

AUSTRALIAN JOURNALISTS' PROFESSIONAL AND ETHICAL VALUES

By John Henningham



In this first comprehensive national study of Australian journalists, the author surveyed 1,068 news people in all mainstream news media. Australian journalists are similar to their U.S. colleagues in distributions of age, sex, and socio-economic background, but have less formal education. Like U.S. journalists, Australians have mixed professional and ethical values and are committed both to investigative and to news-disseminating roles of the media.

The nature of journalism in Australia makes for an interesting and important case study, particularly in the context of comparative studies of journalists. Australia is a relatively young country. Although Australia has been continuously inhabited for 40,000 years, its colonization by Europeans dates only to 1788, and it has been federated as a nation for less than a century. As an amalgam of former British colonies on a large land mass to the south of Asia, Australia is still coming to terms with its geopolitical identity. Large in area but small in population, it boasts a robust media industry traditionally strongly influenced by Britain but which more recently has come under the cultural sway of the United States.

As a parliamentary democracy, Australia, like other democracies, enjoys a considerable measure of freedom of the press. However, journalists lack the First Amendment freedoms valued by their U.S. colleagues.¹ They also have less of a tradition of tertiary education in journalism, and of voluntary, inclusive professional associations. Another important characteristic of the media environment is the concentration of ownership in the Australian press, which increased dramatically in the late 1980s and early 1990s with the closures and amalgamations of dailies in major cities.²

The total number of journalists employed by Australian mainstream news media is only about 4,200. Australia, with about 250 journalists for every million people, has about half the proportion of journalists as the United States (about 450 journalists for each million people).³ This in itself raises intriguing questions about the optimal size of a journalistic workforce and the factors which determine this. On a per capita basis, Australia has comparable newspaper readership figures to the United States, but fewer titles and fewer journalists per unit of circulation. Australian journalism may be a victim of the move towards oligopoly in the newspaper market: two

John Henningham is Foundation Professor of Journalism at the University of Queensland, Australia, and editor of the academic journal Australian Studies in Journalism. The assistance of David Weaver in supplying unpublished statistics from the most recent Weaver and Wilhoit U.S. study of journalists is gratefully acknowledged, as are the comments on the manuscript by Geoff Turner of the University of Queensland. The author would like to thank the Australian Research Council, the primary funders of this project, and the University of Queensland, which provided additional support.

companies (headed by foreign citizens) publish almost 90 percent of the circulation of national and metropolitan daily newspapers.⁴

In the past, little data has been gathered about the journalism workforce. However a recent comprehensive survey replicating major U.S. studies has provided the opportunity for reliable comparisons to be drawn between Australian and U.S. journalists. In particular, it is possible to compare journalists' stances on professional and ethical issues, as well as their concepts of the roles of the news media. Such inquiry helps an understanding of the extent to which value systems in journalism are universal or are products of nationally-based cultural and political environments.

A questionnaire was designed for administration by telephone, replicating the major areas examined in Weaver and Wilhoit's and Johnstone et al.'s U.S. studies, together with questions used by the author in previous studies of Australian television journalists and of journalists in Hawaii.⁵ Questions covered standard demographics, professional backgrounds, attitudes to current issues in media, ratings of the performance of news media, and standard scales designed to explore journalists' job attitudes (including professional orientations), views on the roles of the news media, and attitudes about situations involving ethical decisions.

The relatively small number of daily newspapers in Australia – fifty – made it feasible to obtain staff lists from all dailies, from which a one-in-four sample was drawn. The same method was used for all forty-four commercial television stations, the two national news magazines (*Time Australia* and *The Bulletin*, which incorporates a scaled-down version of *Newsweek*), the national wire service (Australian Associated Press), and the national broadcasting service (the Australian Broadcasting Corporation). In the case of weekly newspapers and radio stations, samples of organizations were chosen, from which were drawn samples of journalists for interview. Thirty-one of the 104 weekly newspapers with audited paid circulation were selected, and fifty of the 160 commercial radio stations were chosen.

