforms, masters of none. We need to draw a distinction between the learning environment of the classroom and the production environment of the newsroom. This ultimately is about recognizing our students – the best and the brightest of them, at least – as future leaders, builders, and visionaries of the journalism to come, as the future editors and producers who will one day be in a position to shape that production environment, to define the journalism their news organizations produce.

We need to draw a distinction between journalism and the news industry. Journalism is a practice with a long history informed by Enlightenment ideals, tied to notions of citizenship and democratic governance. Journalism is also an institution that is structurally embedded, and not only as a commercial enterprise; it also has a history of various forms of public, cooperative, foundational, and alternative enterprise (Stephens, 2007; Conboy, 2010, Gasher et al., 2016; Gasher, Skinner, and Lorimer 2016). The news industry is one particular, albeit currently dominant, structuring of journalism; that industry structure has evolved dramatically, becoming increasingly corporate, concentrated, and hypercommercial, dedicated to serving readers and advertising markets as well as fickle shareholders. As journalism educators, we need to distinguish between the good journalism the news industry produces and the increasing number of practices – native advertising, click bait, celebrity trivia, and so on – that debase the practice and that render audiences cynical and mistrustful (see Basen 2012, 2013; Benedetti and Compton 2014).

We need to draw a distinction between information and content. Information is the specific form of content that good journalism specializes in – that which promotes understanding, establishes context, provides analysis, and focuses attention on and gives meaning to current events. Here, news values are determined by notions of citizenship and by citizens' need to know. Content is a much broader category, one that includes material that is not news in any conventional sense but that can nonetheless generate circulation, ratings, views, hits, downloads, and likes. Blurring the lines between news and other forms of content hollows out any clear sense of what journalism is.

We need to make a distinction between publics and markets. The notion of public is related to citizenship and community, to a sense of belonging that accommodates both diverse and common interests (see Gil de Zúñiga and Hinsley 2013; Nerone 2015). Serving the public entails an inclusive approach to audience, something that omnibus newspapers and newscasts once strived to ensure. Markets, by contrast, consist of consumers, of subscribers, of advertisers seeking the attention of media audiences with disposable income. This is an exclusive approach to journalism, one that speaks only to some people and that shapes the news agenda accordingly (see Hamilton 2004). This distinction is fundamental to how journalism defines the topics of news coverage; the market approach to journalism, for example, tends to treat politics as a spectator sport, economics as the exclusive purview of investors and managers, the arts and sports as spheres of corporately generated entertainment.

Speaking of markets, we need to distinguish between supply and demand. By supply I mean the elements in the curriculum that we as journalism educators believe are important in order to serve journalism's ideals, based on our experience and the learning that comes both from that newsroom experience and from the perspective we have gained from our reading of scholarship, not only in the field of journalism studies but also in media studies, communication, sociology, political science, history. Demand is what the news industry says *it* wants (and that industry seems lost in these transitional times) and what students say *they* want – internships, paid employment. Such demand is often ill-informed and too short-sighted to serve properly as journalism education's guide.

Finally, we need to draw a distinction between production and distribution. Production of journalism is first and foremost about original reporting, what reporters, shooters, editors, and producers are best qualified to do (Benedetti and Compton 2014). This is where news originates, in the background research and in the face-to-face interactions between journalists and the people, institutions, places, and events that constitute the news world. This is the creative and, ideally, intellectual aspect of information generation. Distribution is what news organizations do: packaging and circulating those original reports. Linking, sharing, and aggregating do not exist without original reporting to link, share, and aggregate.

All of this is my way of saying that journalism educators should serve journalism, an idealized journalism with a set of core values and a long history of producing news and commentary about current events. This journalism should be served through a much stronger emphasis on knowledge about the subjects that comprise the content of news stories, with the focus on those aspects of the practice and the institution that the industry cannot or will not teach, as well as a clear understanding of journalism's role in a modern, democratic society.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Christopher W. 2013. "What Aggregators Do: Towards a Networked Concept of Journalistic Expertise in the Digital Age." *Journalism* 14, no. 8: 1008–23.

Basen, Ira. 2013. "Going Native: The Death of Journalism or the Way of the Future?" *J-Source.ca*, 12 September.

– . 2012. "Is That an Ad or a News Story – and Does It Matter Which?" *Globe and Mail*, 4 August, F1.

Benedetti, Paul, and James R. Compton. 2014. "The Golden Age of Journalism? You've Got to Be Kidding." *J-Source.ca*, 4 April.

Conboy, Martin. 2010. *Journalism: A Critical History*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Dahlgren, Peter. 2013. "Online Journalism and Civic Cosmopolitanism: Professional vs Participatory Ideals. *Journalism Studies* 14, no. 2: 156–71.

Donsbach, Wolfgang. 2014. "Journalism as the New Knowledge Profession and Consequences for Journalism Education." *Journalism* 15, no. 6: 661–77.

Gasher, Mike. 2007 (Fall). "Redefining Journalism Education in Canada." *Our Schools / Our Selves* 17, no. 2: 125–36. Ottawa: Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Gasher, Mike, Colette Brin, Christine Crowther, Gretchen King, Errol Salamon, and Simon Thibault, eds. *Journalism in Crisis: Bridging Theory and Practice for Democratic Media Strategies in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016 (forthcoming).

Gasher, Mike, David Skinner, and Rowland Lorimer. *Mass Communication in Canada*, 8th ed. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 2016 (forthcoming).

Gil de Zúñiga, Homero, and Amber Hinsley. 2013. "The Press versus the Public." *Journalism Studies* 14, no. 6: 926–42.

Gingras, Anne-Marie. 2006. *Médias et démocratie: Le grand malentendu*, 2nd ed. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Hackett, Robert A., & Yuezhi Zhao. 1998. *Sustaining Democracy? Journalism and the Politics of Objectivity.* Toronto: Garamond Press.

Hamilton, James T. 2004. *All the News That's Fit to Sell: How the Market Transforms Information into News*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Heinrich, Ansgard. 2008. "Network Journalism: Moving towards a Global Journalism Culture." Paper delivered to RIPE conference in Mainz, 9–11 October. http://ripeat.org/wpcontent/uploads/2010/03/Heinrich.pdf

Johansen, Peter, and Christopher Dornan. 2003. "Journalism Education in Canada." In *Journalism Education in Europe and North America.* Edited by Romy Frölich & Christina Holz-Bacha. 65–90. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Knox, Paul, and Abby Goodrum. 2007. "Journalism Education in Canada: Size and Scope." Paper presented to World Journalism Education Congress, 25–28 June, Singapore.

Mangan, Katherine S. 2005. "Plan Would Change Journalism Education." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 3 June. http://chronicle.com/weekly/v51/i39/39a00802.htm

McChesney, Robert W., and John Nichols. 2009. *The Death and Life of American Journalism*. New York: Nation Books.

McChesney, Robert W., and Victor Pickard, eds. 2011. *Will the Last Reporter Please Turn Out the Lights: The Collapse of Journalism and What Can Be Done to Fix It*. New York and London: The New Press.

Muhlmann, Géraldine. 2010. *Journalism for Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nerone, John. 2015. *The Media and Public Life: A History*. Malden: Polity Press.

Shade, Leslie Reagan, and Michael Lithgow. 2009. "The Cultures of Democracy: How Ownership and Public Participation Shape Canada's Media Systems." In *Mediascapes*. Edited by Leslie Regan Shade. 174–203. Toronto: Nelson Education.

Skinner, David, Mike Gasher, and James Compton. 2001. "Putting Theory to Practice: A Critical Approach to Journalism Studies." *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism* 2, no. 3: 341–60.

Spinner, Jackie. 2014. "The Big Conundrum: Should Journalists Learn Code?" *American Journalism Review*, 24 September. http://ajr.org/2014/09/24/should-journalists-learn-code

Stephens, Mitchell. 2007. *A History of News*, 3rd ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Straw, Will. 1984. "Teaching Critical Media Studies." *Canadian Journal of Communication* 11, no. 1: 5–16.

UNESCO (Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). 2007. *Model Curricula for Journalism Education*. Paris.

Van Der Haak, Bregtje, Michael Parks, and Manuel Castells. 2012. “The Future of Journalism: Networked Journalism.” *International Journal of Communication* 6: 2923–38.

Ward, Stephen J.A. 2004. *The Invention of Journalism Ethics: The Path to Objectivity and Beyond*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill–Queen’s University Press.

Ward, Stephen J.A. 2014. “Ethics Resources.” *Media Morals*. http://mediamorals.org/ethics-resources

Selling Digital Dreams: "Entrepreneurial journalism," the Decline of Public Service Reporting, and the Role of Journalism Education

Paul Benedetti, Meredith Levine, and Mike Gasher

New, disruptive technology has had enormous economic repercussions for the media industry and, consequently, on the practice of journalism. Fragmented audiences and declining advertising revenues have resulted in widespread closures and layoffs in struggling legacy media organizations. Simultaneously, the rise of new media outlets that blend news, gossip, entertainment, rumour, and humour, and that use Web metrics and audience tracking to maximize page views, have challenged the hegemony once enjoyed by traditional media. The responses to this rapid transformation and destabilization have been varied, but two ideas with far-reaching implications have emerged in journalism circles.

The first is that technological innovations have rendered the prevailing model of journalism economically unsustainable and conceptually anachronistic, especially with regard to the supposed "wall" between its business and editorial functions. The second idea, which is related to the first, is that individuals cannot and should not rely on institutional journalism for employment; rather, they should take personal responsibility for innovating, for building their own businesses and their own "brands," and for developing new "entrepreneurial" endeavours that fuse "doing journalism" with business and profit. These ideas have become the mantra of online and digital enthusiasts such as Jeff Jarvis of BuzzMachine, who goes even further by blaming individual reporters for the economic trough in which journalism now finds itself: "I believe that by teaching journalists that business itself is corrupting, we became terrible stewards of journalism and that is one of the key reasons journalism is in the fix it's in" (Jarvis 2010).

Framed as the only viable survival strategy, these ideas have been enthusiastically embraced by journalism schools in North America and abroad (Coddington 2015). Responding to a growing number of new entrepreneurial journalism programs in the United States – most notably the MA program in Entrepreneurial Journalism at the CUNY Graduate School of Journalism, and the Scripps Howard Journalism Entrepreneurship Institute at the Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication at Arizona State University – Canadian journalism educators have joined the chorus calling for similar programs in j-schools here. Julie Ireton, a CBC reporter and contract instructor at Carleton University's School of Journalism and Communication, agrees that it is necessary to inculcate business skills and entrepreneurship into journalism education: "Journalism programs need to encourage a new kind of journalism ... and a better understanding of the ever-changing business of journalism ... That means students need to learn about business models and development, how big ideas are pitched and branded" (2014). In Britain, Baines and Kennedy call for a similar re-evaluation of journalism education, citing the eroding boundaries between journalism and public relations and "information brokerage." They call for educators to "strive to give students the opportunity to become entrepreneurial self-employed agents" (2010).

Yet there has been little critical evaluation of either the concept of entrepreneurial journalism or the wisdom of adopting it. Coddington notes that "entrepreneurial skills and the business of journalism have become increasingly emphasized in American journalism education" – with, it appears, little critical evaluation. He writes: "There is notably little public discourse defending against the advance of entrepreneurial journalism in the name of the news–business boundary. Instead, virtually all of the discourse advocates journalists' increased understanding of the news business, and most of it foregrounds the rhetoric of survival" (2015). This position is echoed by Baines and Kennedy, whose response to underemployment and precarious employment in the media is to "prepare students to consider independent career paths with the skills, ability and confidence not only to work as journalists (employed or freelance), but to establish independent enterprises in the wider communications sector" (2010).

We challenge this new common sense. We hope to add to the public discourse by providing a critique of the definition, theory, assumptions, and practices of "entrepreneurial journalism." Our examination reveals serious problems, both theoretical and practical, regarding the definition, rationale, conception, historical context, and implementation of entrepreneurial journalism and the weakening of established boundaries between journalism-as-public-service and journalism-as-business.

Meredith Levine begins this suite of papers by interrogating the term "entrepreneur." She argues that Joseph Schumpeter, the godfather of entrepreneur scholarship, was sometimes guilty of conflating the terms innovator and entrepreneur in his work, setting off a semantic confusion that remains today (Sledzik 2013). Contemporary Schumpeter scholars argue that innovators and entrepreneurs are different kinds of people with different skill sets: innovators generate ideas; entrepreneurs implement and monetize those ideas, often by copying or imitating them (Sledzik 2013; Allen 1994). It is important for journalism educators to thoroughly understand the concepts and the realities of entrepreneurship before jumping on the entrepreneurial journalism bandwagon.

Paul Benedetti, in his paper, provides a snapshot of the forces and developments that have brought us to this juncture. In the process he illuminates, empirically and theoretically, the inherent contradictions in this strongly promoted view of the future of journalism. Benedetti proposes that journalists and journalism educators, instead of seeking new ways to serve advertisers and to maximize page views, should reject this approach and stand firm against new attempts to appropriate journalism as a commercial enterprise enlisted to serve the market instead of the public.

Finally, Mike Gasher asks: What is journalism education for? Instead of answering the question directly, he seeks to clarify the object of analysis by drawing a number of distinctions between terms that are too often conflated, emphasizing that journalism education should serve journalism rather than the news industry.

REFERENCES

Allen, Robert Loring. 1994. *Opening Doors: The life and Work of Joseph Schumpeter*, vols. 1 and 2. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Baines, David, and Ciara Kennedy. 2010. “An Education for Independence: Should Entrepreneurial Skills Be an Essential Part of the Journalist’s Toolbox?” *Journalism Practice* 4: 97–113.

Coddington, Mark. 2015 (forthcoming). *Boundaries of Journalism: Professionalism, Practices,and Participation.* New York: Routledge.

Ireton, Julie. 2014. “Why J-Schools Should Foster Entrepreneurship.” *J-Source.ca*, 29 April.**http://jpress.journalism.ryerson.ca/jsource**

Jarvis, Jeff. 2010. “Journalism’s Leaky Condom.” *Buzzmachine*, 8 October.

Sledzik, Karol. 2013. “Schumpeter’s View on Innovation and Entrepreneurship.” In Management Trends in Theory and Practice. Edited by Stefan Hittmar, http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2257783

A Campus-Wide J-School: News Literacy as an Avenue for Journalism Schools to Connect with New Students and a New Generation

Jordan Press

The digital age has created an existential crisis for news media, with legacy outlets trying to reinvent themselves in order to remain profitable and relevant in a rapidly changing information ecosystem. They are trying to adapt their traditional business and journalism models to situate themselves within a new reality, one in which legacy media – the traditional news gatekeepers – must compete with a multitude of new voices that are creating and sharing news.

It follows that journalism schools must adapt their old curricula to prepare their own students to be successful news producers, and to prepare the wider student body to be critical news consumers.

To that end, journalism faculty should reach beyond the confines of journalism schools to help students develop news literacy skills so that they become critical news and information consumers. News media products are part of students' everyday lives. That is why those products are often used in media literacy classes as part of textual analysis. That connection to students' lives outside school is very much part of the Dewey (1929) model of education, which attempts to link students' out-of-school lives with their in-school experiences so that they succeed not only in school but also in real life (Eisner 1967). Journalism schools have been training journalists for decades to develop an engaged, critical citizenry through their reporting. Journalism faculty should now reach out to those news consumers that their journalism students have been trying to reach for years, and do so with help from other faculties.

Masterman (2001) argued that media educators should work with journalists to enhance media literacy education and to further media literacy goals. The same is true for journalism educators: they should avoid isolating themselves on the university campus and instead broaden their mandate and reach out to non-journalism students to talk with them about news and media.

The changes in the news media landscape over the past decade have only increased the need for journalism schools to pay as much attention to developing news-literate citizens as to training industry practitioners (Reese 2012). The time to reach out and create news-literate students is now.

In this paper I begin by summarizing the debate within the emerging news literacy field over how to define news literacy and what a news literacy curriculum ought to include. I then outline reasons why journalism programs might be best situated to offer news literacy instruction and discuss the results of interviews with five Ontario journalists regarding what they think news literacy education should look like in Canada.[1] Finally, I suggest what Canadian journalism schools should do, based on the views of those five journalists (Press 2011).

What is News Literacy?

Defining the academic and pedagogical boundaries of news literacy is increasingly difficult. At the National News Literacy Summit held in Chicago in mid-September 2014, journalists, educators, academics, and administrators gathered to discuss the state of news literacy education and future directions for the field. Among the issues identified during the two-day conference were these: there is a lack of consensus on the central learning outcomes of a news literacy curriculum; curricula rely heavily on lectures and group work as instructional methods (as opposed to, for example, project-based learning, where the student decides on the issue to explore and the teacher acts as the educational facilitator rather than the instructor, possibly ending with the student creating an educational game, a dramatic video, a play, or a spoken-word presentation such as a rap or a poem); and curriculum designers are taking a paternalistic approach, setting a top-down method of instruction akin to the Tyler rationale, which is an ends–means model of curriculum that emphasizes identifying goals or objectives and then creating a curriculum to meet those goals (McNeil 2009, 118). One criticism of the Tyler rationale that is relevant to this discussion of news literacy is that it does not provide a way to balance biases that appear at various points in the curriculum design process, nor does it resolve political conflicts in curriculum policy design even when the actors involved can agree on common values (McNeil 2009, 120). In the case of news literacy, the actors at the conference couldn't agree on common values or a way forward for news literacy as a field or discipline. Those who identified themselves as news literacy educators seemed offended that media literacy educators were intruding into their field, or attempting to take it over outright. What should be the basis for a curriculum? How should the subject be taught? And how is news literacy different in its scope and objectives from media literacy education? There seemed to be no consensus, just more questions.

One Definition of News Literacy: The Center for News Literacy

The centre of the news literacy movement in the United States is Stony Brook University on Long Island. There, the news literacy curriculum is boiled down to four lessons: identifying various types of information, what the faculty call "knowing your information neighbourhood"; evaluating sources of information and sources within news stories; identifying news and opinion; and understanding and identifying media bias as well as understanding how the biases of news consumers influence how they decode media texts (Press 2011). The curriculum, much like media literacy curricula, also requires students to create news media. In this way, news literacy becomes a combination of critical reception and critical production (Schwarz 2011).

There is little in Stony Brook's course that wouldn't be found in media literacy courses in an Ontario high school or on a university campus. The reason? Much like media literacy, news literacy taps into the following concepts: that all media messages and products are constructed using creative production techniques; that messages can be decoded differently depending on the different schemas people hold; that bias plays a role in the encoding and decoding process; and that media messages are generally created for profit or to exercise power (Thoman and Jolls 2004, in Craft, Maksl, and Ashley 2013). The media, then, "provide us with selective versions of the world, rather than direct access to it" (Frau-Meigs 2006, 19). In that sense, the news is never a perfect reflection of reality, nor do the media provide perfect methods of narrative telling (McLuhan 1994). So, people must learn how to critically analyse texts.

Despite this link to media literacy, news literacy educators seem opposed to allowing media literacy practitioners to shape the definition of news literacy.[2]

So how should news literacy be defined?

It should start with an acknowledgment that news literacy is a subset of media literacy and should borrow its theoretical underpinnings from media literacy, but focus it through the lens of the news. Media literacy is defined as the ability to access, analyze, evaluate, and produce communication and information in a variety of media (Aufderheide 1993; Frau-Meigs 2006). News literacy can and should be defined in the same way, with a few additions, such as the ability to recognize and critically examine hidden meanings in news media; to identify sources of information in the news media, including sources cited in news media texts; and to develop an understanding of news media consumption habits (Fleming 2010). These additions to the generally accepted definition of media literacy help put some meat on the bones of Aufderheide's definition, which Martens (2010) criticized for lacking specificity in that it “cannot provide much detail to people who want to design educational strategies” (Martens 2010, 2).