Most of the interviews were conducted by a market research firm (Quadrant Research). A graduate student interviewed weekly newspaper journalists and some radio journalists. In total, successful interviews were achieved with 1,068 journalists, representing a very pleasing response rate of 90.1% of the original sample. The sample closely reflected the distribution of journalists between regions and media types. State break-downs were: New South Wales, 36%; Victoria, 22%; Queensland, 15%; South Australia 7%; Western Australia, 9%; Tasmania, 5%; Australian Capital Territory, 3%; Northern Territory, 2%. Forty percent of the journalists worked for metropolitan newspapers and news magazines, 28% for nonmetropolitan newspapers, 29% for broadcast media, and 2.5% for the wire service.

General characteristics of Australian journalists indicate that they are similar to other journalists in developed western economies – in a word, yuppies (Table 1). They are young (median age 32), predominantly of Anglo-Saxon ethnic origin, and of middle-class background (6 out of 10 come from homes in which the main breadwinner was in a white-collar occupation). They are more likely to be male than female by a factor of two to one (but the 33% of females is a leap from the 10% of the early 1970s). In all these respects they are very similar to U.S. journalists.⁶ They are liberal in their

Method

Results

TABLE 1
Selected Characteristics of Australian Journalists

| | |
|--|--|
| Age | Median 32 |
| Sex | Male 67%, Female 33% |
| Socio-economic background (based on father's occup) | Professional & managerial 44% Clerical and sales 17% Skilled trade 17% Semi-skilled, unskilled 12% Agriculture 10% |
| Type of secondary schooling | State school 56% Catholic school 23% Private non-Catholic school 20% |
| Highest education level | Secondary only 45% Some tertiary 16% Diploma 4% University degree 31% Some postgraduate study 2% Postgraduate degree 2% |
| Major at university (of those who had attended university) | Journalism 33% Communication 8% Other humanities/soc. sciences 41% Economics, business 6% Science 3% Other 10% |
| Religious denomination (in which brought up) | Roman Catholic 32% Anglican 31% Other protestant 22% Orthodox 1% Jewish 1% Other 1% No religion 12% |
| Is religion practised now? | Yes 26% No 74% |
| Political leaning | Pretty much to the left 4% Little to the left 35% Middle of the road 41% Little to the right 14% Pretty much to the right 2% |
| Voting intention | Labor Party 37% Liberal Party 29% National Party 2% Aust Democrats 3.5% Other 11% Don't know 13% Refused 4% |
| Mean no. of years in journalism | 13 (median 10) |

political leanings (39% say they lean at least a little "to the left," while 41% say they are "middle of the road") and religiously skeptical (only 26% say they practice a religion). They are fairly mobile in their careers and quite satisfied with their jobs. Compared with U.S. journalists, they are much less likely to have a university degree (39% compared with 82%), although the proportion of graduates has increased eight-fold since the 1960s.⁷ The concept of professionalism in Australian journalism has a checkered history. Early professional ideals which resulted in the establishment of associations and institutes at the turn of the century gave way to a more unionized approach with the formation of the Australian Journalists' Association.⁸ This led to a divide between the bulk of the workforce, who belonged (often compulsorily) to the union, and such leading members of their occupation as editors, editors-in-chief, news editors, and (in broadcasting) executive producers, who are "nonunion." In 1965, political scientist W.J. Hudson concluded that the AJA was "marked much more by trade union than professional characteristics."⁹ From the 1970s, the AJA took a leading role on many professional issues, but the conflict which arose from time to time between professional and industrial imperatives was generally resolved in favor of union priorities.¹⁰ In 1992, the role of the AJA as a professional association was further muddled when it merged with two other unions to form the Media, Entertainment and Arts Alliance.¹¹ The new alliance enjoys a very high level of membership on the part of journalists – 86% of Australian journalists belong to the union. Since the early 1990s, however, the major employer, Rupert Murdoch's News Ltd, has increased pressure on journalists to enter contractual arrangements with employers rather than receiving coverage from industrial courts.

An assessment of the professional characteristics of Australian journalism has concluded that in terms of traditional criteria (specialized knowledge, autonomy, organization, codes of ethics, and a service ideal), attainment of professional status is in progress but has not been realized.¹²

The Australian survey found that almost two-thirds of journalists would choose the word "profession" to describe their occupation (Table 2). While this is a large majority, it remains problematic that a third of journalists do not favor the professional label. One would not expect this degree of

TABLE 2
Best Word to Describe Journalism

| | % |
|------------|------|
| Profession | 64.8 |
| Craft | 22.5 |
| Trade | 6.2 |
| Other | 5.9 |
| Don't know | 0.7 |

Question: "What is the best word to describe journalism – a craft, a trade, a profession, or what?"

rejection of professionalism on the part of, for example, doctors, lawyers, or teachers. Alternative labels preferred were "craft" (by 22.5%) and "trade" (by 6.2%).¹³

Younger journalists, especially those aged under thirty-five, were more likely to favor the professional label; of those over fifty, most rejected the term. Possession of a university degree made little difference to concepts of journalism as a profession, but 74% of journalism graduates saw themselves as members of a profession, compared with 62% of arts graduates and 59% of general communications graduates. Those whose parents had been in white-collar occupations were more likely to see themselves as professionals than those whose parents were in blue-collar occupations.

The extent to which an occupation is a "calling" is a traditional approach to concepts of professionalism. Ideally, a professional performs tasks to meet people's needs, rather than for status or high income.¹⁴ One does not have to be too cynical to question whether contemporary custodians of the traditional professions (other than the clergy) are primarily motivated by the call to service. However in the present survey, an insight into the vocational element of journalism was obtained by asking respondents (in an open-ended question) why they chose journalism as a career (Table 3).

For most, their ability at writing was the primary reason (often prompted by careers advisers at high school), while factors related to the glamor and excitement of journalism were second most important. The desire to serve the public (reflected by such responses as "finding the truth," "putting things right," etc.) was expressed by fewer than 4% of journalists. Hence, a strongly service-oriented notion of journalism was not found among Australian journalists, although it could be argued that the desire to undertake work which exercised their abilities is an important aspect of professionalism.

To develop approaches to professionalism further, questions devised by Johnstone et al. and used in subsequent U.S. studies to examine the

TABLE 3
Reasons for Entering Journalism

| | % |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| Good at writing | 27 |
| Exciting, interesting | 19 |
| Interest in news, current affairs | 16 |
| Circumstantial, accidental | 15 |
| Suited ability | 5 |
| Father/relative in journalism | 4 |
| Service to public | 4 |
| Family influence | 3 |
| Other | 7 |

importance of various job aspects were put to the Australian sample. Results for Australian and U.S. journalists are shown in Table 4. The questions can be used to test journalists' commitment to professional versus nonprofessional concerns. (Items 2, 4, 5, 6, and 7 in Table 4 are designated as testing specifically professional values.) For half the job aspect items, responses from Australian and U.S. journalists were identical (or differences were insignificant). About 6 out of 10 journalists rated job security as very important; almost exactly half attached high importance to the level of autonomy they were given; 4 out of 10 valued the chance to develop a speciality; just over 1 in 5 gave a high rating to pay.

On the other hand, a greater proportion of United States journalists gave a high rating to the editorial policies of the organization, and the chance to help people. Australians were more likely to value the chance to get ahead, but said they were less interested in fringe benefits. The similarities between the journalists are as interesting as the differences. It is clear that, despite different cultures and historical backgrounds, journalists in the two countries look on many aspects of their work in the same way: job security and autonomy are important; pay is not a major factor.

The differences are intriguing: perhaps there is a little less valuing of the importance of editorial policies because of the oligopolistic nature of media ownership in Australia. There are fewer places for journalists to go if they disagree with policy, and hence this may result in greater acquiescence. On the other hand, the greater valuing by Australians of the chance to "get ahead" may indicate realization that promotion within an organization is the most effective way of developing a measure of independence – or at least the opportunity to have an influence on policy.

The sharp difference in the valuing of fringe benefits may represent a different interpretation of such benefits; in Australia the term evokes the meaning of "freebies" or other, slightly illicit, benefits associated with employment, rather than any nonsalary components of a package provided by employers.