There is evidence that to become news literate, one should have an understanding of news media ownership (Ashley, Poepsel, and Willis 2010). While this has long been viewed as of great importance in the United States, where there are “blue” and “red” media, the issue of media ownership – more specifically, the concentration of ownership – has become a greater issue in Canada in recent months. Shortly before this paper was written, the federal Competition Bureau approved the sale of Quebecor’s 175 newspapers in the Sun Media chain to Postmedia Network Canada for $316 million.[3] These kinds of lessons in a curriculum would begin to probe power relationships within news media, as well as the power relationship between news consumers and news producers that frames critical discourse. Journalism schools with faculty who have real-life experience dealing with owners are best situated to add richness and expertise to this portion of an education in news media.

Canadian journalism schools should use these elements as the basis for an operational definition of news literacy. Canadian journalists themselves have suggested a similar operational definition of news literacy (Press 2011). Other faculty on campus may be more willing to allow the ink-stained wretches of the world into their classrooms if they are coming with a generally accepted media literacy educational pedagogy.

This leads to the next question this paper seeks to answer: Why teach news literacy at all?

Why Journalism Schools Should Teach News Literacy

University students are exposed to more news media than ever before (see Foehr, Rideout, and Roberts 2010). Queen’s University media professor Sidneyeve Matrix has described Canadians as “‘infovores’ who spend much of their time online perusing news websites” (Perreaux 2010). But it is not clear whether their news literacy skills are advanced. A 2008 report from the British Library concluded that while the “Google Generation” found it easy to access media, they possessed limited ability to critically analyse media texts (cited in Considine, Horton, and Moorman 2009). Research has also suggested that Canadian students may be less than knowledgeable about news media ecosystem. Ashley, Maksl and Craft (2013) noted that post-secondary students were “highly knowledgeable about commonly held attitudes about news media” but not “knowledgeable about how the news media system actually works … Considering how pervasive media are, it is not surprising that students have been exposed to and developed a variety of attitudes about media without factual knowledge about the media system.”

This is the first place where journalism faculty can step in. Research suggests that elementary and high school teachers in other disciplines sometimes feel ill-equipped to teach students about news media; the result has been different experiences with news literacy (Ngomba-Westbrook 2013**)**. Journalism faculty have the above-mentioned "factual knowledge" about how the media system operates. They have been – and often still are – part of that system as producers of news media products, and they are just as likely to be active news consumers. On top of this, they are steeped in educational pedagogies and teaching experience. So these faculty are well-suited to prod students into a critical analysis of journalism, besides being well-placed to bring non-faculty journalists into the classroom for added lesson depth.

In my own research, Ontario journalists showed an intense interest in teaching young students about journalism and news literacy skills. They lamented the lack of knowledge about how the news media actually work. One participant spoke of being a print-based reporter and having an interviewee ask whether the interview would be on television that night. A general theme emerged among participants that journalists need not do something magical in teaching news literacy – they need only demystify the journalistic process and engage in critical dialogue about the craft itself. Once they had done these things, students would be in a better position to understand and partake in the social process that creates news media texts and gives them meaning. All were willing to go into classrooms, or had already done so, to be guest speakers for elementary and high school students.

This leads to the final question this paper seeks to answer: How should Canadian journalism schools teach news literacy?

How Journalism Schools Should Teach News Literacy

A review of the literature suggests that educators and journalists should work together to further media literacy and news literacy goals (Masterman 2001; Hobbs and Jensen 2009; Press 2011). These goals should include building critical thinking, oral, written, and multimedia communication skills, and a more engaged citizenry. A news literacy curriculum should avoid perceptions that it is attempting to build audiences for traditional or legacy media. The way to avoid this is to have journalism educators – former print and broadcast journalists themselves – work with educators from other academic fields to develop lessons and curricula. It should be a uniquely Canadian model that does not entirely replicate the Stony Brook model.

The Stony Brook model is tough to digest academically. The course has twelve lessons, starting with an introduction to news literacy and a discussion about why news literacy can be considered important in the digital information age. Students are then exposed to the reasons why people follow the news; what makes the news different from other sources of information such as advertising, publicity, and entertainment; and the philosophical and practical pillars that hold up the American press, such as the First Amendment. Next comes a lesson on the journalistic process. This includes understanding how some information becomes news; what the difference is between news and opinion; what the difference is between fairness and balance in media coverage; what journalistic truth actually means; how to evaluate sources of information and sources within news stories; how to understand the power of images; how print news differs from broadcast news; what issues are unique to online news; and, finally, what the future of the news may be, which includes an overview of the structures of media ownership. In short, there is a lot to learn, but much of it has to do with planting information in students' minds and then testing their ability to apply what they have deposited there.

The Stony Brook curriculum has been criticized for focusing too much on the craft of journalism and not enough on the theory of news media production (Hobbs 2010). The instructors are mostly former professional journalists, many of whom spent most of their working lives in print or broadcast journalism before entering post-secondary education. I once watched them put together a final lecture, and saw how they added or removed slides in the same way that they would have inserted news stories into or removed them from a broadcast line-up or print page.

Even so, these staff members added to the students' learning experience. Fleming (2014) found that students in the Stony Brook news literacy program responded favourably to the professional journalism backgrounds that educators brought to news literacy lessons. That the journalism school provided hands-on knowledge about the journalistic process may well have enhanced the study of news media across the university campus, besides bringing some real-world practice to theories of news media production from different academic disciplines.

Results from the participants in my study overlapped with several aspects of the news literacy curriculum at Stony Brook. One participant's "concentric circle lesson"[4] – which links news items to various circles of influence that lead back to the individual consumer – could be used to teach students why it is important to follow the news. Others talked about understanding and evaluating media bias, fairness, and journalistic truth, as well as understanding audience bias and evaluating sources during the consumption of news.

Participants placed greater emphasis on the roles social media play in the news ecosystem, be it as platforms for news delivery or as means to connect journalists to sources. A more recent issue has been how algorithms for sites like Facebook influence what users see in their news feed and thereby influence their clicks. Teaching about this will not be easy and is best suited to a student-centred teaching approach because of the ever-changing social media landscape, in which new tools, sites, and platforms rapidly appear and disappear.

There is another issue that needs to be addressed about the Stony Brook model, which has been successfully exported to campuses across the United States and to institutions overseas. Its success is partly the result of strong fundraising. In all, four foundations have granted the school almost US$3 million to help it build a curriculum, assess student outcomes, and export the course elsewhere. The faculty themselves have been entrepreneurial when it comes to attracting first-year students on campus away from traditional liberal arts courses, such as psychology and sociology. In my visit to the school in the spring of 2010 as part of my own research, the instructors explained to me how they worked to put the idea of the news literacy course in front of first-year students during orientation week when they were selecting classes. This combination of financing and salesmanship likely contributed to its success. Also, the possibility of grants has lured traditional media literacy educators to start dipping their toes into the news literacy field – something that likely added to the tension on display at the news literacy summit in the fall of 2014 in Chicago.

Canadian universities looking to replicate the Stony Brook experience are likely to find themselves short of major granting partners, such as the Knight Foundation or the McCormick Foundation. There isn't the same history of journalism funding foundations in Canada as there is in the United States. Overcoming this financial obstacle will not be easy in an age of belt tightening in the public education system.

So what can be done?

The place to begin is by drawing on the resources currently available on campus to enhance the news literacy education already taking place in various courses. A start could be reaching out to, for example, sociology, psychology, philosophy, and economics professors to identify lessons that could be enhanced by importing the expertise that only a journalism school faculty member can bring. Embedding news literacy ideas in the curricula of other disciplines – an approach that has shown promise in furthering news literacy instruction (Fleming 2010) – should not be about dispelling sometimes negative evaluations of news media texts, but about adding greater context and critical expertise. As Hobbs (2010) rightly argues: "news literacy programs must have, as their primary learning outcomes, a focus on building learners' critical thinking and communication skills in responding to news and current events in today's world, warts and all."

The thoughts of professional journalists are a place to start when considering which concepts to enhance in other curricula. The journalists who took part in a study on news literacy education (Press 2011) believed it should include a discussion of the social process that creates news – a process impacted by media bias and audience bias – with journalistic objectivity as the yardstick. They believed that news literacy requires elements of information literacy as well as elements of digital literacy, especially when it comes to the roles social media play in news production and consumption. There was also mention of philosophical discussions with students about ethical journalistic practices.

What they left out was a focus on the role of free speech in society – likely because Canada does not emphasize the Charter right to free speech as strongly as Americans do their First Amendment. Participants in the study also did not explicitly state that students should be required to learn about the *mission* of the press, which is part of the curriculum at Stony Brook.

Journalists in the study identified a hands-on approach to teaching news literacy, one that would call for students to do more than talk. Such an approach would require teachers to guide the students through questions about how news media affect them. This might involve less-structured lectures or project-based learning. For post-secondary education, journalists in the study suggested that teaching should focus on theoretical debates within news gathering and production – for example, the ethics of anonymous sources, and the messages sent by shot selection in a broadcast or video report – as opposed to the basics of being a journalist. In short, the journalists tapped into a constructivist paradigm, often without realizing it.

But these journalists were also aware that their domain expertise was limited to journalism, much as reporters in a newsroom will defer to the beat reporter whose expertise in a particular subject area – education or health, for example – exceeds their own. This unexpected finding in the data suggested that they wanted to work with other faculty and teachers rather than try to teach news literacy on their own.

It would be wise for Canadian journalism educators to reach out to other disciplines to embed news literacy in curricula. Reaching out to the wider campus would also meet the Ontario Ministry of Training, Colleges and Universities 2001 policy on general education, which outlined how courses should "identify and deal with issues of societal concern in a manner relevant to the lives of students" by guiding students through the issue's historical context, theoretical bases, and application to modern life. All courses, the ministry wrote, should help students with their personal growth; help them become informed citizens; and prepare them for future learning.

News literacy meets these ideals while also providing an evolutionary step for the journalism school. No longer should journalism schools think only about preparing the next generation of journalists to report the news – schools should also help prepare the next generation of news consumers to navigate the modern news ecosystem.

NOTES

[1] The study involved one-on-one, semi-structured interviews with five Ontario journalists in late 2010 and early 2011. All were employed with either a news outlet, a journalism association, or a journalism education program. I then used a phenomenological and narrative analysis to evaluate each participant's interview.

[2] For more on the issues identified at the summit, see this response from Sherri Hope Culver, president of the National Association for Media Literacy Education and director of the Center for Media and Information Literacy at Temple University: http://centermil.org/2014/09/16/thoughts-on-the-news-literacy-summit.

[3] Disclaimer: I was employed at the *Ottawa Citizen*, a Postmedia newspaper, as a parliamentary reporter when I first began work on this paper. As of June 2015, I am no longer a Postmedia employee, having voluntarily left for a position at The Canadian Press.

[4] It is best to picture an archery target to understand the concentric circle lesson. The circle in the middle is for news about the circle of influence closest to the student: their immediate environment, such as their neighbourhood, school, or family. Every circle beyond represents more distant news – the local, provincial, national, and international – that the student finds a way to connect back to himself or herself. The participant who discussed this lesson plan referred to it as a concentric circle lesson, and I have decided to use his words whenever I describe it.

REFERENCES

Arke, Edward, and Brian Primack. 2009. "Quantifying Media Literacy: Development, Reliability, and Validity of a New Measure." *Educational Media International* 46, no. 1: 53-65. doi:10.1080/09523980902780958

Ashley, Seth, Mark Poepsel, and Erin Willis. 2010. "Media Literacy and News Credibility: Does Knowledge of Media Ownership Increase Skepticism in News Consumers?" *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 2, no. 1: 37-46 . http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/jmle/vol2/iss1/3

Ashley, Seth, Adam Maksl, and Stephanie Craft. 2013. "Developing a News Media Literacy Scale." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 68, no. 1: 7-21. doi: 10.1177/1077695812469802.

Aufderheide, Patricia, ed. 1993. *Media Literacy: A Report of the National Leadership Conference on Media Literacy*. Aspen: Aspen Institute.

Considine, David, Julie Horton, and Gary Moorman. 2009. "Teaching and Reading the Millennial Generation through Media Literacy." *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy* 52, no. 6:

471–81. doi:10.1598/JAAL.52.6.2

Craft, Stephanie, Adam Maksl, and Seth Ashley. 2013. "Measuring News Media Literacy: How Knowledge and Motivations Combine to Create News-Literate Teens." McCormick Foundation. http://hdl.handle.net/10355/34713

Dewey, John. 1929. "My Pedagogic Creed." In *The Curriculum Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. (2004), ed. David Flinders and Stephen Thornton. New York: Routledge.

Eisner, Elliot. 1967. "Educational Objectives – Help or Hindrance?". In *The Curriculum Studies Reader*, 2nd ed. (2004), ed. David Flinders and Stephen Thornton. New York: Routledge.

Fleming, Jennifer. 2014. "Media Literacy, News Literacy, or News Appreciation? A Case Study of the News Literacy Program at Stony Brook University." *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator* 69, no. 2: 146–65. doi:10.1177/1077695813517885

– . 2010. "'Truthiness' and Trust: News Media Literacy Strategies in the Digital Age." In *Media Literacy: New Agendas in Communication*, ed. Kathleen Tyner. New York: Routledge.

Frau-Meigs, Divina, ed. 2006. *Media Education: A Kit for Teachers, Students, Parents, and Professionals*. Paris: UNESCO.

Foehr, Ulla, Victoria Rideout, and Donald Roberts. 2010. *Generation m2: Media in the Lives of 8- to 18-year-olds*. Kaiser Family Foundation.

Hobbs, Renee. 2010. "News Literacy: What Works and What Doesn't." Paper presented at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) conference, Denver, Colorado, 7 August 2010. http://works.bepress.com/reneehobbs/12

Hobbs, Renee, and Amy Jensen. 2009. "The Past, Present, and Future of Media Literacy Education." *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 1, no. 1: 1–11.

Martens, Hans. 2010. "Evaluating Media Literacy Education: Concepts, Theories and Future Directions." *Journal of Media Literacy Education* 2, no. 1: 1–22.

Masterman, Len. 2001. *Teaching the Media*. London: Routledge.

McLuhan, Marshall. 1994. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

McNeil, John. 2009. *Contemporary Curriculum: In Thought and Action*, 7th ed. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons.

Ngomba-Westbrook, Nalova. 2013. "Tensions of Teaching Media Literacy in Teacher Education." PhD diss., Pennsylvania State University. https://etda.libraries.psu.edu/paper/18794/17151

Perreaux, Les. 2010. "What Makes Canadians Spend More Time Online? *Globe and Mail*, 28 December. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/technology/what-makes-canadians-spend-more-time-online/article1851469

Press, Jordan. 2011. "News You Can Really Use: Thoughts from Ontario Journalists about the What and How of Teaching News Literacy." MA thesis, Queen's University. http://hdl.handle.net/1974/6414

Province of Ontario. Ministry of Training, Colleges, and Universities. 2001. *General Program Standard*. http://www.tcu.gov.on.ca/eng/general/college/progstan/business/oa-gen.html#general1

Reese, Stephen. 2012. "Global News Literacy: The Educator." In *News Literacy: Global Perspectives for the Newsroom and the Classroom*, ed. Paul Mihailidis. New York: Peter Lang.

Schwarz, Fifi. 2011. "Media Literacy and the News." http://www.windesheim.nl/~/media/files/windesheim/research publications/120319_media_literacy_and_the_news.pdf

Like Reaching for the Pen: Towards a Greater Place for Digital News Video in Newsrooms and Journalism Curricula

Gavin Adamson

Introduction

This study is inspired by the results of an experimental approach to reporting live in a student newsroom. On 16 November 2012, two fourth-year undergraduate students at Ryerson University's School of Journalism ventured to the University of Toronto to cover a men's rights activist's speech. There they would produce, by some measures, the most successful editorial content published by ryersonian.ca (Lagerquist 2013) to date.

The reporters arrived at the scene with notebooks but also with smartphones. They were reporting in a live blog, a relatively new platform that digital newsrooms have used for breaking news events (Buttry 2014). It allowed the journalism students to post their choice from a variety of media, including text, photos, video, audio, and third-party social media, moments after they reported or captured it. The blog was embedded in the newsroom's website at the time (http://archive.ryersonian.ca/article/27899).

At the event, protesters chanted, engaged the Toronto police, and charged the doors of the lecture hall building. The police rebuffed them, and several skirmishes flared up. The reporters shot video and interviewed several protesters and eyewitnesses. The article page was shared via social media, as were some of the posts in the live blog.

Within forty-eight hours, the comments section below the live blog was busy with more than forty comment posts, which is about forty times more than the average *Ryersonian* article page attracted at the time. The platform's audience analytics reporting page showed that the reporter's thirty-seven posts, several of which were video posts, had been popular with viewers. The three pages of the live blog had been viewed 5,801 times, at an average length of about 30.5 minutes each, for a total of 202,900 engagement minutes, a tally that included the time viewers spent engaging with comments at the bottom of the article page. Average article pages on ryersonian.ca during the same period were viewed for ten seconds, by comparison. For a corpus of about 223 other live blogs produced in the same eighteen-month period to 2 December 2013, the average numbers for those same analytics, respectively, were 129 page views, 22 minutes, about 3,400 engagement minutes. What are we to make of these numbers?

An initial goal of this research was to account quantitatively for the appeal of video in live blogs generally. Ultimately the data available, including the exceptional audience numbers above, did not establish a general correlation between greater audience engagement and the use of videos on the article page. Still, the research review below supports the argument that online news video production should be increasingly integrated into journalism curricula and newsroom practice on platforms such as live blogs.

The argument is supported in part by qualitative evidence of audience interest in live blogs, and especially by mounting evidence about the growth in online video watching on many platforms where news is distributed. Given the competitive and financial landscape for the journalism industry globally, audience interest is more important than ever when assessing potential editorial approaches to coverage.

Bergland and colleagues (2013) suggest that audience expectations and curricular choices in journalism schools may both have an impact on what kind of multimedia appear in the news industry. So the findings can be instructive both for journalism schools trying to anticipate what to teach, and for the industry making the ongoing transition to digital news. This paper concludes with some ways of integrating mobile video with core journalism training about news judgment and best technical practices for audio and video capture for news.

Literature Review: Online Video in Newsrooms Today

It is almost a cliché to describe how quickly the digital news ecosystem shifts, but the subject is too relevant to resist, especially where video is concerned. Most recently the *Wall Street Journal* changed direction on its video strategy, ending a three-year investment in live studio online broadcasts. It will continue to invest in producing videos viewable on-demand by the audience, according to news executives (Wang 2015; Welsh 2015). Over a relatively longer term, consider that when Amy O'Leary announced in 2015 that she was joining *Upworthy*, the digital video platform, leaving her position at the *New York Times,* she joked that she had been hired by the *Times* to train staff to create audio slide shows in 2006, when that seemed to be the future of news multimedia (O'Donovan 2015). Indeed, according to a report, in 2013 there seemed to be "no consensus on how to produce news videos or how to profit from them" (Tu 2014). In 2013, Abbey Adkison and Duy Linh Tu crossed the United States to describe what kind of video was being produced in a project called *VideoNow* for the Tow Centre, and their report describes the industry in this experimentation mode. The report, more "qualitative than quantitative," relied on interviews with forty producers of video in newsrooms, none of them traditional broadcasters. In the related book, Tu described six "flavors" (2015) of Web video that have emerged in the industry: (1) traditional, broadcast-style videos: newsrooms repurpose traditional broadcasters' reports and repost these packages on the Web; (2) raw videos: Shot and uploaded by print reporters using smartphones; (3) explainer videos: for difficult subjects such as personal finance and political machinations; (4) interactive features: short clips that complement text in so-called immersive multimedia projects; (5) feature videos: deeper looks into subjects or themes, although not necessarily told in traditional documentary style; and (6) Documentary and long-form narratives: time-intensive, planned and produced longer videos. It is fair to say that generally the list, although not comprehensive by Tu's admission, reflected the state of video in Canada as well. The study was echoed by a content analysis of two hundred Web videos posted by both television and newspaper newsrooms by Bock (2014). The aim of the study was to capture the change in storytelling style between 2011 and 2013. It showed that generally, even at broadcasters, the narrative "telling" voice of journalists was heard less frequently by the end of 2013. However, Bock notes that given the relatively small sample size, it was difficult to capture precisely all the variations and experiments in production and story-telling style. She concluded that it is impossible to know which sorts of news video will compete with cat videos. She called for studies that ask which formats best serve audience needs, and that is what the industry has been doing on its own. In 2015, journalists and developers for newsrooms gathered in New York to "hack" – and conceive of new platforms and formats for online video that the audience would appreciate (Ellis 2015) – and on it goes.

Finding an Audience Is Important, But …

While audience has always been a concern for newsrooms, researchers have remarked recently how audience Web analytics are driving changes in news-making processes. News organizations of all types have been loading content onto websites. As described above in the student newsroom example, the distribution of links via social media is an integral part of reaching the audience. Schlesinger and Doyle (2015) note that newsroom managers describe this as "discoverability." This practice drives traffic to the website, generating homepage visits by readers. Some news organizations have been tracking website analytics for several years (Anderson 2011). Beckett (2010) described the range of possible analytics and calculations in conversation with a data analyst at *Philly.com*. The newsroom watched page views, duration of visits, return visitors, and frequency of visits. It also monitored the numbers of visitors who commented on stories or brought their own media – photos, videos – to the site. Lee, Lewis, and Powers (2014) found that monitoring those data for audience "engagement" through Web analytics was a top concern among journalism professionals. Mersey, Malthouse, and Calder (2012, 698) described "engagement" as an umbrella term for "the collective experiences that readers or viewers have with a media brand." Napoli wrote that a growing body of research suggests a meaningful relationship between how the audience views editorial content and advertiser satisfaction (2011, 96). Recently, Anderson, Bell, and Shirky have observed that understanding the audience is "critical" in today's newsrooms, adding with some incredulity that some newsrooms are still not attempting to do so (2014, 37–38).

Some researchers have written that the monitoring of audience represents a troubling commingling of financial and editorial concerns (on this point, see Paul Benedetti's essay in this volume). Describing the newsroom as a sociological field that is being encroached upon by business concerns, Tandoc (2014a, 2014b) discussed how newsrooms insert Web analytics into the editorial process. In describing the practice, Tandoc resorted to the word "twerking" – a "low, squatting stance." Previous research has underlined concerns about newsrooms' hunt for page views and the commodification of audience (Robinson 2011). Summarizing the basic argument, Vujnovic (2011) suggests that in a for-profit, market-based industry, analytics can be used in an "exploitative" way. The connection between higher page views and audience engagement on the one hand, and ads served and revenue on the other, is undeniable. But as Boczkowski and Peer (2011) have described, we can also conceive of newsroom audience analytics as a healthy way to understand what the audience wants, by examining the connections between editorial choices and the most-shared and most-read lists that news websites have developed as a means to both reflect and drive traffic.

Online News Video and Audience

A growing body of evidence suggests that online audiences interested in news are consuming more video. In 2014, Pew reported that almost two-thirds of American adults now watch videos online and that more than half of them (36%) watch news videos. This was up from 40 per cent of adults who watched online videos in 2007, and 26 per cent who watched or downloaded news videos. Facebook, notably, announced that in 2014, video posting on its platform increased almost fourfold. By June of that year, users were watching 1 billion videos a day. "Whether you're a journalist in the field or a public figure sharing a part of your life, post raw videos that are compelling, shareable, clips that no one else will have," Facebook urged on its user blog. Its audience figures did not distinguish between news brands, ads, and personal posts. In Canada, AOL announced it was investing more in video production for its websites, including *Huffington Post Canada*, after a more than 50 per cent growth in year-over-year audience (Jeeva 2015).

Surprisingly little peer-reviewed academic research has been done related to online news video and audience. In her research described above, Tu (2014) noted that, leaving aside the occasional viral video, audiences did not view content produced by newsrooms more than a couple of thousand times, and many reached fewer people than that. Peer and Ksiazek (2011) wrote of online video in general that "from the standpoint of traditional news organizations … a majority of these videos are not viewed on their websites, but on video-sharing websites such as YouTube" (2011). The same would be true of some of the video that newsrooms share to Facebook and Twitter, which began to support video in 2015.

Television still dominates print and digital cousins as a source of news (Papathanassopoulos et al. 2013), but at least some migration from that medium to online has been described as a demographic shift. As early as 2012, the Pew Research Center reported that scarcely more than one-third of US audiences twenty-nine years and younger said they watched television news. More recently, Pew found that national broadcast and local TV news saw viewership growth in 2014 while the cable news audience slipped (Pew Research Center 2015). The general picture for cable television in Canada is the same: a small percentage of cable TV customers are dropping services, but that percentage is growing sharply. One industry analyst has said that the trend is likely to continue; he bases this partly on low TV viewership trends among younger adults (Friend 2015). According to Nielsen, viewership of broadcast television in the United States was down 25 per cent among eighteen- to forty-nine-year-olds in the year to September 2015. A spring 2015 poll of 1,100 undergraduate students in Toronto found that less than 18 per cent watched cable television; the rest consumed online and other formats (Hutchinson 2015). Meanwhile, Nielsen has reported that YouTube reached more American adults aged eighteen to thirty-four than any cable company (YouTube 2014). In a keynote address, Robert Picard has warned that a "tipping point" will be arriving for TV news, as it did for its print cousin, as advertisers migrate away from local TV affiliates to the Internet, following the audience (Picard 2015).

Peer-reviewed discussions about the variety of digital platforms are also elusive. Peer and Ksiazek restated Christensen's view in the *Innovators Dilemma* (1997) that viewers of online news video appear "willing to accept non-traditional production elements in exchange for the convenience of on-demand access to news content" (2011). Thurman and Lupton noted that when editors changed the placement of videos within news sites, it made some difference as to audience interaction. On the BBC news website, a video placed in the stand-alone player, accessed via a link next to the related text story, had an average take-up rate of 2 per cent. However, when an embedded video was placed at the top of the text story, the conversion rate leapt to between 25 and 40 per cent (2008). The researchers also suggested that the preferred format for online video is forty seconds and “shareable” (2008). In Canada in late 2015, television news producers such as CBC, CTV News, and Global News are in the habit of transferring broadcast video to the online environment and sharing some of it socially. Overwhelmingly, digital distribution is the second window for their content, but newsrooms are also experimenting with a wider variety of news video. Global News occasionally predistributes video packages online, and the CBC’s Community page uses mobile video in some of its online coverage.

One academic paper worth firmly underlining asked the audience about its motivation for watching online video. The online news audience said that “timely learning” drove its viewing habits, while television news watchers scored entertainment more highly. The survey of online news viewers found high agreement scores for substatements such as “Because I am interested in current events,” “To find constantly updated event information,” and “To find breaking news events.” In their discussion, the researchers write that “it seems that online video platforms are better than television at satisfying consumers’ learning motives in a timely manner” (Cha and Chan-Olmsted 2012).

The Journalism Case for Lightly Produced Mobile News Video

Online video, no matter the source, often has news value. In the week after the 2011 earthquake in Japan, the twenty most viewed news videos on the YouTube platform were viewed more than 96 million times (Pew Research Center 2012). Lee (2012) describes the myriad ways that popular citizen-source videos are aggregated and reposted by news organizations in Hong Kong, and again, it is fair to say that some elements of the case study apply to Canada. Newsrooms recognize the impact that documentary mobile video can have from a public accountability perspective as well. Consider the video of Toronto police repeatedly shooting and tasering a man, who was in some mental distress, to his death on a streetcar. A nearby resident witnessed the incident, recorded it on his phone, and uploaded it to YouTube before sharing the link with newsrooms. The evidentiary documentary video had immediate news value, and Ontario’s Special Investigations Unit eventually laid criminal charges (Alamenciak 2013). As the victim’s family’s lawyer stated, the “Sammy Yatim case,” named after the victim, might never have advanced to court had it not been for the compelling video (Andrew-Gee 2014). When *Toronto Star* reporters viewed video that allegedly showed the mayor of Toronto smoking crack cocaine, its immediate news value was not in doubt, nor was its importance as a political accountability tool. Researchers have documented many other instances of so-called guard-dog citizen journalism involving video recording (Antony and Thomas 2010). Arguably the most important news video of 2014 – it is notable that it was not taken by a reporter from a broadcast news outlet – was captured by a newspaper reporter on his mobile phone on 22 October when a gunman stormed Parliament Hill in Canada's capital city, Ottawa (Wingrove 2014). The indisputable eyewitness video was distributed almost immediately online and replayed on news broadcasts and news websites in Canada for several days. It was the best media available related to the news event, giving a sense of what it was like inside the building as events unfolded. The clear news value of digital video in the instances above is one reason for suggesting that journalists of all stripes should be capturing it regularly.

Convergence Reluctance

While researchers have described resistance to convergence in newsrooms, they have also described the desire of newsroom leaders for more multiplatform recruits. A large portion of the research into online news video has concentrated on the processes, anxieties, struggles, and sometimes failures related to the converged newsroom (Tameling and Broersma 2013; Thurman and Lupton 2008; Boczkowski 2004). Bock (2011) wrote that even as researchers describe multimedia integration pains, they speculate that the economic environment "is likely to foster a reliance on video journalists who can multitask." She later described (2014) the two main, related categories of concern: (1) technical considerations about how the news gets produced for a changing distribution network, and (2) newsroom politics and cultural conflicts relating to which people and processes are privileged over others as the textual and visual approaches are merged. (The part that analytics play in newsroom processes is related to these concerns.)

Thurman and Lupton (2008) captured the range of rhetoric about the conflict in newsrooms in two interviews. The attitude shifted from this sort of statement: "being an exemplary journalist in both print and multimedia probably wasn't feasible," or, "I don't think they're a necessarily complementary set of skills," to this: "I think papers have certainly got an opportunity," said the *Mirror*'s Steve Purcell:

> If we can break stories in a video format then we've got a distinct advantage. We're not weighed down by the mentality of thinking we can only do this with five men and two cameras. We can just go along with a mobile phone and take footage. We can also get users to send in their experiences and not be too concerned about the quality.

Tensions have not been not resolved, but recent research also suggests that newsrooms have been aware for some time of the unrealized potential of mobile news video. In a study about the introduction of videographers at British broadcasters ITV and BBC, Wallace concluded that newer video technologies can have beneficial or compromising effects on journalistic standards, depending on how they are used (2009). Ketterer, McGuire, and Murray (2013) found that video and multimedia skills were both among the top five most important, according to both print newsrooms and broadcasters with websites (writing and editing were the top two for each). Broadcast producers valued the ability to deliver a good standup, but from a production and shooting perspective, this delivery can be practised just as effectively in a digital medium, including live blogs.

Live Blogs Including Video

Research into live blogging may be useful to traditional broadcast and textual journalists and educators because the platform breaks down the constituent elements of journalism into their raw forms without privileging any one of them. Reporters in the field can load lightly edited text, photos, video, or audio to the live blog nearly immediately, where it can be further edited. Assuming a reporter is equipped with a mobile device, there is no structural reason to choose text over video, or vice versa. A reporter who made a choice for text, in theory, would do so because of a judgment about the limited visual appeal of the subject, not because the platform could not receive the content in a networked environment. Any textual and visual media content can be loaded synchronously to the live blog. For context, all of the elements can be captioned immediately in the platform. The audience views the content as a vertical timeline, organized in the same way as a social platform, with older posts at the bottom and newer ones at the top.

At around the same time as the Canadian journalism school mentioned above was experimenting with live blogging in its newsroom, a team analysing live blogs at the guardian.co.uk was conducting some early research into the medium. Live blogging for *The Guardian*'s news website was “increasingly the default format for covering major breaking news stories, sports events, and scheduled entertainment news” (Thurman and Walters 2013). The British study took a qualitative approach to analysing what editors and reporters prefer and dislike about the medium and conducted a survey of audience preferences. Researchers found that during a twenty-four-hour period, readers visited live blogs three times more than article pages, and these received more than four times the page views, as unique visitors often returned to the same page for updates. They were second only to photo galleries in popularity. Video was not a coded element in this study, presumably because it was not a common enough element in the live blogs at the time. A survey of live blog readers visiting the *Guardian* website found that nearly 60 per cent visited the platform on guardian.co.uk each day. A follow-up study on *Scribblelive*, a live blogging platform that newsrooms can license, showed that 11 per cent of US and UK news readers had read live blogs in the preceding week, with Japanese news readers reporting consumption at the rate of 35 per cent. Respondents indicated they preferred the platform for "breaking news" and "unfolding political stories" (Thurman and Newman 2014).

Part of the appeal of live blogging depends on this platform providing a simple, efficient, and affordable way to capture and post video for a newsroom. Newsrooms could build their own live blog platforms, as *The Guardian* has. *Scribblelive*, which is the most frequently used third-party provider of live blog interfaces, provides its platform free to journalism schools but not to industry. At the time of writing, some of its efficacy could arguably be replaced by Twitter's video service. Notably, Twitter Inc., which owns the eponymous micro-blogging platform, has also bought Periscope, which allows users to micro-broadcast live video to a limited number of viewers. Many digital newsrooms have begun experimenting with this free service as well (Flynn, 2015).

Discussion

Instilling in young digital journalists the value of capturing digital video as part of their daily information gathering is prudent considering demographic audience trends, new technology, and needs in the job market.

The first step for newsrooms and journalism schools to take is to recognize the potential for delivering digital video that has news value to the audience on this platform. For volume, reporters across any country will not be able to match the number of citizen journalists who, by happenstance, produce newsworthy video content. Sites like Facebook and YouTube will always aggregate video from their millions of users, some of whom occasionally shoot video with high news value. Nevertheless, newsrooms have the advantage that they are trained to recognize news. They should establish their websites as places where audiences can expect to see more immediate, lightly produced online news video, shot by professionals.

Next, some of the evidence presented above indicates that journalism schools need to engage with the industry's approach to distributing video. Concerning audience appeal, "discoverability" is important, as noted above. Newsrooms and journalism schools alike need to consider placement on the website homepage or article page as well. Newsrooms already have learned they need a place in the social media news ecosystem, and video is increasingly playing a part in those media.

Journalism schools are already teaching students to make judgments about what is newsworthy and have been doing this for a long time. They are also training students about visual storytelling in the broadcast setting, which they should continue to do, considering the strength of that industry. While there are arguments about convergence in journalism schools, more video capturing should only sharpen student's news judgments and skills in aid of news delivery on any platform.

Many students use recording devices for their interviews. About 90 per cent of the 2015 incoming undergraduate class at Ryerson University's School of Journalism owned a mobile device that would let them record multimedia. (Fortunately, the school has been able to accommodate those who do not.) The next step is to ask students to make more deliberate choices about which moments audiences want to see and hear for themselves.

In time, journalists and newsrooms will make better judgments about what to post online. It helps that they can receive feedback about audience response to the video they are capturing and their news judgments via analytics platforms. If newsrooms are grappling with the integration of website analytics with their traditional news-gathering and gatekeeping roles, then journalism schools should be addressing these questions, too.

It's worth exploring, for a moment, how digital news video could integrate into current curricula. As described above, broadcast producers and digital editors emphasize convergence in the skills and traits they are looking for from young journalists. In addition to consistently and constantly making judgments about the news value of what they are seeing, hearing and witnessing, journalism students can practise other important technical and reporting skills:

- Video interviewing in time-sensitive situations
- Capturing complementary and contextual information for captions and cutlines
- Efficient, clear standups that deliver updates on any news subject from the scene of a news event, breaking or not
- The development of visual storytelling, including photo and video composition basics
- Shooting b-roll that may be useful for further sequence construction
- Panning, tilting, and zooming techniques
- Avoidance of technical hindrances such as background distractions, and lighting and audio problems

Mobile phones can now be mounted to lightweight tripod systems. Native and third-party apps allow for simple editing on either end of a media clip. The raw news content can be reported in a timely manner almost instantaneously on the digital live blog platform, but it can also be assembled for longer pieces that merit the coverage in traditional broadcast packages, such as the traditional ninety-second news piece. Similarly, students will develop skills and techniques for that distribution form as well.

Live blog platforms can also provide a safe environment for unpublished material. That's a quality that might be desired for the purposes of education, especially in early years of a journalism program, when mistakes are guaranteed and indeed are important to learning. Such platforms are an alternative to Twitter and Facebook, for example, which are always live.

Disclosure:

Scribblelive has donated its platform to the Ryerson School of Journalism for its use for more than four years.

REFERENCES

Alamenciak, Tim. 2013 (19 August). "Sammy Yatim: Family 'Relieved' by SIU Decision to Charge Officer with Murder." *Toronto Star*. http://www.thestar.com/news/crime/2013/08/19/sammy_yatim_family_relieved_by_siu_decision_to_charge_officer_with_murder.html

Anderson, C. W., Bell, E., & Shirky, C. (2014). *Post-Industrial Journalism: Adapting to the present*. New York, New York, USA.

Andrew-Gee, Eric. 2014 (27 July). "YouTube Video Had Huge Impact on Sammy Yatim Caser." *Toronto Star*. http://www.thestar.com/news/crime/2014/07/27/youtube_video_had_huge_impact_on_sammy_yatim_case.html.

Anderson, C. W. (2011). Between creative and quantified audiences: Web metrics and changing patterns of newswork in local US newsrooms. *Journalism* 12, no. 5: 550–566. doi:10.1177/1464884911402451

Antony, M.G., and R.J. Thomas. 2010. "'This Is Citizen Journalism at Its Finest': YouTube and the Public Sphere in the Oscar Grant Shooting Incident." *New Media & Society* 12, no. 8: 1280–96. doi:10.1177/1461444810362492.

Beckett, Lois. (2010). Getting beyond just pageviews: Philly.com's seven-part equation for measuring online engagement. *Nieman Journalism Lab*. Retrieved November 9, 2014, from http://www.niemanlab.org/2010/10/getting-beyond-just-pageviews-philly-coms-seven-part-equation-for-measuring-online-engagement/

Bergland, Robert, Lisa Crawford, Sarah Noe, and David Hon. 2013. "Multimedia and Interactivity on Newspaper Websites: A Multi-Study Analysis of Seven English-Speaking Countries' Multimedia and Interactivity on Newspaper Websites" *Official Research Journal of the International Symposium on Online Journalism* 2, no. 1: 25–45.