The valuing of job security in both cultures deserves comment. Earlier studies of journalists' professional values suggested that the gaining of nonprofessional rewards from journalism was in a sense antithetical to professionalism. Formulae designed to test professional orientations even subtracted positive responses to job security questions in determining individuals' "professionalism" scores.¹⁵ Later studies rejected this approach, arguing that professionalism and need for security are different dimensions of job aspects, and not necessarily in opposition to one another.¹⁶ Indeed, it seems apparent that, just as the traditional professions typically bestow high security on their members, journalism at a professional level should be capable of flowing from within a secure working environment.

On those professional items where Australian and U.S. journalists differ (editorial policies and helping people), the U.S. journalists are more committed to a professional position. In both cultures, however, professional factors are for the most part given a higher rating than are nonprofessional job aspects.

A factor analysis of the nine items in the Australian study found, as did Weaver and Wilhoit,¹⁷ a three-factor structure: valuing of pay and fringe benefits formed a distinct factor, as did job aspects related to autonomy (freedom from supervision, autonomy, and developing a speciality); remaining aspects formed a factor named by Weaver and Wilhoit "personal development" (getting ahead, editorial policies, helping people, and job security).

TABLE 4
Importance of Aspects of Journalism

| | Percentage saying "very important" | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Australian journalists (n=1,068) | U.S. journalists (n=1,156) |
| Job security | 58 | 61 |
| Editorial policies of organisation | 55 | 69* |
| Chance to get ahead in organisation | 51 | 39* |
| Amount of autonomy you have | 51 | 51 |
| Chance to help people | 44 | 61* |
| Chance to develop speciality | 40 | 40 |
| Freedom from supervision | 39 | — |
| Pay | 23 | 21 |
| Fringe benefits | 7 | 35* |

* Significant difference based on t-tests of mean responses (3-point scale): $p < .001$

U.S. data courtesy David Weaver of Indiana University.

Formation of a scale of five professionally-oriented job aspects (editorial policies, autonomy, help people, develop speciality, and freedom from supervision: Cronbach's alpha reliability .53) showed that the more professional journalists (in terms of the job aspects they most valued) tended to be better educated and to be female. Age was not significantly related to the scale.

A second major area of inquiry concerned roles of the media. Johnstone et al. initiated this approach with their inquiry into "neutral" versus "participant" models of journalism.¹⁸ The questions devised by Johnstone et al. and expanded by Weaver and Wilhoit were put to the Australian journalists, who were found to be more inclined than U.S. journalists to support both the news disseminating and the investigative "functions" of news media (Table 5). (Johnstone et al. spoke of neutral versus participant functions.) Relative rankings of the various roles were, however, similar, with adversarial functions given the lowest rankings in both countries. Australian journalists were particularly committed to investigating government statements and analysing issues, as well as to quick dissemination of information.

An important expression of professional values is through ethical conduct. Australian journalists do not rate very well with the public on ethical behavior in comparison with other occupations. The most recent survey indicates that only 7 percent of the public give newspaper journalists

TABLE 5
Selected Media Functions: Australian and U.S. Journalists

| | Percentage saying "extremely important" | |
|--|---|-------------------------------|
| | Australian journalists (n=1,068) | U.S. journalists (n=1,156) |
| Get information to the public quickly | 74 | 69* |
| Provide analysis & interpretation of complex problems | 71 | 48* |
| Provide entertainment & relaxation | 28 | 14* |
| Investigate claims & statements made by the government | 81 | 67* |
| Stay away from stories where factual content cannot be verified | 45 | 49 |
| Concentrate on news which is of interest to the widest possible public | 38 | 20* |
| Discuss national policy while it is still being developed | 56 | 39* |
| Develop intellectual and cultural interests of the public | 37 | 18* |
| Be an adversary of public officials by being constantly sceptical of their actions | 30 | 21* |
| Be an adversary of businesses by being constantly sceptical of their actions | 27 | 14* |

Source of U.S. data: David H. Weaver and G.C. Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 1990s: A Preliminary Report of Key Findings From a 1992 National Survey of US Journalists* (Arlington: Freedom Forum, 1992); plus personal communication.

* Significant difference based on t-tests of mean responses (4-point scale): $p < .001$

a "high" or "very high" rating on ethics and honesty.¹⁹ Journalists have a much higher view of their own performance: 59 percent were prepared to give journalism a high rating for honesty and ethics.