Bock, M.A. 2011. "You Really, Truly, Have to 'Be There': Video Journalism as a Social and Material Construction." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 88, no. 4: 705-718. http://jmq.sagepub.com/content/88/4/705.short

– . 2014. "Showing versus Telling: Comparing Video Narratives on Newspaper and Television Websites Video." *Journalism* 11, no. 2: 1–25. doi:10.1177/1464884914568076

Boczkowski, Pablo J. 2004. "The Processes of Adopting Multimedia and Interactivity in Three Online Newsrooms." *Journal of Communication* 54, no. 2: 197–213. doi:10.1093/joc/54.2.197. http://joc.oupjournals.org/cgi/doi/10.1093/joc/54.2.197

Boczkowski, Pablo J., and Limor Peer. 2011. "The Choice Gap: The Divergent Online News Preferences of Journalists and Consumers." *Journal of Communication* 61, no. 5: 857–76. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01582.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01582.x

Buttry, Steve. 2014. "20 Tips for Live Coverage of Events." *The Buttry Diary*. http://stevebuttry.wordpress.com/2014/06/24/20-tips-for-live-coverage-of-events

Cha, J., and S.M. Chan-Olmsted. 2012. "Substitutability between Online Video Platforms and Television." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 89, no. 2: 261–78. doi:10.1177/1077699012439035

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The Innovator's Dilemma*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard Business School Press.

Ellis, Justin. 2015. "Hacking Journalism Spent the Weekend Reimagining Video — Here's What They Came up with." *Nieman Journalism Lab*. http://www.niemanlab.org/2015/01/hacking-journalism-spent-the-weekend-reimagining-video-heres-what-they-came-up-with

Flynn, K. (2015). Twitter's Periscope Infiltrates TV Newsrooms As Reporters At CNN, CBS, NBC And Others Try Live Video Streaming Apps. *International Business Times*. Retrieved from http://www.ibtimes.com/twitters-periscope-infiltrates-tv-newsrooms-reporters-cnn-cbs-nbc-others-try-live-1866848

Friend, David. 2015. "More Canadians Scrap Cable Packages or Never Sign up: Report." *The Canadian Press/CTV News*. http://www.ctvnews.ca/business/more-canadians-scrap-cable-packages-or-never-sign-up-report-1.2325386

Hutchinson, Michael. 2015. "Netflix, Social Media Trumps Cable for Toronto Students." *The Ryersonian*. http://www.ryersonian.ca/netflix-social-media-trumps-cable-for-toronto-students

Jeeva, Rashida. 2015 (21 September). "Doubling down on Video Is the Right Strategy for AOL Canada." *Marketing*. http://www.marketingmag.ca/sponsored/doubling-down-on-video-is-the-right-strategy-for-aol-canada-156907.

Ketterer, S., J. McGuire, and R. Murray. 2013. "Contrasting Desired Sports Journalism Skills in a Convergent Media Environment." *Communication and Sport* 2, no. 3: 1–17. doi:10.1177/2167479513482118

Lagerquist, Jeff. 2013. "Protesters Disrupt Men's Issues Awareness Event at U of T." *Ryersonian.ca*. http://archive.ryersonian.ca/article/25226

Lee, Francis L.F. 2012. "News from YouTube – Professional Incorporation in Hong Kong Newspaper Coverage of Online Videos." *Asian Journal of Communication* 22, no. 1: 1–18. doi:10.1080/01292986.2011.622778

Lee, A. M., Lewis, S. C., & Powers, M. (2014). Audience Clicks and News Placement: A Study of Time-Lagged Influence in Online Journalism. *Communication Research* 41, no. 4: 505-530. doi:10.1177/0093650212467031

Mersey, R. D., Malthouse, E. C., & Calder, B. J. (2012). "Focusing on the Reader: Engagement Trumps Satisfaction." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 89 no. 4: 695–709. doi:10.1177/1077699012455391

Napoli, P. (2011). *Audience evolution: New technologies and the transformation of media audiences*. New York, New York, USA: Columbia University Press.

O'Donovan, Caroline. 2015. "Q&A: Amy O'Leary on Eight Years of Navigating Digital Culture Change at *The New York Times*." *Nieman Journalism Lab*. http://www.niemanlab.org/2015/01/qa-amy-oleary-on-eight-years-of-navigating-digital-culture-change-at-the-new-york-times

Papathanassopoulos, Stylianos, Sharon Coen, James Curran, Toril Aalberg, David Rowe, Paul Jones, Hernando Rojas, and Rod Tiffen. 2013 (December). "Online Threat, but Television Is Still Dominant." *Journalism Practice* 7, no. 6: 690–704. doi:10.1080/17512786.2012.761324. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/17512786.2012.761324

Peer, Limor, and Thomas B. Ksiazek. 2011. "YOUTUBE AND THE CHALLENGE TO JOURNALISM." *Journalism Studies* 12, no 1: 45-63. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2010.511951

Pew Research Center. 2015. "State of the News Media 2015."

– . 2012. "YouTube & News." *Pew Research Centre's Journalism Project*. http://www.journalism.org/2012/07/16/youtube-news

Picard, Robert. 2015. "The Changing Business Logic of Media: Why Contemporary Trends Require Rethinking Company Strategies." *International Symposium on Online Journalism*. https://online.journalism.utexas.edu/videos.php

Robinson, S. (2011). "Journalism as process": The organizational implications of participatory online news. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*. Retrieved from http://jmo.sagepub.com/content/13/3/137.short

Schlesinger, P., and G. Doyle. 2015. "From Organizational Crisis to Multi-Platform Salvation? Creative Destruction and the Recomposition of News Media." *Journalism* 16, no. 3: 305–323. doi:10.1177/1464884914530223. http://jou.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1464884914530223.

Tameling, K., and M. Broersma. 2013. "De-Converging the Newsroom: Strategies for Newsroom Change and Their Influence on Journalism Practice." *International Communication Gazette* 75: 19–34. doi:10.1177/1748048512461760. http://gaz.sagepub.com/cgi/content/long/75/1/19/nhttp://gaz.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1748048512461760

Tandoc, E. C. (2014a). Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping. *New Media & Society* 16, no. 4: 559–575. doi:10.1177/1461444814530541

Tandoc, E. C. (2014b). Why Web Analytics Click. *Journalism Studies* 16, no. 5: 1–18. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2014.946309

Thurman, N., and B. Lupton. 2008 (1 November). "Convergence Calls: Multimedia Storytelling at British News Websites." *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 14, no. 4 (4): 439–55. doi:10.1177/1354856508094662. http://con.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/1354856508094662

Thurman, Neil, and Nic Newman. 2014. "The Future of Breaking News Online? A Study of Live Blogs through Surveys of Their Consumption, and of Readers' Attitudes and Participation." *Journalism Studies* 5, no 5: 655-667.

doi:10.1080/1461670X.2014.882080. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/1461670X.2014.882080

Thurman, Neil, and Anna Walters. 2013. "LIVE BLOGGING – DIGITAL JOURNALISM'S PIVOTAL PLATFORM: A Case Study of the Production, Consumption, and Form of Live Blogs at Guardian.co.uk." *Digital Journalism* 1, no 1: 82-101.

Tu, Duy Linh. 2015. *Feature and Narrative Storytelling for Multimedia Journalists*. 1st ed. Burlington: Taylor & Francis.

– . 2014. "Purpose & Methodology." *Video Now: The Form, Cost, and Effect of Video Journalism*. http://videonow.towcenter.org/index.html

Wallace, Sue. 2009. "Watchdog or Witness? The Emerging Forms and Practices of Videojournalism." *Journalism* 10, no. 5: 684–701. doi:10.1177/1464884909106539.http://eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk/16438/1/licence.txt

Wang, Shan. 2015. "In Revamping Its Video Strategy, The Washington Post Steers Clear of Imitating TV." *Nieman Journalism Lab*. http://www.niemanlab.org/2015/09/in-revamping-its-video-strategy-the-washington-post-steers-clear-of-imitating-tv

Welsh, Madeline. 2015. "From 'WSJ Live' to 'WSJ Video': Publishers Step Away from Dreams of Live TV-Style Broadcasting Online." *Nieman Journalism Lab*. http://www.niemanlab.org/2015/07/from-wsj-live-to-wsj-video-publishers-step-away-from-dreams-of-live-tv-style-broadcasting-online

Wingrove, Josh. 2014. "Video: Footage from Globe Reporter Josh Wingrove Captures Gunfire inside Parliament." *Globe and Mail*. 22 October 2014. http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/news-video/video-footage-from-globe-reporter-captures-gun-fire-in-parliament-hill/article21219457

Using Analytics: A Round Table Discussion

Moderator: Gene Allen

Participants:

Marissa Nelson, Senior Director of Digital Media, CBC News[1]

Erika Tustin, Digital Editor, *Toronto Star*

Kenny Yum, Managing Editor, AOL Canada, Huffington Post Canada

Introduction

The rapid and profound changes affecting journalism make it difficult for journalism educators – many of whom have not worked regularly in newsrooms for several years – to keep up with new developments. In the continuing digital transformation of journalism, one of the most important recent changes has been the ability to receive rapid and essentially constant information about audience response. Using measures known as "analytics" or "Web metrics," journalists (and others communicating information and images in digital space) can learn a great deal about such things as where website visitors come from, which articles or other forms of content they consume, when and how often they return, and so on.

The growing reliance on analytics has elicited considerable interest among scholars, who see it as representing a significant change in how journalists go about their work (see, for example, Tandoc 2014; Schlesinger 2014; Vu 2013; and the paper by Paul Benedetti in this volume). Issues such as the role of journalistic standards; concerns about dumbing down content to attract larger, if perhaps less committed, audiences; privacy; and the erosion of the boundary between journalistic and advertising or circulation decisions have all properly been raised, and continue to be raised.

This round table discussion was intended simply to provide a primer on analytics as the practice was being used in Canada as of mid-2014. It is more descriptive than evaluative and represents the point of view of practitioners who are deeply engaged in the use of analytics at three different journalistic organizations. One is a relatively recently established, digital-native outlet, The Huffington Post Canada (www.huffingtonpost.ca). The second is Canada's long-established public broadcaster, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, which has been aggressively expanding its digital presence (www.cbc.ca); the third is Canada's largest-circulation newspaper, the *Toronto Star* (www.thestar.com). My hope is that this will give journalism educators a better idea of what exactly is involved in the use of analytics, so that they can make better-informed decisions about how and to what extent this practice should form part of their evolving curricula.

Gene Allen: The first question is a very simple, descriptive, factual one: What is analytics? More specifically, what sorts of information about your readers, listeners, and viewers are you able to collect? And what do you do with it?

Marissa Nelson: We collect quite a bit of information. It depends whether you are logged in as a member or not. If you're logged in as a member, then we obviously have a lot more information, but generally we track device use, browser use, operating systems. We can tell what product you're using to consume our content. We also track referrals; we can also see internal traffic patterns. So we can see where you came from and how you go through our site – you went from this page to that page, to this page and then back to the homepage, for instance. So it's internal traffic patterns, and if it's a member, we collect much more information obviously; things like e-mails, and sometimes there's demographic information, though the bar [the amount of personal information required] is relatively low in terms of signing up for a membership.

Erika Tustin: That's very similar to the *Toronto Star*. We have a member sign-in as well, My Star. When we use that option, we can collect a lot more information than we typically do just based on IP addresses. Also, within our commenting system we have a social sign-in aspect as well – if you use that, that also allows us to collect specific information on social [media] from you, based on what your privacy settings are.

GA: Does that mean, if you come in from Twitter or Facebook or something like that?

ET: Correct. You can use your Facebook login to sign into our commenting system. Generally along the same lines as the CBC, we collect data on what we know our readers like to read, when they like to read it, what platforms they read it on, how they're accessing our journalism. From what country, from what website, and their internal traffic patterns within our website as well.

MN: These are all very typical. They're tracked in Omniture, which is the tracking tool. It isn't journalism-specific, it's a Web-specific thing.

Kenny Yum: Just the fact that you have three journalists talking about analytics represents a massive sea change: businesses, newspapers, broadcasters, digital plays are putting their frontline journalists at something that, twenty years ago, you would say journalists would not be involved with, which is that we're in tune with our audience. A lot of the discussion we have about analytics sounds really geeky, because it's all about numbers, but the flip side for me as an administrator and from a strategy perspective is that for the first time you have journalists actually taking a look at these numbers. Twenty years ago, you would judge a great front page by how many newspaper stand pickups there were. That's exactly how they used to calculate those metrics. We have way more data now, and not only can we act on it on a day-to-day basis, but we can actually make strategic decisions on how we track readers and understand their patterns, because it helps us serve them better. When we say tracking, it's based on everything you do. The way I describe it is, how do you interact with our brands? I run many brands: one of them is Huffington Post Canada, and one way you can interact with us is on our homepage and on our story pages, but a lot of our readers interact with us on social platforms. So when we talk about analytics, we're also talking about your engagement with us on social platforms, like Facebook. For example, right now, Saturday morning [May 31, 2014], I'd say there's a lot more Facebook traffic happening on mobile with our brand than on our website. Why? Because, except for my esteemed colleagues here, everyone is outside enjoying their day, looking at their phones and using platforms like Facebook to consume information. It's not just about what is the top-read story on your site, and that's the end of the discussion. It's a lot deeper than that, and we spend a lot of time thinking about combining the data to give us actionable items to either act on now or to say, where are we going to be a year from now? Where were we a year ago? And to find those trends.

MN: There's even a Facebook bump late at night when everybody comes home from the bar. And the kinds of content people are going to consume then are very different. Weekends are, for sure, a mobile play because nobody's on desktop. So then your focus, in terms of what you're doing and what your staff are doing, is going to be very different.

GA: When people are coming in through Facebook, does that indicate a higher level of engagement? How many people sign in as members? Is somebody coming in through Facebook different from somebody just happening on something and seeing it once?

KY: You're asking basically an audience question: What is the difference between a person who subscribes to the *Globe and Mail* and gets it six days a week, versus one who may pass by a newsstand

and pick it up? The way you're asking about Facebook is the way people like us think about our audiences in different slices. And when it comes to analytics, we actually have a good view of our audiences in different contexts. So I have a reader who may come to my homepage every day for a month and they're really loyal and their engagement on our site we can track; we understand what that reader is like. The Facebook audience is about how the social platforms, in general, drive interaction of our brands with the consumers. So they may not be as loyal, but, you know, a reader changes. A reader may enter your realm once through Facebook and within five times they become loyal; the same reader is now a bookmark reader. It gives us a big opportunity because we spend a lot of time creating our gardens and we measure who comes to us. The era right now we're in is not a passive one. We are actively finding the readers, and the analytics is about understanding the Facebook behaviour. It helps us understand, do we have the right strategies to serve these audiences?

MN: On Facebook I think it's really interesting too. There's the brand-loyal person – who I would call lovers – and then there are the people who are just breezing by, who I would say are the snackers. The interesting thing about Facebook is it that it plays off both. I'm exaggerating the polarity of those two types of users, but Facebook actually plays to the lovers and the snackers. So, Facebook is great because you can make stuff viral; you can get it out and share it beyond your own influence. You can get people who don't know you, who don't know your brand, who don't even care about your brand, to actually see your content. So you can hook in the snackers that way. But then, once they've actually liked your brand, are engaged with you, or asked questions, had a back-and-forth, then they're becoming lovers and they're starting to develop a relationship with the brand. So it plays off both of those two halves.

GA: How do you use the information about analytics specifically, in terms of your journalism? Does it help you decide which stories to do? How to do the stories? How to play them? All those newsroom journalistic decisions – how does analytics play into that? And does this help serve readers better?

ET: For us it's a little bit of all of that, but first and foremost the *Star* very much is guided by its Atkinson Principles [http://www.thestar.com/about/atkinson.html]. We never make decisions on stories based on analytics. Where we would use the analytics is [in terms of] presentation and platform, and the type of content that would go on one particular platform over another. So, for example, a story that we would particularly conceive for a mobile audience wouldn't ever see the light of day on desktop or in print. And that's where we're focusing our efforts; it's mainly in the presentation aspect. Also, the analytics allow us to understand the particular type of content we can serve to those readers at specific times on those platforms. For instance, on the presentation side, we struggle very much with our long-form. We do a lot of long-form pieces, a lot of investigative pieces; they resonate quite well in print. Desktop, mobile, tablet, it's a struggle. That's when we use the analytics to determine presentation, placement, time of publication, all those things that help us ensure that that piece of important journalism will get into the largest possible number of hands …

GA: Can you give an example of a story that would be on mobile but not another platform?

ET: Our mobile usage is quite high in early morning commute, around six a.m. We cover Toronto transit because there are a lot of subway shutdowns; they shut down for half an hour and then all of a sudden they're back up again. That would generally not be something we would cover in a digital newsroom, in terms of putting it on the desktop. This story is basically gone by the time anyone would be reading it. That's definitely a social/mobile story that we would quickly put together in order to keep the public updated as they're moving throughout their day, and then all of a sudden it's gone. Unless it turned into a massive water main break, that then flooded the entire city, then we might see it in the paper the next day. But the shelf life of that story is probably about a half an hour.

KY: And you're driving, I'm assuming, the success of an early morning commute story based on what you've seen happen when you put it up. So if you just put it up and say we're serving a market need, in theory, the analytics gives you that layer to say, how many people were reading it? Is seven o'clock the sweet hour or is it eight o'clock? And to ignore all that, I think, is being blind to ways of better serving your audience. The fact is that more people come from Twitter or Facebook than are coming to your homepage. Using the data, using analytics to prove that what you've done has worked, will help you hone that strategy …

MN: I think Kenny was alluding to this earlier too – having data drive audience strategies isn't a new thing. In TV we have diaries and BBMs [Bureau of Broadcast Measurement results], there's NADbank [Newspaper Audience Databank Inc.], these things – we've always wanted this kind of data in every other medium. It's just we have it much more, so we can use it more strategically. And BBMs and diaries and NADbanks come out so infrequently that it's very hard to use them in a day-to-day way. In my newspaper days, you were going after a particular audience, whether it's male or female, you were going after a particular demographic and you were going to use research to judge whether you reach that demographic and you would assign against that demographic. So if you're going after women twenty-five to thirty-four you're going to find stories based on that demographic. We just have the ability to see these numbers in real time. We haven't even talked about things like Chartbeat – live numbers that actually tell you when a story is spiking. So now, with something like Chartbeat, you can tell when you've got a Reddit bomb and suddenly you've got this huge peak of traffic. We had one last week that was this year-old story about a stranded orca. You can see some of these strange anomalies in real time.

ET: When we see those spikes at the *Toronto Star* we dig into it, we investigate why the story might be resurfacing after two or three years of being hidden away. Sometimes it's a bit of a fluke; most times, though, there's something that is on the periphery of becoming news at some point, so we take that opportunity to then drive that story forward in whichever way – creating a new piece of content while also acknowledging what is happening with the old one.

GA: I'd like to ask you to talk more about how analytics affects the way the journalism is done. You were saying, Marissa, that this is nothing new, but differences in quantity become differences in quality, and the radical changes in the time structure, the way you can time information, are quite striking. So how does this inform the journalistic decisions broadly?

MN: If you're going after a particular demographic, then you can get feedback immediately about whether you're actually reaching that demographic. I think we've been really successful, for instance, in engaging our audience more in things like politics, that we feel are an important part of the civic vertical. We want people to engage with political coverage. So a simple setup piece to a debate in the House of Commons would traditionally get very little audience. Well, now we can try to package that in a variety of ways and it can actually hook a lot more audience. So then you realize, oh, Canadians really do care. Politics for CBC is a huge vertical, it drives a ton of audience. And the conception that Canadians don't care about politics, from my perspective, isn't true. But we can find ways of reaching a broader and bigger audience to get people engaged with important political stories in how you package it. For those of us who were in newspapers a decade ago, it was the alternative story format, lists or Q&A's or pro–con lists or charticles or any of those things. Those are all things newspapers have tried. It's just that we get instantaneous feedback so we can figure out that a story that you post on Facebook with a photo is way more likely to be picked up than if you just post a headline. So you can start to find ways to actually hook people in.

GA: In the case of a setup story for a parliamentary debate, how would you set it up to work more effectively?

MN: I would probably do the old tried-and-true list. You know, the five important things we need to know about this bill. Or a Q&A with the minister who is presenting the bill. Those would be the two easiest, but we tend to do either lists or charts or alternative story formats in setup pieces in particular, because setup pieces traditionally don’t engage audience at all. But sometimes setup pieces are particularly important when it’s a complicated topic.

KY: I’ve been in newsrooms long enough to say that I’ve been in newsrooms long enough. You think about veteran editors-in-chief in the newsroom – they sit back in a chair and they’ll make a declaration about “Here are the important things we need to do,” or “Here’s a big story, I know exactly the things we need: feature story, column down the side.” When you think about how they come to those decisions, to be able to sit back in that chair and make that call – what is the correct package to cover a big story that’s A1? They’re taking a body of knowledge that they’ve accumulated through their career. What they’re telling you is, “I learned something through covering conflicts and covering fifteen budgets and five federal elections; that’s how I operate as a journalist who makes journalistic decisions.” I want to be clear with you, that continues to happen. I sit back in the chair and I say, “Here are the smart things we need to do, here are the stories we need to cover.” One of the tools I use day to day is also understanding what analytics tells me about the audience and how stories actually resonate with them. So yes, when I’m thinking about the big fall features that I want to plan for my audience, when I think about how to cover the Ontario election that’s a few weeks away, I’m thinking about A, what are the great things I need to do for the brand, as a great EIC would typically do. But I’m also thinking about, “What did I learn about the past fifteen elections that I covered?” The analytics have shown me everything from when it spikes, what are people looking for, keyword research to understand what people are looking for. Google is a platform just as Facebook, is, and [analytics] gives me more confidence than any EIC who has no idea about their audience, who has no idea what people are consuming. What they’re really relying on is, “I know it all.” And I think that’s a bit of an arrogant approach to our readership, especially an evolving one. You have to find a way to mix real data, and you can make your decision about what you want to do with it. I can look at data, you can look at data, and we can go in two different directions. I could decide I don’t want to cover sports, period, because my audience doesn’t want it and that’s a recommendation I can make, and focus on these [other] types of things. When it comes to the day-to-day conversations, when we’re encountering big breaking stories, when I’m supporting my staff, what I’m doing is looking farther down the field, as opposed to, oh, is that lead okay? My question is, “What are the five, six steps to move it? How I might disseminate the news?” And then, “Can I measure that traffic?” And then, “Can I give more intel to my staff so they can act on it?” … I learned through my career of actually covering the same thing that here are the things you need to do – and by the way, if you’re going to ask me why I made that call, I have the data to show you. And that's permeating everything we do. I don't think there's an analytical side, then we turn it off and become journalists again. I think it actually informs how we act every day.

GA: Some of the points that Erika and Marissa made struck me as very interesting – about how you use information about the audience to make decisions about when you run a particular story or how you run particular story and how you present it. But what Kenny was just saying about sports made me wonder – are you using it to decide what to cover and what not to cover as well?

KY: It helps you. One of the more interesting things we're seeing, in the digital space especially, is other sites that are quasi-news taking space away, and what they're really taking is audience. They may not, in the end, take away audience from you, but you have to understand as a news organization where you're going to win. We all understand scrums, the reason why everyone is sending the same reporter to basically the same interview. And we have to understand, where is the battle? Some organizations say our proposition is that we're going to be everywhere: our mandate is broad. Some organizations, like ours, say we want to reach large audiences and we think we can win with these topics. So for us especially, from a start-up perspective, we can launch news sites targeting audiences that we think we can go after and we know there's a type of strategy we can do. We can have a parenting site that we've launched, and we know specifically the audience demographic. It means we can be really focused. Trying to be everything for everyone is a difficult thing. I've worked in places where – the typical newspaper, you open up it up to all the sections and it gives you that, "Well, I guess we have to do every single one well." But then you go to a place like Huff Post, where we actually have more than seventy or eighty sections. We have a wedding section and a divorce section, together, and why do we decide to do that when a newspaper would package it as lifestyle? We figured out there's a lot of niches we can fill.

MN: You can use analytics in the micro day-to-day, minute-by-minute and second-by-second, and then you can also use the analytics for the 50,000-foot perspective, which tells you a bit about your brand – who people perceive you or your brand to be, and whether you like how they perceive your brand or not, and how you might want to shift it or enhance it. The CBC, for instance – CBC News doesn't cover lifestyle. We don't do recipes and that sort of thing because that's not something people expect from our brand. In digital we did do it for a little while, and it didn't do very well. So you can make story choices based on what you know resonates with your audience or where you want to move your audience, and then you can make more strategic ones about specific verticals where you see opportunity.

GA: Can I ask about individual curation? You're mostly talking about aggregations of people, large numbers of people liking things at a certain time of day or liking a certain kind of article. I'm wondering about things like when I go to Amazon.ca they say, you got these last six books, so you'll probably like this. To what extent are you able or do you want to be able to curate what you present to individual users in that way, and how useful is that?

MN: It will be interesting to see in the next five years how algorithms play into journalism. We're typically not using algorithms. We generally curate our line-ups or our homepages, and it'll be interesting to see if algorithms play into it. Some people may have seen the *New York Times* leak of their digital document that talked about the homepage being dead. Curation focuses on a very traditional audience pattern where people come to your homepage and consume what you've put there. And what search and social is doing is really disrupting that whole consumption pattern, so instead of consuming it in the way that you want, there are now independent little pieces of content that are out there. So there are two sides to that question. I think we will see news organizations play with algorithms and I think that will be interesting to watch. The other side, I think, is – you know, if we're managing a homepage, we can make sure there's broccoli and cheese. If people are landing on the story page [from somewhere else], your ability to control their news platter isn't there. And that then drives design because we want to make sure that that story page is a homepage, that there's a whole bunch of discoverability on that homepage.

GA: Algorithms are the means by which you can do that individual level …

MN: No, algorithms is the Amazon – Amazon figures out what you've bought and then serves up more books like that. I think there will be news organizations that observe your traffic pattern, so if you consume a politics story then on your platter when you come to our homepage, you'll have more politics.

KY: That's already in place. Think about your social network as your algorithm. You have told Facebook that here are the three hundred people that you trust, and a lot of sites can integrate that. So there are fifteen other articles that your friends read on the *Toronto Star*. And maybe because Bob liked it, you like Bob and you understand that there's stuff Bob likes that you like too – and then you're in there. So from that perspective – related content when you're landing on our pages – algorithms are used throughout. On the business side, serving ads to an audience, that is already there. When you talk about, for example, wedding content, it's not always that we're creating a wedding page everyone visits. People are sharing wedding content, the advertising side is packaging it together, and I don't know how [the audience is] going to get to it … A lot of us can't wrap our heads around the fact that our product – we bake it, ship it, and then they have this product they're going to read front to end, just like a newscast, right? You've got to sit down at six o'clock and you're going to watch the whole thing. This is not the way people consume information, believe me, this is not the reality. There is a specific type of audience that still likes it, but if you want to reach Canadians in general, the twenty-seven million-plus who are online, most of them do not. We're really fragmented in terms of audience. So we're adjusting to how we can be part of their lives, not just by curating a homepage that they're just going to visit once a morning.

MN: The curation aspect of traditional landing pages is becoming less and less important.

ET: That's very similar to our experiences. The *Star*'s traffic is more desktop than mobile at the moment, but we're looking strategically ahead to do a major shift. The curation aspect of that desktop page certainly is something we spend time thinking about, but more in terms of what we will do with it eventually, once the shift happens in terms of our audience to mobile, to social, to tablet, and then what does that desktop become? What does it look like? Who does it serve?

GA: What role do you think analytics will have in the evolution of journalism over the next five years, and are there any major new developments that you foresee?

MN: I think it's going to change the attitude of traditional journalists towards their audience. Hopefully that's already happened, but if it hasn't, it will. I was on a panel a while ago with Zach Seward from Quartz – and if you haven't gone to Quartz you should use qz.com, great site – he now has a great blog called Glass about the future of television [http://glass.qz.com/]. For their journalists, what they say is, "Okay, you've published your story, now what are you going to do to go and get the audience?" And that speaks to analytics. You have to understand how to go and get the audience. Publishing it is step one. I think you'll see journalists – instead of just writing, thinking, publishing, gathering, that being their job – hunting down audience. [It] will become a key part of their job, and analytics will drive that.

KY: I have a story to illustrate that point. In my previous life I worked at the *National Post*, where in 2007 we created our own site called thenationalpost.com. And one of the things we did was retrain our newsroom [so that they can understand] what they can do to embrace digital storytelling. Twitter came along, and we spent a lot of time teaching journalists what Twitter was, but it's safe to say that in those early days people like sports reporters did not get it. Fast-forward years and years – I'm seeing some of the people who initially were deeply sceptical about something like Twitter surpassing the number of tweets I have by five times. And when I speak to them, they relay things to me like, "Hey, do you know that story I did at the Olympics? So I tweeted it out and blah, blah, blah …" And then fast-forward: highest traffic ever. And he looked at me, saying, "It was so great to get audience …" The different aspects of it became engagement, him understanding who was his core audience, talking to them, understanding their concerns. He may not make a decision based on that about what stories he's going to cover, but at least he has a deep understanding that his e-mail inbox is now Twitter. Now he knows he can influence the success or failure of a story by being on [Twitter]. What he's doing is analytics. He's looking at the success rate of – if he's going to tweet live during a game, why is he doing that? Shouldn't he be writing his story? But you have the engagement. You're sharing a story, and your readers are saying, "I love this person, they're talking all the time, they have great insight, and at the end of the day I'm going to read their story." And you can measure that. You can go look at any sports reporters – I encourage you to look at them, I think they're doing some of the coolest things on Twitter, specifically, because Twitter is a live-medium type of platform. It's a lot of fun to watch.

MN: I have a great example. *the fifth estate* did a fantastic piece on sugar. And as part of the roll-out, they decided they were going to try to seed it on social, so they tweeted at Jamie Oliver and Jamie Oliver retweeted it and it was absolutely massive. The long tail for the traffic was huge, and it far surpassed all of our expectations. And that's that fundamental shift from being passive – we published, that's it – to actually going out and getting the audience.

ET: We just did a major training at the *Toronto Star* on social media. It was 180-odd people going through Facebook, Twitter, and different social platforms. It also opened up their analytics to them through Facebook Insights and Twitter Analytics. Culturally, we've tried to do this so many times in the past, but being given the data and seeing the immediate response in terms of the engagement through their stories – I've never experienced that in the newsroom. And the enthusiasm and excitement has continued. We talk a lot about reporters, columnists, being their own brand, being their own masters, and being responsible for the story well beyond publication time. This way they were really shown how effective it can be and it was tremendously, tremendously encouraging. It's actually brought that discussion of, "Okay, I've got this really big story I'm publishing in November – oh, wait a minute: what's my social strategy around this? Who am I going to direct it to? And how can I then think about this as I'm leading up to the story and well past the story?"

GA: Are there also changes in the nature of the technology? I'm wondering if the technology is going to change in ways that allow much greater depth for this information. Are you going to be able to learn more about more people in some substantially new ways? Are you going to be able to analyse and use this data in substantially new ways?

KY: The scary thing is that the data actually is out there. Omniture, for example, measures so much. I'll give you one example. I spend on average about an hour, an hour and a half, delving into the metrics every day. And I'm solving business questions, perhaps from my staff, or I'm looking ahead, a year down the road, two years down the road. And the two business questions I ask myself are, A, "What is happening to my lifestyle audience?" That is, women over thirty-five, maybe first-time parents. And B, "What are the patterns I need to understand?" And so I did a day parting analysis: How is traffic on two channels happening literally by the hour, by the day? And I came to some interesting conclusions, which is that mobile is huge. I was sitting in a boardroom at a major newsroom organization in 2009, where the discussion and then the fear was that mobile would surpass desktop. That has been the rallying cry in digital space over the last five years. We all think this device here, the smartphone, is going to overtake desktop. And then with the tablet it's been accelerated. Right now in some channels the mobile audience is actually catching up in a huge way. You have as many people reading stories on their phone as you have on desktop. That makes for me a lot of strategic questions: Are we monetizing, from a business perspective, that mobile audience? Obviously, I have to think about that.

MN: But less monetized than desktop.

KY: Yeah. So, we think about that, but also, what are the forms of content I'm providing that audience? And also when? And the second thing I want to talk about is video. Video is the future; it is monetizable in a big way, people are using it. And when I talk about video, let's talk about audience. Let's talk about the entire space, because I think a lot of the journalism field thinks that when we think about who we're battling, it's newspaper against newspaper, BuzzFeed versus Upworthy versus New York Times versus Huff Post. I am battling against Netflix. I am battling against people who are choosing to lose cable, I'm battling for Apple iTunes, I'm battling for people who are on YouTube. So when I think about audience, I think about where are they doing it? And where are they shifting towards? Because all they're using is time, and they're consuming information. When I look at video, I'm understanding patterns: What happens in the evening? That helps me go back to my video team and say, "We have a huge challenge. We have a really great infrastructure, we have great programming techniques, we know how to get video out there to our audience, but here are some things you did not know about our audience." I'm not going to share much of that because I'm sure it's proprietary, but it came to some interesting conclusions about how we operate in our day-to-day, our editorial. A lot of it made common sense. You know, are you watching video at your work at nine a.m.? Probably not. Are you watching video at other times of the day? Probably a lot. So what does that mean for us in terms of creating video and getting it out to you at the right time?

MN: And the right kind of video.

KY: And the right kind of video. The right type of video – how long is that video? It helps me solve immediate worries – "Can I own more of the video space?" But when I get challenges like, let's take more of that YouTube pie, I have actionable things that I can do as a journalist as opposed to waiting for the business office, who doesn't understand the audience. You know, I understand my audience better than anyone in my organization. So I would love to actually make the strategy to go and get that audience. Rather than be told, "Well, we heard that mobile's great, so do more mobile stuff." Great, that's a great challenge [*laughs*]. Let me go and try to create some strategies to actually go about doing these things.

ET: That's very interesting that you mention the business aspect of it. Being in your position and being in editorial and being involved in the analytics, it informs your decisions around editorial, but then it can also inform the business side in terms of being able to monetize what it is that you're providing, or sell around it. Or have a sponsorship because we're able to provide data on why this is important, who the audience is, what we expect the reach could be, and that it was conceived of at least partly with those aspects in mind. So it makes for much better cohesion between the business side and the editorial side. And in terms of business, I find at the *Star* that they're very much involved in the analytics end, but it's still surprising when we come to the table and say, "Hey, did you know X, Y or Z?" And it's just like the light bulb goes on, and it informs a lot of the decisions that we make. … And we're looking at new platforms every day. We're entering into a new partnership in the next couple of months on a platform that can be a little more well rounded. Whereas we would go to Omniture for archival data, and certain other programs for real time, it has a little bit of both combined, which we feel will serve our editors and reporters in terms of making informed decisions. It also offers A/B testing. Things like that really drive display and presentation.

GA: What is A/B testing?

ET: It's where you can segment your audience. You've got a story – going back to politics, it's not a niche audience, but it takes a lot to get that information to the right people. There are important stories that we care about. They can be the dullest headlines in the entire world, but there's important policy in there, important changes, important journalism. And in order to best present that to our audience, we can test which headlines resonate with the reader in order to drive more traffic, and also drive the audience to an important piece of journalism that deserves to be read. It informs a lot of our decision making. Because sometimes, we don't know it all. We're coming at it from the perspective of, "I've been an editor for ten years, I think I know this is how people want to read this." But this allows us to get some immediate feedback on that.

MN: It's an automatic thing, half the audience gets one headline, half gets the other, and then …

ET: … and it says winner!

GA: Kenny and Erika were just mentioning the use of analytics for business development, and I have two questions that critics of analytics bring up and I wanted to hear how you respond to them. First of all, people talk about problems of analytics in terms of protection of privacy. How do you handle that? And the maintenance of the distinction between news and what you might call promotion – as Robert Piccard was saying, perhaps the fanciful notion that as journalists we should be able not to be involved in the business side, that this somehow pollutes or corrupts what we do. And the notion that sometimes it just amounts to pandering: if your audience says we want Justin Bieber, that's what they get, Justin Bieber. I'd be interested to know how you and your organizations respond to these kinds of concerns?

MN: I get this question all the time. I'm sure we all get this question a lot. Is it challenging traditional journalistic judgment? I heard this at newspapers. They'd bring in a consultant with a whole bunch of research and everybody would say, "Well, it's journalistic." People would argue the journalistic judgment. I would say that "journalistic judgment" is a sample size of one. Analytics can give you a much larger sample size, and research with a larger sample size is going to be better than the biases, the experiences, and everything else that's made up in your brain. I was thinking about this a lot this month when the news came out that there were 1,100 missing and murdered Aboriginal women. How many local newsrooms, how many local news editors, using their journalistic judgment, didn't cover those murders and those stories that were so important? Robert Picard started his talk talking about how there are often these huge crises that we don't notice until they're a huge crisis. So I would challenge the concept of journalistic judgment being this sacrosanct thing that's infallible, because in fact it really is fallible in a pretty fundamental way, and we've seen it here in Canada. I think that analytics are perhaps an affront to the traditional sense that we know best and the audience doesn't, and I would just fundamentally disagree with that. I think the audience does want best. Kenny mentioned this idea of how we are the arbiters of brand. So yes, people want Justin Bieber or Rob Ford stories, but how do we approach those stories? And, you know, porn in the Internet is huge too but we don't cover porn. So I think analytics is helping us understand our audience in a fundamental way that actually makes the journalism better, so that we're not just using these biases and individual experiences to make important judgments around stories.

KY: I concur with all that, even what I said at the outset about the arrogant, smart editor-in-chief …

MN: Patronizing, it's patronizing.

KY: It's really, "I know what's good for you and are you going to take it?" And you know what? That's fine, I guess, for some places but it's not how a lot of us operate. The brands we all work for, all the news organizations, may have hundreds of years of history – or in my case, my news organization is nine years old. The DNA of the Huffington Post is very different from the DNA of the *Toronto Star*. We share a lot of the same values, there are certain topics that we excel at, and so we take that as our proposition to the readership. People know that politics is part of what we cover, so we don't waver from covering that. We also know that we're not going to be the *Report on Business* for business. We cannot build our brand to be vanilla, we need to have that flavour. When people really like us like from a social perspective, they like something about what we do. When you come to our packages, our brands, there's something that you expect, so we are very, very consistent in that. And using the analytics to help evolve. For example, I had to bring the Huffington Post to Canada, and it was a US site, and on Day One all I said was, "Look, this is a different country." I have the DNA, I understand how the journalism is done, but I need to figure out what it is for my audience …

MN: I mentioned earlier the broccoli and cheese factor. Parents for years have put cheese on broccoli to get kids to eat broccoli. News consumers come, they have all sorts of – they consume recipes, they consume Justin Bieber, they consume very serious political news – and I think there's lots of research to show that Canadians consume more international news and political news than a lot of other countries. So sometimes it's a matter of making sure your platter has broccoli and cheese, not just broccoli.

ET: It goes back to what Marissa was speaking about earlier on, that gathering information about our readers is not something new. In particular with the *Star*, we've done reader surveys going back decades. That's how we used to design our content in print, and we still do. Now, in the digital age, we have access to immediate analytics that tell us about our readership and we're using those to serve that audience. It's not quite the same audience, it's actually quite different. There's very little overlap, but in terms of what they want from the *Toronto Star* brand, they want quality journalism, policy pieces, they are very much coming to us for what we do best. Therefore, the idea of watering anything down just doesn't apply.

GA: On the privacy question – I love news, I love news sites, and in a way I'd like them to know what I'm interested in. But I have concerns about disclosure of my personal information to corporations. I know attitudes about that kind of privacy are changing a lot, but can you talk about the privacy issue? What are your practices about that? Is it a problem? Is it not a problem? Or is it the world changing so fast?

MN: It's a concern, and the [federal] Privacy Commissioner is really watching everything we do. The biggest privacy issue is not around things like knowing what browser or operating system you have, because that can't be tied back to you. It tends to be around member centres where people have to log in to comment or do whatever. The technology that drives member centres, making sure that's ironclad and that the servers are protected, is the most important aspect of it. That's also why in our member centre, we require very little about you, and I think you'll see probably as we go forward that people aren't going to sign up for something where you have to give them absolutely all of your information. For us, it's also thinking about which third-party platforms we're going to use. Do we want to use Facebook as our commenting platform? At the moment, the answer is no because we think our audience will react to using it. You can actually use the Facebook platform to drive comments, and I've talked to a lot of publishers who are using that Facebook plugin, and they tend to get a very negative reaction from the audience because of these privacy concerns. So I think it'll drive product choices in terms of what kinds of technology we'll use. And then there's the back-end concern around protecting the servers and that sort of thing.

KY: The biggest elephants, Facebook, Google, Apple, and large-scale publishers – not even publishers, just technology companies – you've already given your information to them. AOL as an organization does not gather as much data as [they do] – It's pretty much, open the Internet and you've already given [personal information] … Navigating in different countries with AOL, every country has different specific needs … And yes, we – because we operate in all these platforms – are drawn into that conversation. For us, our customer is a consumer, so we're always listening to their concerns. So when we do things like change our commenting system that will require Facebook moderation, we get a lot of feedback from readers, but it's helpful because it gets a lot of understanding of where they are. Where are the troubling aspects for them? How can we respond to that? But what it actually means to us as a publisher, whether engagement drops for comments as a result of people not trusting it as much – those are decisions that we have to be aware of as we go forward.

ET: That would be very similar to the way we operate in the sense that we've got a membership sign-in, My Star, which requires very little information. The information that is gathered through that is more by your reader habits, not necessarily about you: I'm thirty-five, I'm a woman, I'm all of those things. But in terms of commenting, definitely, we have gone through three different platforms in the last little while and there are long, drawn-out discussions as to how this will affect the potential commenter: What will be the reaction? Getting into the crowdsourcing area, we try to do a lot of crowdsourcing, especially for really big projects that we're committed to where we want a lot of reader engagement. And we ask a lot of pointed questions in our forums, and certainly, those are run through legal. The reason why we want to try to get more data on the individual is so that we can best understand where that information is coming from. So say, ideas on transportation or education, eventually looking down to [specific] clusters in the city as to where these concerns are coming from. So, we're asking for more of your information, we're invading that privacy slightly. It is your decision, but also we find that journalistically, that is something that would be of use to the public at large in the end.

GA: One term that comes up very often in your discussions is engagement. Is engagement going to be the thing that saves journalism?

KY: Engagement for me is the difference between ignoring the audience and [paying attention to it]. I think traditional journalism – when I exited that field, there was very little of that. The letters to the editor page, where you would publish fifteen smart letters and ignore the rest, was pretty much your community centre. I think the way people expect to interact with each other in news sources has changed. A lot of competitors are understanding that the conversation is back and forth … It means that you're listening more. Doesn't mean you're always talking to everyone who's talking back at you … and you also have opportunities to grab people. The new subscriber of the next era is not a person who's going to want a newspaper that lands at her door. She made a transaction because they like your brand, they like what you're doing, they had an interaction with you once that leaves a lasting impression. I can't tell you how many times we've had an irate reader who would contact one of our reporters and by the end of the conversation – actual conversation – they're converted and they're apologizing for being a troll. So talk to them, and that's on a micro level, but when you expand that to your overall strategy it pays huge dividends.

MN: Five years ago, or maybe it was more, when we talked about engagement we talked about page views per unique visitor. How can we get one more click? Engagement, absolutely, is a focus, but it isn't about, well, can we get this one person to click one more time or stay one more minute? It's really not about that. It's about a relationship with our audience and a relationship with our brand, and I think for us, that relationship will stand us in good stead. So I would say for the big brands, that relationship with your audience, replying to people, saying thank you, always engaging with them, I think that has to be the focus.

GA: For people who teach journalism – what do our graduates need to know to operate in the world you've been describing?

KY: Don't be afraid of numbers, first of all. The audience is the key portion of your job. It matters more than it ever did. All of us enter into this field because we're storytellers, we want to tell stories in more different formats, we want to be behind the scenes, we want to be in front of the camera, we want to write a great long read. At the end of the day you understand the reason you're doing it [is] for a public – you want people to read it, you want people to interact with it, you want to make a difference with that story …

MN: They need to understand the basic skills, but then they also need the critical thought for – okay, so if I see that people are using Facebook when they come home from the bar at night, what is the kind of content and how am I going to present it to actually engage with those people who are coming home from the bar late at night?

ET: Looking back five years, we wouldn't have said, "Oh, you know, you can make a career as a social media editor." Whereas now, you can make careers out of being an audience development editor. We've hired a content optimization manager. These are new and emerging jobs that are built on a journalism foundation, but also on a data analytics foundation, and it's quite difficult to find the appropriate people to fill those positions.

Question (not picked up by the microphone, from the publisher of a website that deals with issues of interest to immigrants and recent residents of Canada): He wants to focus on positive aspects of the immigrant experience but finds that his audience responds more strongly to negative stories about difficulties immigrants face in Canada, such as racism. Should he change the focus of his coverage?

MN: It’s like that broccoli and cheese scenario. We want everybody to eat the broccoli, so what’s the right cheese to get them to eat the broccoli? In your scenario I would focus on the positive stories, because that’s your brand, that’s the core of your service, just as CBC news is not going to do recipes, for instance. So if doing positive stories is core to your brand, and it sounds like it is, I would use the analytics to help you package that so that you get the eyeballs. So when you post it on Facebook – my argument would be that Facebook tends to be a little bit more positive than Twitter, where it’s a little bit more snarky. So maybe you want to try and think about Facebook and then watch your referral rate, using your analytics from Facebook. If you’ve got one story and you’re going to post it three, four, or five times on Facebook in different ways throughout the day, then watch which one actually engages the audience and you can start to learn – a certain post at a certain time of day will get traction on Facebook, and if you post it exactly the same way at six a.m., it gets no traction. I wouldn’t let analytics change what your brand is. It’s a tool to help engage the audience.

KY: How old is the site?

Questioner: Two years.

KY: So you’re using that data to understand, what is your base traffic? And I think you need to understand, do you have any loyal readers, period? I think scale becomes a really big issue for a lot of start-ups because I think they simply don’t have a scale, which means that your homepage, just like my homepage – no one visits homepages any more, so you need to exist in other areas. So, you understand your traffic and understand that, potentially, search and social are your biggest drivers, and figure out what is working within those realms, and then capitalize on those wins. At the very end of the day it may be certain search terms that you’re seeing popping up, that’s where all the negative stuff is coming from. So you make a decision: Do I want to do more content that is using those key words? But I could flip it: make an emotional headline that asks, “Why are we being so X?” The A/B test is not to be dismissed because the stuff that you want to succeed, I think you have to help it succeed and measure it. If you have a piece that you think is just the greatest piece ever, and you put it out there and then you’re just hoping it does well, and you’re not supporting it, either supporting it to get it out to other influencers on social to see if they retweet it, get it on a certain platform, maybe – Pinterest is typically more inspirational. So is there something you could do in there? You have to throw a lot of stuff against the wall. We do it every day, even on a large scale, to see what sticks and realize, from those, things that work and help you shape a strategy going forward …

MN: We launched CBC Aboriginal this past year, and one of the interesting things was that the First Nations community of Canada is huge into social media. So we could use analytics to help us go and be part of that conversation. I would also use analytics to see where your community is, so you can go and play – with values that are still core to your brand, but be part of the conversation where they are.

Question: How much do you share your analytics with individual journalists as opposed to using the data on an organizational level? For example, the *Globe and Mail* had a board where you could see what the top ten stories were at any given moment, and it would drive some of us crazy as we watched our stories go up and down. So when and what aspects of the analytics do you share with your journalists?

KY: I think it depends on the type of organization. I agree, I think some education about why are you putting the numbers up, what reason is there for that other than being a scoreboard? In my organization there's a big culture where we do understand what the numbers mean. We get a lot of information, we look at hourly reports, we look at what search traffic looks like; every channel editor gets a report every day about how they're faring. But they get a lot of support, which is, "What does this mean for you? How does this help you in your day-to-day, other than looking at numbers?" I think a lot of us get a lot of dashboards in the morning and we're reading through dozens and dozens of these panels and we're – I don't know what to look at, I guess yesterday was a big day, I guess that sort of went well. If you don't have follow-up with guidance, well, a newsroom like yours needs to have conversations from the section handlers down to reporters about, "What does this actually mean and why we are doing stuff like that?"

Question: Kenny was saying that video is the future. Can you describe the characteristics of a really fantastic story that worked well on mobile, in terms of video?

KY: I think short, easily shareable – when I say short I mean *short*. What we're really grappling with, with mobile, is that there's a certain cut-off of time that people will no longer engage with it or even launch it. But from a platform perspective it has to be able to play. The responsive sites need to be built to support that. Sorry, I know I'm answering you with a product question, which is that we have to build a better platform for people to see it, but it's true. And the second part is, how do you get it out to audience? Is it through social channels? Is it prevalent throughout your site, so you give users an easy way to launch videos? So those are a lot of things that we have to solve. Analytics help us understand – for example, a video analytic I look at is video views per visitor. And if you see it varies from channel to channel, then I ask questions like, "Are we using the right strategy for this channel to get video in front of people?"

Question: When you say short – thirty seconds?

MN: For sure, under three minutes. After three minutes, 50 per cent of the audience drops off. And I would also say that there’s a spectrum of video content, and we’re trying to figure out what is that right spectrum. So you have the raw, from the scene, live, happening now – for sure, a big appetite for that. We do get consumption of linear storytelling, and that’s *The National*. Every morning people watch *The National* because they missed it the night before. So, between those two goalposts there’s a whole spectrum of video content. The interesting thing about video content is that just as display advertising in digital has been commoditized and it’s a race to the bottom, we’re starting to see that happen with video. So I might argue with my friend here about it being the future because we’re seeing the commoditization of the money that comes from videos, much the same way as we saw with display advertising. But, having said that, the interest and consumption is growing exponentially because the data plans are sucking a little bit less, so the consumption and the desire for video content is certainly growing.

NOTES

[1] Marissa Nelson was appointed senior managing director of CBC's Ontario Region in October 2015.

REFERENCES

Schlesinger, Philip. 2014. “Multiplatform Enterprises and Journalistic Identities.” Paper presented to the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Montreal, August.

Tandoc, Edson C., Jr. 2014. “Journalism Is Twerking? How Web Analytics Is Changing the Process of Gatekeeping.” *New Media and Society* 16, no. 4: 559–75. doi:10.1177/1461444814530541

Vu, Hong Tien. 2013. “The Online Audience as Gatekeeper: The Influence of Reader Metrics on News Editorial Selection.” *Journalism* 15, no. 8: 1094-1110. doi:10.1177/1464884913504259

Working as a Journalist in 2020: What Will It Take?
A Round Table Discussion

Moderator: Gene Allen

Participants:

Derek Chezzi, Editor-in-Chief, Yahoo Canada

Steve Ladurantaye, Twitter Canada

Jonathan Whitten, Executive Director of news content, CBC News

It's no longer news to anyone that journalism is facing a crisis; nor is it news that this presents opportunities for those who are willing to reimagine what journalism is, or might be. Every week brings new evidence of both trends: continuing declines in advertising revenue for newspapers, along with newsroom layoffs; and the emergence of new, mostly Web-based journalistic ventures and methods. Sometimes the two go on simultaneously under the same organizational roof, but often not. Underlying everything is a historic shift in power away from journalists and journalistic institutions and toward audiences.

In these circumstances, it may be worth considering the traditional "theory versus practice" debate about journalism education from a new angle. A frequent criticism of journalism schools has been that they focus too narrowly on producing what Robert Picard, in his challenging keynote address at this conference (reproduced elsewhere in this volume), described as "news factory workers who can be dropped into a slot at a journalism factory." With most established journalism factories shrinking and many facing an uncertain future, this approach is clearly more questionable than ever.

A large part of Picard's critique is frankly intellectual: journalists have insufficient knowledge to explain what truly needs explaining about the world, and their status as defenders of democracy is almost entirely self-ascribed. As well, journalism faculty are not producing enough research that will help us understand and shape their field's evolving landscape. But a second major thread of Picard's critique is that, as the boundaries of traditional journalism become ever more porous, students need to learn a new and different set of what might be called, for lack of a better word, "skills." As digital media challenge "the monopolies on informational functions formerly held by journalists and legacy news providers," many of these functions “have been seized by other information providers.” These new forms of communication “are every bit as important to speaking truth and holding power to account as journalism.” In these changed circumstances, Picard argues,

> we need to be teaching about how to write and produce content for multiple digital platforms for which audiences have different requirements. We need to teach how to understand audiences and use the avalanche of user data that is overwhelming news organizations. We need to help them prepare their work and lives for new types of journalistic employment. We need to teach them to be digital developers and how to be problem solvers.

The idea behind this round table discussion is that journalism educators should understand these new forms of communication, how they work, and what they require, in order to prepare their students for a world in which they will occupy a growing share of the wider journalistic (or perhaps post-journalistic) ecosystem. This is not to say that journalism education should concern itself solely with the prospect of employment (on this point, see Mike Gasher’s paper in this volume); but no one would argue that a professional university program like journalism (or medicine, law, engineering, nursing, social work, etc.) should have no concern for the eventual employment of its graduates. At the end of the session, an audience member asked whether we were not perhaps just replacing the old factory with a new one. To this, one panelist replied that the kind of entrepreneurial education he was recommending would give young graduates more autonomy than they had in the past. Seeing how this question, among many others, is resolved over the next five years will be one of many intriguing aspects of the changing journalistic landscape.

Gene Allen: When we were organizing this conference, the members of the organizing committee wanted to hear from people in the industry about what they were looking for from graduates of journalism programs. And the immediate question this raised for some of us was, well, what *is* the industry these days? Because it is changing so much, there are so many new forms, the established organizations are going through such a transformation. So we’re fortunate to have three people here representing the different modes and different forms that the journalism business is taking now, and is perhaps taking in the future: Derek Chezzi, editor-in-chief of Yahoo Canada; Steve Ladurantaye of Twitter Canada; and Jonathan Whitten, executive director of news content for CBC News. We owe a special thanks to Steve Ladurantaye – having just won a National Newspaper Award in Charlottetown last night, he took the midnight plane to get back here today. So we have one transforming legacy news organization, we might say, and two more in the new media, digital-native camp.

I'm going to start with an easy question to get things going: What do you think the journalistic landscape will look like in the year 2020?

Derek Chezzi: Let's just think about four years ago, when students might have been entering the stream, who might be matriculating this year – what has changed? The landscape has changed so dramatically in those four years. Now online video is a focus. We didn't really have tablets at that time. I'm trying to remember when I bought my first iPad – I think that might have been 2010?

Steve Ladurantaye: 2010.

DC: Social media was something that was there, was starting to be reported on, but now it's so integral to our operations …

SL: If one thing is clear, it's that news will be more mobile … The *Globe and Mail* is the example I have off the top of my head. The *Globe and Mail*'s Rob Ford story, where they paid all the money for the photos from the video – the traffic for that story was 68 per cent mobile … It wasn't going to their website, it wasn't going to print. Is print going to get any better? No. Are websites going to be more popular? No, they're probably not going to be. And what does that mean? It means it's going to be mobile. It may be phones, it may be tablets – I think it's probably phone.

But this is where I'm going to sound like a broken record throughout this whole panel. I'm going to keep saying the same thing: I don't think any of that matters when we're talking about journalism, because we're still delivering stories and we're still delivering content. The platform, and where the money is going to be, and how it all shakes out – we have no control over that, largely. You know, some newspapers are going to go up in flames, some TV stations are going to vanish and go online only. But [for] journalists, the storytelling skills are what really matter. I wasn't hired at Twitter because I'm good at social media, I was hired at Twitter because I'm a good reporter. They want to know, as a content delivery company – they're not a content company – what do people who write content need to get their stories out to the people who want to see them? How can we build roads that will get people to stories, where they're going to be in 2020? And that has nothing to do with being good at any one platform, or any one trendy thing that's happening right now. I was [on] a panel earlier, and they were talking about how much time should we spend teaching students to code? That's the exact same conversation we were having in my classes – I went to college – about desktop publishing, fifteen years ago. There were people in my classes who failed because they couldn't define encapsulated postscript – I'll never forget it, EPS files. The people who would be very good storytellers didn't need that technology, necessarily. So I'm going to keep saying over and over: it's more important to teach people to write well, to be clear in their thoughts, to know what a good story is, to be able to pitch that good story, and to get off their arse and get out of a newsroom and go talk to people, which I think is the number one thing we should be teaching because it just doesn't happen any more … What the business models are going to be a couple of years from now, I don't know, but I think the core of what we do hasn't changed an awful lot from when I went to school, and when people are going to school now. And it's really easy to lose sight of that as shiny things come along and show promise …

Jonathan Whitten: I think there's probably a thousand things we could talk about when we're looking forward to 2020. I'm going to pick five. And some of it is obviously guesswork – who knows what we'll be dealing with then? – but looking at trends and looking at what's happening so far, I'll talk just briefly about five things.

One of them is wanting to build a little bit on Robert Picard this morning, [when he was] talking about entrepreneurship. It's not exactly in the way that he talked about it, which was becoming a start-up. It's more that I think in 2020 – we're seeing it now, it'll be really clear then – reporters are going to have to be entrepreneurial, even if they're working for a large media organization like ours. They're going to have to find their audience themselves, and they're going to have to be pretty good at doing most of the work of finding their audience. So today, if you're a radio reporter, and you've got an item, and you're in a radio newscast that's at a strong part of the morning, on a strong network, buttressed by a good morning show, you're going to find your audience. I think in 2020, the entrepreneurship will come from not having that luxury any more, and really having to do the hard work of finding people who are going to consume your content. That, in a sense, is not just looking at contacts as people to give you information, but using that contact base to actually accelerate the process of delivering what you're doing. And part of that entrepreneurship will mean being much closer to the business than I think reporters are now. That's not finding advertisers, it's finding new formats, it's finding new ways to reach audiences. So I think *entrepreneur* is actually an important word to use, and I didn't want it to get lost. People need to leave journalism school and have that ethos and do a start-up. Even working for a big company, you're going to need to do that.

Working for a large, unionized organization, what we'll see for sure by 2020 is the maybe a hundred job categories that we have right now coming down to something like ten. More and more jobs are merging. There aren't the disconnects between a writer and an editor, a producer and a reporter. We're seeing it already, and I think that by 2020 you're going to see that happen at an accelerated pace. The technology is allowing that to happen, and I'm not just talking about forcing people to do more work. I think actually it's a good thing in a lot of ways. It's not just a question of now sending one person to

Ukraine where a large organization used to send five. It's just that if you send five people to Ukraine, one of them is not the camera, one of them is not the reporter, one's not the producer; you're breaking it up in different ways. You're breaking it up by a.m. and p.m., by breaking news and context, so it's a whole different way of looking at how you deploy. And I think in that universe, it's more about being a journalist than about whether it's camera, reporter, producer.

I think we'll also see – I'd like to see students coming out of journalism school and helping with this, because I know when I was in school we were learning formats that existed in conventional forms of television and radio. People have to come to us with new formats. Having seen, for twenty years, people predicting the death of the 6:30 network newscast in the United States, or the prime time newscast in Canada – I don't necessarily want to do that because that's a bit of a mug's game – but I think by 2020 the conventional two-minute news item will have largely merged or will live in a much smaller space than it does now. So really what we'll see by then is an explosion of formats, an explosion of figuring out new ways to tell stories … templates that can be used over and over again … that can deliver text, audio, video, photos, separately, together, whatever it's going to take, and that's going to have to shift constantly to meet whatever the next iPad is, or whatever the next piece of technology is.

This is an obvious one, but I do think that it will be truly digitally driven. A lot of us who are now in broadcast, at least, or new media (and perhaps less in print) would say that we are digitally driven … I think we'll move very quickly from trying to figure out how our broadcast content will work on digital, to trying to figure out how our digital content is working in broadcast. So you'll see a total flip in how we approach content. And I do think this will lead – and this is maybe more provocative – to a landscape where it really will be all about content. Again, talking about a large, multiplatform organization – radio, television, online, local, network – I think you'll see the part of the organization that's dedicated to assignment, or to bringing content to different parts of the organization, or lining up a program, or creating a program, that portion of the operation will shrink, and the portions actually newsgathering will expand. You'll see verticals that will be divided, perhaps in the same way they are now around locations, or around areas of expertise or around specific kinds of content – City Hall, if you want to think about it in an old-fashioned sense. Those content-creating areas will be expected to deliver at certain times of day, certain kinds of content, some depth, some context, always breaking news, and deliver it in a way that it's understood where it will go and where it will be received. So essentially, your newsgathering operation grows and if it works out and if you can make it all come together, the part of the operation that actually delivers the content shrinks. For newspapers, that's really about the thing you'd be reading. People are just creating content all day at some papers, and the number of folks who put the paper out is actually shrinking and shrinking. I think you'll see that trend move into television and radio. So that's five areas that I would capture, among many.

SL: You've seen that in newspapers, for sure. When you're looking to 2020, you want to be the person producing the content, or you want to be the person bossing those people around, and you don't want to be anything in the middle. If you're working at the *Toronto Star* or the *Globe and Mail* as a copy editor, your company is outsourcing your job to itself through another division for half the money. And that's going to keep happening in everything. Circulation has been merged. I have one guy who delivers four newspapers to my house every morning. It's not four different guys delivering four different papers, it's one guy. That's going to happen across all media. Content producers are going to be the bosses, and that flattens out so the people who are producing the content have to be able to produce *all* the content, because there aren't going to be those big support networks in between.

JW: The way we think about it sometimes is – if we've got a couple of people in Afghanistan doing a series of stories, you'll often find at any big media organization that the various sections or platforms or whatever it is meet in a room. You've got seven or eight people sitting around talking about the work of the two people in Afghanistan and where that work is going to go and what it's going to look like. What we're talking about here is a shift, where you've got two people in a room somewhere, trying to figure out where all of this stuff goes, and eight people in Afghanistan. Now that's aspirational, and we'll see if that actually comes to pass, but that's the theory, at least in my mind, of where we're heading.

DC: I find it interesting that you characterize it as the merging of jobs and the merging of different classifications. Because where I work, we're a digital organization; we don't have this legacy business where you have all these different touch points coming together. The challenge we find in hiring people is that the people coming out of the schools don't have the combination of skills that we're looking for. So it's interesting that you mention storytelling skills, but for us that's only one part of it. There are curation-type skills that we're looking for in the editors who come through the door. They need to be able to understand analytics. Even if they're not super-familiar with math, as long as they're comfortable with numbers and comfortable looking at spreadsheets and building PowerPoint presentations and looking at dashboards … [with] being able to synthesize that information, extract insights. How does that inform the choices that they're making going forward? They don't all necessarily need to have coding skills, as you mentioned, but they need to be familiar enough with taking a project from the beginning to completion to be able to – sort of like in project management, not as project manager, but that kind of a context – to be able to communicate with developers, explain to them what the needs of the writers and the editors are so that the CMS [content management system] works. Being able to communicate to the developers, who might not have the sort of consumer-facing experience, or the same sort of touch, in terms of how the readers are interacting with the content. To be able to communicate to them what sorts of changes are needed to the front end to be able to increase the performance – sorry, I use all these types of words, that's how we talk internally – being able to, as you say, work on a mobile platform. So there are a number of skills … and you know, these are skills that are portable between industries as well. Students can take and use them in the journalism media context, but then [maybe] they want to move outside of that and get into a job with a technology company, for instance, where increasingly that's where we're seeing a number of jobs open up.

GA: Derek was essentially answering my next question, which is, what are the intellectual capacities, skill levels, and attitudes that journalists will need in order to thrive in the new environment, and how will these requirements differ from what they've been in the past?

SL: Well, I think the two things that you need to know – and I don't always agree that you need to be taught a lot of this stuff while you're in school – are the ability to be flexible and the ability to pick up new things. The technology will change from year to year, content management systems will be different, you're going to be doing things five years from now that you weren't doing five years ago and all the rest. Just the idea that you need to be nimble and teach yourself these skills as you go. Nobody taught me how to code, but it was very clear five years ago at the *Globe and Mail* that if I wanted to build a spreadsheet and make sense of it, that's what I would have to do, so I went and did it … I think it's really important that people do understand that. There's a lot of self-directed learning that has to happen if you're going to stay current. The fundamentals don't change. What *will* change over time is the way you deliver it, and if you don't understand analytics as a reporter in 2014, or whatever year we are, then you're going to be in some kind of trouble. Even if you're not going to let it dictate your coverage, you need to understand how all of that works. Whether you need to learn it in school or not, I'm not convinced, but that's something you need to understand. As journalists we haven't really thought that way historically, we haven't really thought about what the broader business is all about. We haven't thought about the implications of the way we write stories and the way we deliver stories. Changing that mindset and talking about advertising levels, or the best way to deliver content – it doesn't have to be a dirty conversation.

JW: If we are talking 2020, I have to think that social media, photography, video shooting and editing, all these kinds of things – people will come equipped with that because they're life skills now. Certainly for my fourteen-year-old they are, and they'll increasingly become that way. When I went to journalism school, I wasn't taught how to use the telephone. I think we'll see the same thing in 2020. You're not going to have to teach people how to do those basic things. I'm not up on what's being taught now, in terms of things like video editing in a place like Ryerson, but the latest iteration of desktop editing that we're rolling out right now is very similar to what you would edit on with a $90 program for your home computer. It's quite intuitive, fairly simple to use, so if you don't show up at journalism school already having those skills, then we'd wonder why you were there. So I agree that those specific skills don't really, shouldn't have to be taught. I think they're life skills, now more than ever, and certainly will be in four or five years.

To add a bit in terms of what I think the attitudes are going to have to be – more than ever now, people are going to have know how to find stories. It's amazing still to see people who don't have that as a skill, and I think increasingly, as distinctiveness and an ability to get yourself an audience, and an ability to rise above the rest, to move beyond basic news, as that becomes more of an imperative to helping your company become successful, then finding stories is really [going to be] key to thriving. And I think having a passion for stories too is … something that's important now, often not as prevalent as you might think, but that needs to be there for the future.

SL: Historically, you could … kind of half-ass a story in the past and it would go in a newspaper or on air, and you had no idea if anybody was reading it or not. You can't really play that game any more. Increasingly, you know exactly who your audience is. When I was at the *Globe* the last couple of years, I wrote about media, which is a fairly marginal beat in the grand scheme of things. There are maybe 4,000 people in the entire country who care about it regularly, but I was able to deliver those 4,000 people because I went out and found those people. They found me on social media, I was targeting my coverage at them, I was listening to what they were talking about. I couldn't have done that years ago. You didn't get that instant feedback, where I could say to the *Globe*, "We have to keep doing this beat because I can see the traffic on this story, because we pushed it there." So reporters who understand how to push their own coverage, or their own audience, and more importantly understand that their audiences are going to have audiences increasingly as well, and that you need to take advantage of that … You need to distribute your own content, and in order to do that, you have to actually be producing good content. Before now, as I said, you could have half-assed it a lot more than you can now. Everything's measured -- that's fundamental change.

DC: When I started at Yahoo, the notion of the editor as the gatekeeper was just starting to fray apart, and the idea of editors as facilitators for conversations was part of the conversation in the industry at that time – just closing that feedback loop. And now it's gone beyond just the editor – the individual contributor is the one who's actually fostering that. So you're putting your piece out there, marketing it essentially, listening to, looking at the conversation, taking that feedback from the conversation, using that to inform how you follow up your piece, or what is the next topic that you're following up on. That's just at the reporter level. Then you stand back, and editors are using that [information] every single day to optimize the overall traffic to their websites. You mentioned self-taught – whenever I speak to students, the one thing that I mention to them is that the skills that we're looking for … all the tools to teach themselves these skills, exist today for them, for free. They can go and create a blog on WordPress or whatnot, and plug in Google Analytics and just look at the traffic on their own blog, test ideas out, see how readers react to the different pieces of content they're developing, understand how search works … distribute their material on social networks, see how that is and just test it out. There's nothing stopping any of these people, the students who are coming in, from just playing around. It could be that the institution, the format for education in journalism, is going to be fostering that behaviour, but also providing them the opportunities, the laboratories where they can go in and learn from people, and from one another. So maybe it's that everyone has to put out some sort of website, or a Tumblr blog, or what have you, and test and test, and learn from one another, and see what worked and see what didn't, because those are ultimately a lot of the skills that they're going to learn.

JW: If you think of an app like Videolicious, or something similar – I'm sure they'll have more of a role to play in newsgathering in the years ahead. The kind of content you can create with that app in an hour, it's amazing to think what it would have taken just ten or fifteen years ago to create similar content, in terms of mixing stills and video and audio, and adding music. And now it can be done intuitively in an hour with a free app. So that's disruptive.

SL: I think one of the important things for trained reporters is that they can use those same apps but they do it a lot better. So, sure, the six o'clock newscast may not be what it once was in 2020, but one of the things I'm currently obsessing about is what happens when you take that six o'clock newscast and you explode it essentially? You've got all these pieces, and it doesn't have to wait until six o'clock. You could do that two-minute segment at ten in the morning, if that's when the news happened, and distribute it and reach your audience. And then, there's no reason you can't package that all back up at the end of the day and put it there for everybody who didn't see it. Having the technology that lets you do that is actually very liberating and very exciting, because you're doing quality work. It's no less – well, it's always going to be more work. The one thing I always hear when we're talking about new things that you can do is, "Oh my god, there's going to be more work." We need to get over that idea, because everything we ever do for the rest of our lives is going to be more work than what we did yesterday … But with the tools we have there's a lot we can do and that's pretty exciting.

DC: It's also different work. That's the other thing: people see it as more work, but some of the work that they were doing, they no longer have to do, so it should be shifting. Whether that's at a traditional organization or even at Yahoo, it's the same thing: we're changing, we go through eighteen-month cycles where it's just change, change, change. People who started at the organization eight years ago still need to learn how to adapt, and there are the same grumblings you would find at a traditional media organization: "Oh, it's more work, we have to do this …" And the answer is, well, yes, but we're going to free up some time by no longer worrying about these other things, and that's just how we're going to shift. We need to be flexible and we need to be able to adapt.

GA: Let me pick up on that point, the idea that you cease doing something in order to do other things. The people who are involved in journalism education spend endless amounts of time trying to figure out what we should be doing with the curriculum, and it's essentially a zero sum game. If you do a bunch of new things, there are things you're already doing that you have to cease doing. I was very encouraged when I first spoke to Steve about this panel, and he said that the basics of journalism – the ability to report, identify a story, tell a powerful story – are still highly relevant. But what do you think are the basics of journalism? Jon, you were raising questions about the two-minute TV news report, which some people who teach the course, like me, might think is a basic format for TV journalism. What do you think really are the basics that we absolutely should make sure that our beginning students know about?

JW: The folks I mostly deal with are mature staff so I don't do necessarily a lot of hiring. So I did ask around and the answer is unanimous. You can teach it, I think, although I think from my own experience that if you have it, you have it, and you can get better. And if you don't, you may not be getting it. But it's writing. It's the answer that I got from everybody. It seems obvious, but certainly, no matter what you think of in terms of future formats or future ways of gathering, wherever you are on the spectrum, you need to be able to write. Even if you're going to be doing more visual storytelling, there is metadata, there are things you have to input, there are captions, there are all kinds of things. So writing is a basic skill. It's a tough one to teach, though, but for sure that is the answer that comes back, and that makes sense to me.

SL: The things that you can't teach, and you hope that they have when they come here, are just the curiosity and empathy that people who are interested in journalism bring to it. And then it does come to the writing. I don't necessarily mean 9,000-word boring pieces about whatever, just the ability to organize thoughts and streamline them in a way that you're going to be able to (a) identify a good story, (b) pitch the good story to your editors in a way that they're going to let you do it, and (c) actually deliver a compelling piece of journalism in whatever medium you're going to do it in. But you need to be able to identify those stories and be able to deliver them, and that's a skill that needs to be taught in school because it's a way of thinking, it's a way of understanding the way people consume news … At the most basic level, I would agree that writing is the key because that allows you to get into everything else.

DC: I'm not sure it's just writing. As we're becoming increasingly digital, there is probably a suite of five or so basic skills that we need that go beyond writing. I agree that it's the foundation. But if we think increasingly that everyone's a content creator – whether that's just our utopian vision (or not) that everyone is kind of equal at that level, that everyone is able to create – then what sets people apart? What is it that will make student journalists marketable, let's say? And more than journalists, people working in media? That's where I think of analytics. Being able to listen to audiences and understand what audiences are asking for – I think that it's going to be demanded of everyone who's working in the business, so I would say that that's a critical skill to have. And then communication, written but also oral. You'd be surprised at how many people can't really communicate orally. To be able to take ideas and synthesize them and speak to their own team members, but also externally, in between teams …

GA: Thinking of the journalism curriculum, if you had to identify one thing that journalism graduates will need that they are not now getting, or are not getting enough of, or not getting in the right way – is there one thing that you really wish journalism graduates did better, or had more of, or knew more about?

JW: I'll agree with Derek and try to push a little farther: it is really understanding the business. Not the larger business, not advertising or necessarily even revenue, but just understanding the business that we're in now. This search engine optimization, all these skills that are now held by a few people in a large organization, will, before long, have to be held by everybody and understood by everybody. So, understanding the business, understanding not just what works but why it works, how it will work better, the kinds of stories that will get an audience, all that to me would be really critical. It isn't now, and as long as there are enough new people coming in to a larger organization like ours who have that, then we can push forward. But we're not going to hire anybody in four or five years who doesn't have that understanding of how things work.

DC: A little anecdote: I was talking to someone recently, a young journalist who's trying to map out his career, and he really wants to write long-form journalism. That's what he wants to do, and he's determined to do it, which is great. But he keeps insisting that's what readers want, and I'm encouraging him in the different ways that he can be successful in doing that. But at the end of the day, in terms of understanding the business, I can probably tell you what percentage of the readers want long-form. It's not to say that people just want light and trite necessarily. People do want good content, but different platforms have different consumer experiences; people interact with them in different ways. There's room for long-form. You could probably make part of your career doing that, but the business has moved far enough and someone at his age should be ready to understand all the tools and the different inputs where he can actually determine whether or not that's what people want. And from that he could use that information to help map out his career.

SL: A realistic world view of what they're walking into is also helpful … I don't know if anybody's mentioned I won an NNA last night, but that was a 9,000-word story that got a ton of traffic and it was largely read on mobile. It got 82 per cent mobile readership; that went against everything we thought we knew about long-form journalism. But the week before I wrote that story, I got my biggest traffic hit story of all time when I wrote about Paulina Gretzky's boobs. It was a three-hundred-word story that was flashed on the front page and got hundreds of thousands of page views. I'm okay with both. And I think you need to understand, when you talk about all the traffic and the measurement and the engagement, there's no one way to do this and you need to be able to adapt and do all sorts of stories. So that you get to do the stories that you want to do eventually.

JW: It is a mix. For everybody who wants to celebrate – and we do celebrate investigative pieces and enterprise pieces rocketing to the most-viewed section on our own website – there are things like phallic topiary in Windsor which will also rocket up there to first place very quickly, or a four-year-old story about a guy who cut down a power pole just so someone could come and find him in the middle of a forest. It's a mix of stuff, and it kind of all has to be there or else *we*'re not going to be there.

DC: I would just mention, though, that for all the different sorts of stories that you mentioned, people's interest hasn't really changed. There's "I want the gossipy, I want the rubbernecking pieces", and then there's a segment of the audience interested in the deeper investigative pieces. Now that said, there's a skill set that we also look for, that I think every media organization looks for, which is, how do we take those stories, and how do we package them in ways that are for different platforms? But also in different ways so that readers can enter into the story from different doors, let's say. Can we take this story and pull out a shorter piece that some readers might be interested in? I'm thinking about this because I just recently read about the *New York Times*'s package mapper software that they developed … It's interesting, basically it's a piece of software, internally developed software, that's allowing them in real time to see user flow on the website, so that they can optimize the traffic on the *New York Times* website. And when we talk about what sorts of skills we're looking for in the newsroom and the merging of jobs –

it’s a very interesting time for media in general, for people who want to get into it and don’t want to do traditional reporting necessarily, but who are interested in the business, who can come in and perhaps they can start off through the journalism stream so that they can get that foundation that is required to be successful in their careers. But they also might want to do audience analytics specifically, enjoy being able to develop innovations that will then help their organization be successful. There’s lots and lots of jobs I see emerging, and it’s the digital disruption that’s propelling this. Some of them are within the organizations, new roles within the organizations. Some are organizations like ours, but also like Twitter and Scribblelive and CoveritLive, where they need journalists to be able to make their platform successful because it’s not successful if no one is using it. So it’s a tool there to be used, and they’re looking for storytellers and people who can speak to news organizations, to clients essentially, and help them to use these tools to help the media organizations themselves.

SL: Heather Mallick from the *Toronto Star* is following along on Twitter and she answered the question about what journalism skills students must be taught, and she emphatically said *reading*. Students do not read.

DC: When I meet journalism students, I’m fascinated by those who say they want to get into print and then you ask them what they read and they say they don’t read. They’re not reading newspapers and they’re not reading magazines but they want to get into newspapers and magazines. And then I ask them, why? If you don’t consume those forms, why would you want to get into it? Then they’re writing the stories for the *Ryersonian* [the multimedia news website of the Ryerson University School of Journalism] and I just say if you’re not reading that, who’s reading that? … Invariably they’re getting their news and information from social networks and apps and whatnot. And I say, then think about your career. You might want to steer it towards where your consumption behaviour is because chances are that’s where your peers are and your peers’ peers, and that’s inherently where the industry is moving.

GA: I wanted to ask you about career patterns. Jon was saying early on that entrepreneurialism will be an important asset inside larger organizations like CBC, but I think everybody agrees that the kinds of career patterns for young journalists entering the business now are going to be very different than the ones most of us have been familiar with. I wanted to ask how you see the career patterns of journalists changing and what particular attributes they should have. We talked about knowledge of the business and flexibility and so on, but are there any other particular attributes – ability to do a start-up, for example? Or those kinds of harder business skills?

SL: Having recently left the *Globe*, one of the first questions I always get is, "Why would you leave the Globe?" As if this was the most prosperous time in newspaper history and it's the most non-understandable decision ever. And then they'll say things like, "Well, you could stay at the *Globe* a long time. My dad was at the *Ottawa Citizen* for forty-three years. Isn't that what you want?" And all I can think is I hope to God I'm not working at Twitter three years from now. The world is changing so quickly now that I don't want to commit to something for the next five, ten, fifteen, twenty years. I want to go where it's interesting and I think that's an attitude that journalists have to have now. When I left the *Globe* there was a memo sent out that I had left journalism. That was the way they phrased it, and it was kind of hissy. But I don't think that's true any more, the way it used to be. You need to be able to step out to understand what's happening, step back in once you understand, and I think that's the way it's going to go. You build the skills and you pick up the stuff you need to know on your own, the self-learning and all the rest of it. You know you're probably going to be changing organizations a lot … I've never felt that you have to do one thing and I think that's only accelerating now and the definition of journalism changes as well.

DC: Back to the entrepreneurial piece – one of the ingredients to success for entrepreneurs is being able to identify a problem and then finding a solution to that problem. So for some, it's getting into an existing organization, be it large or medium or small, and a lot of the medium and small ones are the ones that are struggling and have some of the biggest problems to wrestle with. And spending some time in there and understanding how that works, and then getting out, perhaps, and then trying to find a solution that can help many.

SL: I worked at the *Peterborough Examiner*, and the pattern was you would go there for a year and then go back to Toronto and work at a Toronto paper … But the people that stayed after I left are still there and they're not leaving for Toronto and they're not leaving for anywhere else. They're leaving for the Chamber of Commerce and things like that. So that path doesn't exist any more. So to that point about being entrepreneurial and making your own way, if you want to stay in journalism that's going to be increasingly important, I think.

GA: I'd like to turn it over to the audience.

Question: Most of our students are women, and I was reading something recently that suggested the technical nature of many new online-related jobs means women are being shut out of these positions. Are you seeing that? And what's the male–female ratio among those two thousand engineers and eleven journalists?

SL: On the journalism side it's probably about fifty–fifty. My boss is a woman. On the engineering side, it's no secret that Silicon Valley companies are very bad at being representative of the broader community. Google just released their stats, I think they were something like 60 per cent white, 30 per cent Asian, 80 per cent male. On the programming side, historically, that's been the way it's been. We're taking steps to correct that at Twitter. And Google is also consciously trying to hire more inclusively. But historically it hasn't been the case that a lot of women have gone into those programs. I think that's changing; there are coding academies all around Toronto that are geared specifically to teaching women how to code.

Question: We've ended up talking a lot about delivery and not very much about how news will be gathered. I noticed that when you were describing your ideals, quite a bit of time went by before Jonathan talked about gathering the news and getting information. I wanted to open that door and talk more about, how would you be doing your job? How will you be gathering the news?

JW: I'll be optimistic. As technology gets better – it's lighter, it's easier – people will be less encumbered with it and the storytelling won't suffer. I think there'll be more time to tell stories. One of the things that may be difficult for me as a person who started as a local reporter, with the cameraman and an editor who were separate people, and an assignment editor in a very traditional newsroom, is to tell people now, here, we're going this [different] way. At the same time, I try to remind people that even in the mid-1980s model it wasn't as if we were spending all day just waiting until five o'clock. You were constantly checking back with the desk, you were taking notes, you were calling your assignment editor explaining what the story is. All of that kind of work can be translated into digital, just in a different fashion. So the notes that you're taking, you might be transcribing an interview instead of holding on to that until you get an edit suite at five o'clock now. That should get pushed out all day long, and we're starting to do some of that, so that as information becomes available, it's out there … Those discussions with the assignment desk, those things now can happen on air. Even at the beginning of the day, when you're deciding, "What do I want to find out today? What am I going to chase down? What am I going to try to learn about?" That has a value too, and maybe that's something we do in a digital sense to let people know what we're chasing. So the arc might remain the same, it's just that the destination is different. We're not aiming toward six or nine o'clock at night. As we get information, as we dig things up, [we're] delivering it immediately in different forms. And those formats will change … So the form, at the end of the day, will change, but the basic gathering, I hope at least, will remain just as important. And in some ways unencumbered with some of the conventions that exist, it might actually be better.

Question: We talked about all the work we no longer have to do. Everyone's obsessed about how hard it is to learn new things, without considering how much time we'll save, even on the most basic activities.

SL: Finding information has never been easier, and by 2020 it's going to be even easier. The baseline – find the person, where do they live? How do I get hold of them? All that is going to be easier than ever, that's a given … But going to the house and knowing how to interview, and how to talk to people, is more important than ever because everybody is just pulling in data all the time. We're obsessed with data right now.

DC: Think about how we bring the reader and the audience into the newsgathering and the distribution, into the process. Writing is hard. That's why you don't have a lot of audience participation in that. What are they sharing? Videos and photos. Why? Point, shoot. Record, shoot, share. The end. And that's why Instagram, why photo sharing online is as big as it is, because it's easy. And so when CNN or any of the other broadcasters share content from the readers, what is it? Photos, videos … So increasingly, it will be easier to do that and you'll see more audience participation in that regard, but the writing will probably be relegated to the staffers and then the contributors, the people who know how to do it, and probably some experts. Editors and writers will be going out there and finding those bits of information and taking them on. One of the best pieces, or the pieces that I enjoyed most, on the Malaysian Airlines story, for instance, was published in *Wired*. It was from a Canadian pilot who had written on Google+ his own theory on what happened to the airline, which to me was one of the most fascinating stories I had read at that point. And it's going out there and finding those pieces of information. But not everybody can write. So you'll still have some experts, some people who can do that, but there'll be a lot more of that kind of sharing with the reader. I have these sort of romantic visions or fantasies about the idea of an open portal to the newsroom, where anyone can talk to the editorial team at any time – readers – and you have this kind of conversation happening all day long. You can just check into what they're doing and there's basically a live Webcam happening in the newsroom. And you can see how boring really the newsroom is.

Question: For Steve – are the results of measurement always right? And if not, when are they wrong?

And for the broader panel, how would you respond to the suggestion that you've done a wonderful job of describing the news factory of 2020, considering Mr. Picard's assertion this morning about the role of journalism education being more than providing workers for the news factory.

DC: What do you mean by when is it not right?

Question: You've done a wonderful job of explaining the extent to which analytics are underlying everything. So is the ability to measure, and the results of that measurement, always the right answer for journalism?

DC: No.

Question: So when is it the wrong answer?

SL: There were many, many times when we went against what we thought the analytics would show us or where the analytics were trending, and we didn't use them as a reason not do the story, but to either change the delivery or change the packaging. So if a story is tanking and the analytics are saying nobody ever wants to read that, and you can rewrite the top and do it as a video instead, and you see it rise up then – we still got the same story out, but it just wasn't reaching people the same way.

Question: Is it going to be more and more difficult to fight the argument that analytics are everything?

SL: Analytics *are* everything though, right? But it doesn't mean you have to listen to them. If you think something is important, nothing precludes you from doing that. That's the basic function of the newsroom, is to say every once in a while, okay, well, we know the analytics aren't going to love this story, but we think it's important so we're going to do it anyway. And we'll also do five Justin Bieber stories so we can bump up the rest of the site in the meantime.

DC: It depends on what you're measuring, at the end of the day. You use the number to develop insights into whatever it is, the audience behaviour or the audience trends, and you use that to inform. The numbers should not dictate what you do, they should inform. Sometimes you use the numbers and you follow through with them and you say, if we do X it will deliver Y result. But sometimes you say, "We know it's not going to be popular but we're going to do it anyway." Popularity isn't always the be-all and end-all of what we're trying to achieve …

For a while, everyone was chasing hits … And why was it hits? Because that's how we were measuring the traffic on a page, because the advertising industry had determined that hits and then page views were the most important metrics. I was at the ONA's [Online News Association] conference … six years ago? At the time when it was just, "Oh, metrics, what is this?" And everyone was freaking out because they didn't understand what metrics were and why they were important. Fast-forward four years and everyone is familiar with metrics, so everyone in the room knew about them, it was part of their day-to-day. But what was really encouraging was because so many journalists now had their hands dirty on metrics, none of them wanted page views to be the determining factor on whether it was successful, whether it was quality. But nobody had the answer about what should a successful metric look like. And I think we're getting to that place now where we're starting to define what successful metrics look like for the news organization. Not so much from the monetization perspective but to determine what is quality work, and how we want to measure the performance of our teams.

SL: It's all the scale, right? Phillip Crawley [publisher of the *Globe and Mail*] freaked us all out one day by telling everybody at this conference that 40 per cent of the stories on globeandmail.com were read by fewer than a thousand people. That's a shocking number when you're sitting in the newsroom and you're saying, "Oh, well that means nobody's reading the stories, why are we doing the stories?" … But it's a sliding scale. You're always going to get more traffic for the Toronto Maple Leafs than you're going to get for a media story. But a thousand clicks for me on a story about Postmedia [Postmedia Network Inc.] – those are the right thousand clicks, and we're willing to take that hit. So the analytics may not be as good, but there's an understanding now that we didn't have two years ago that those thousand people who are reading that story are the ones I need. They're more valuable to me than a hundred thousand cheap readers.

DC: What I also try to champion as often as possible is setting benchmarks for each of the categories. So our politics section will not a necessarily have the same type of traffic as our celebrity section. But that's okay. What we're trying to do is measure the politics section's performance relative to other politics performance. You don't look at everything you produce and say, "Well, this bucket over here is more popular, so do more of this." It's, "Our politics coverage isn't doing as well as it should, what can we do to elevate it a little bit more?"

JW: And on your other question, I guess I failed miserably on the panel because I really was trying to push the idea that you should move away from the craft skills. Everything we've talked about in terms of running a business is where it should move, and not learning how to work in a factory. Being able to run the factory and being able to build the factory are the important things to teach people …

Question: A lot of metrics focus on counting page views and unique visitors. But are we not missing out on some other, far more important metrics? How do you measure social impact? For example, our students have done a major body of work about issues affecting the LGBTQ community, and it's come back to us that through reading one of these students' stories, someone who was on the brink of suicide decided that life was actually worth living.

JW: But isn't analytics about reaching somebody like that, reaching more people like that? It's not just about doing that story and deciding it didn't reach enough people and not doing that any more, it's about figuring out – what time of day are you going to send it? What's the headline you're going to put on the story to capture a whole bunch of people who are searching for it? … It's the ability to find an audience and to take whatever you're doing and get it out there. It doesn't mean that if you do something and it doesn't work in quite the way you thought, you never do anything like that again. But it *is* about maximizing your audience and learning how to get more people to look at your stuff.

Question: In 2020, will technology have developed so that we have better ways to measure the impact that stories are having?

DC: To me what you're describing, though, is not analytics. It's basically setting goals for your project … Maybe part of your measurement for success is, have we changed a piece of legislation?

JW: We use those metrics too.

DC: When you're setting out, embarking on a project, analytics can be part of it, but there are qualitative success metrics, let's just call it success measurements.

JW: For us as an organization there are multiple things. It isn't just page views, it's not just digital. But it *is* impact, in terms of making changes in society or surveys of your audience.

Question: Where do we as educators go to learn the new skills we need?

DC: The business is changing so quickly right now … How can the curriculum keep up when the business can't even keep up? I'm sure there were lots of conversations today about ways of restructuring it, where perhaps the first year is a foundation taught to all students, and then there's the fifteen-month apprenticeship, a year and a bit. They come back in September, and then it's a laboratory type of structure where the educators are facilitators and they're bringing together developers and journalists, so that they're bringing all the latest insights from the industry back into the classroom. That's where you're learning from one another. The students are learning from the professors and vice versa, to be able to take that next step and direct toward the future. And the other thing that struck me, looking through the schedule for the day and thinking about journalism education, is – what is journalism education trying to do? Is it trying to basically deliver a group of people who have the skills necessary to work in the industry? Or is it the higher learning aspect of it, where you're preparing a group of people to go into the market and to disrupt, and to be the leaders and the innovators and the entrepreneurs and to help drive the business forward? They're two very different things, and educators and education programs need to decide what it is they want to deliver.

Question: What do you think about paywalls and ad revenue, that challenge, and what j-schools should be doing?

DC: Have you seen the Mary Meeker report [http://www.kpcb.com/internet-trends]? *The Atlantic* did a really good summary of it [http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2014/05/mobile-is-eating-the-worlds-attention-11-amazing-graphs-on-the-state-of-the-internet/371727], but basically it's showing where people's attention is compared to two years ago, and where the ad revenue is. People's attention span is declining in print, and digital is where it's on the increase.

Question: Are there particular skills that journalism students are going to need in this context?

SL: I went to Twitter because the conversations that needed to happen about the future of journalism and monetization weren't happening in newsrooms. They're happening in places that aren't traditional newsrooms, like Twitter, like Yahoo, like Facebook. And if you close your mind off to those sorts of opportunities then you're never going to figure out these problems. [Because of] this idea that the only place to do pure journalism would be a newsroom, and you're going to do it this way and you don't care about money and you never talk to the advertising department and custom content is the devil, and all the rest. We have to get away from that mode of thinking, and that's maybe where the traction is in the education sector … You're going to be working with ad reps, you're going to be talking to the editors about, “We have money for a project because of this, how are we going to do that in a way that doesn’t make us feel dirty?”

DC: With the Olympics, for instance, everyone who worked on the team knew what our targets were. We shared with them what our revenue was or what advertisers were spending, but we said, “This is the traffic we need to deliver to the various parts of the site to be able to deliver on the campaigns.” And everyone buys it. On your point about attitude, everyone needs to understand this and everyone needs to be working toward this goal. Because it’s not only editorial team-based, at least at our organization – all of Yahoo Canada is successful when we are all successful together. It’s not compromising any of our principles, necessarily, in terms of what we’re trying to craft. But we are crafting a consumer experience that we think our audience wants, and we’re trying to marry that with what we need for it to be successful financially.

Question: But that doesn’t mean that your reporters stay away from stories advertisers don’t want?

SL: I would never suggest that …

Question: But when we hear about the imperative need to break down firewalls and start turning the newsroom into a business … it sounds a lot as if people don’t understand what it used to be like and what the motives used to be [for maintaining the separation between the newsroom and the business office].

SL: We’re in an existential moment now, where not everybody’s going to make it any more. Twenty years ago you could have this conversation and say, “Yeah, we want to make money and we don’t want to close” but, you know, only three papers were going to close over the last hundred years and it’s going to be twenty in the next five years.

Question: I wanted to ask Derek – what you said sounds to me like you’re really interested in trust in your brand, and that you’re willing to have a lot of stuff up there that is going to draw people in, and also other stuff that you consider important but may not attract people immediately. Which is very interesting to me, because one of the criticisms of legacy media is that they were not prepared to cope with the fact that people really were interested in only certain stories and that the whole idea of trust was somewhat outdated.

DC: You have to understand, our audience is very wide. Seventeen million Canadians come to the network on a monthly basis. Different properties, different channels – business news, sports news – have different audiences and they all have different interests. We try to appeal to everybody, to a wide range, and then we're also trying to appeal to specific niches. And I think to be successful in general, to grow over all, you need to pursue both. You need to pursue mass, wide interests, but also specific [ones]. So, we have a really good hockey blog, for instance, where half of the audience are dedicated readers of that blog and then maybe half, probably less than half, are just general interest. They're tourists who come through once in a while based on whatever the topic might be. We do look at ways of identifying needs of our audience and what we can fill, and we think there are opportunities to go and grow audience by filling those niches.

Contributors

Gavin Adamson is an assistant professor in the Ryerson University School of Journalism, where he teaches first-year undergraduate students and final-year students in the Ryersonian newsroom. His current research concerns mental-health news coverage and digital news dissemination.

Gene Allen is a professor and holder of the Velma Rogers Research Chair in the School of Journalism at Ryerson University, and a faculty member in the Joint Graduate Program in Communication & Culture. His book *Making National News: A History of Canadian Press* was a finalist for the Canada Prize for the Humanities in 2015. Email: gene.allen@ryerson.ca

Paul Benedetti teaches journalism in the Master of Media in Journalism & Communication Program at Western University. pbenedet@uwo.ca

Stephanie Craft is associate professor of Journalism at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign and a former head of the Journalism Studies Division of the International Communication Association. She is the co-author, with Charles N. Davis, of the textbook *Principles of American Journalism*.

Chantal Francoeur, PhD, teaches Journalism at the University of Quebec in Montreal. For twenty years, she worked as a journalist – mostly at the Canadian public broadcaster, *Radio-Canada*. Her doctoral thesis examined the integration of radio, television and Web reporters at *Radio-Canada*. She currently researches the relationship between public relations and journalists. Email: francoeur.chantal@uqam.ca

A former newspaper reporter and editor, **Mike Gasher** is a professor in the Department of Journalism at Concordia University in Montreal and director of the Concordia Centre for Broadcasting and Journalism Studies. He is the principal investigator of the Geography of News Research Project and co-author of the widely-used textbook *Mass Communication in Canada* (Oxford University Press). Email: gashmj8590@yahoo.ca

Janet Giltrow is a professor in the Department of English at the University of British Columbia. She has published widely on rhetorical genre theory, linguistic-pragmatic approaches to style and syntactic variation, writing in the research disciplines, language on the Internet, and ideologies of language.

Sally Haney was an award-winning journalist with the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation between 1988 and 2003. She teaches Journalism at Mount Royal University where she is also managing editor of the student-produced print and online publication, *The Calgary Journal*. Email: shaney@mtroyal.ca

Meredith Levine is a multimedia journalist and full-time faculty member with Western University's Faculty of Information and Media Studies. Her teaching, research and production focuses on digital journalism, ethics and health. Email: mlevine7@uwo.ca

Robert G. Picard is Director of Research at the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism in the Department of Politics and International Relations at the University of Oxford, a research fellow at Green Templeton College (Oxford), and a fellow of the Royal Society of Arts.
Email: robert.picard@politics.ox.ac.uk

Jordan Press is a national affairs reporter based in Ottawa for The Canadian Press, covering federal departments responsible for social programs, labour, and infrastructure. He is a husband, a dad to daughter Maya, and a pet parent to a dog named Cronkite.

Ivor Shapiro is a professor of Journalism at Ryerson University, where he teaches ethics, law and feature writing, and has served as a program director and department chair. A former magazine journalist, his research concerns journalists' professional identity, values and practices.
Email: ishapiro@ryerson.ca

Christopher Waddell is an associate professor at the School of Journalism and Communication at Carleton University and the first occupant of the school's Carty Chair in Business and Financial Journalism. He joined Carleton in July 2001 after 10 years at CBC Television News, where he was the network's Parliamentary Bureau Chief in Ottawa. Professor Waddell received a PhD in Canadian history from York University in Toronto in 1981.
Email: ChrisWaddell@Cunet.Carleton.Ca

Mary Lynn Young is associate professor in the School of Journalism at the University of British Columbia. She has taught in a 'teaching hospital' model of journalism education and has published on newsroom sociology, gender, crime news and the media and computational journalism.