The existence of ethical codes is one of the characteristics of a profession.²⁰ Journalists who belong to Australia's Media Alliance subscribe to a code (currently under revision) which covers such areas as confidentiality of sources, respect for privacy, and avoidance of prejudice (e.g., racism, sexism). A weakness in the application of the code results from its trade union sponsorship: as a result, the most senior members of the occupation, such as newspaper editors, are not formally bound by it. However, most newspa-

TABLE 6
Views on Ethical Issues: Australian and U.S. Journalists

| | Percentage saying "may be justified" | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Australian journalists (n=1,068) | U.S. journalists (n=1,156) |
| Using confidential business or government documents without permission | 79 | 81 |
| Getting employed in a firm or organisation to gain inside information | 46 | 63* |
| Badgering unwilling informants to get a story | 55 | 49+ |
| Making use of personal documents such as letters and photographs without permission | 39 | 47* |
| Claiming to be somebody else | 13 | 22* |
| Paying people for confidential information | 31 | 20* |
| Agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so | 4 | 5 |

Question: "Journalists have to use various methods to get information. Given an important story, which of the following methods do you think may be justified on occasion and which would you not approve under any circumstances?"

Source of U.S. data: David H. Weaver and G.C. Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 1990s: A Preliminary Report of Key Findings From a 1992 National Survey of US Journalists* (Arlington: Freedom Forum, 1992).

Tests of significance: t-tests of means based on t-tests of mean responses (2-point scale):
 + $p < .01$; * $p < .001$

pers are voluntarily bound by the Australian Press Council's statement of principles, which covers important ethical areas such as fairness and privacy. The Australian Broadcasting Corporation has its own guidelines (called "Editorial Policies"), while industry bodies representing commercial radio and television broadcasters have adopted codes of practice which are registered with the country's regulatory body, the Australian Broadcasting Authority. Some individual newspapers have their own codes.

Thus, there is a formal ethical context in the Australian news media environment. The existence of codes is not, of course, evidence of ethical attitudes or behavior among practitioners, nor does it guarantee ethical conduct.

The survey of journalists included a standard set of questions about attitudes toward ethical dilemmas which have been posed in studies in the United States and elsewhere.²¹ Journalists are asked to indicate "would not approve" or "may be justified" as their response to a set of journalistic behaviors (shown in Table 6). For all but one of the items, the "may be

justified" response is classified as less ethical. (The exception is the item concerning breaking confidences, where "would not approve" is judged as the more ethical position.)

Like their U.S. colleagues, Australian journalists had few ethical concerns about using leaked government or business documents. About 80% considered that publication of documents without permission may be justified. Australians were more inclined than were Americans to "badger sources" and to pay for information. By contrast, they were far less inclined to use deceit as a means of gathering information. Thus, the practices of assuming a false identity and getting inside information while employed by a company were more frowned upon by Australian journalists. Australians were also more wary of using personal documents and photos without permission. Journalists in both countries were almost all opposed to breaching guarantees of confidentiality to sources.

One could debate the value of these items in determining journalists' ethical standards. Judgements may vary about how "important" a story has to be to justify a journalist adopting any of the questionable practices, and journalists may answer these questions with different situations in mind. Clearly, the suggestion that using confidential business or government documents is improper or unethical is strongly rejected by journalists in both countries. Again, the wording of the question is important: "Given an important story, which of the following . . . may be justified on occasion . . ."

Some support for the value of the items taken together was found. A scale composed of six of the seven ethics items²² had a reliability of 0.6 – although it should be noted that the fact that the items cluster does not prove that they are tapping journalists' general ethics. When related to demographic variables, it was found that the holding of "more ethical" views was not related to sex ($r = -.05$, n.s.), was positively related to age (younger journalists were "less ethical") ($r = .16$, $p < .001$), and was negatively related to level of education (better educated journalists were "less ethical") ($r = -.15$, $p < .001$). Holding of the "more ethical" positions was also related to political conservatism ($r = .11$, $p < .001$) and religious practice ($r = .14$, $p < .001$).

Hence, items may ultimately be testing something other than journalists' general ethical dispositions. From the correlations, indicating that those more likely to approve the controversial practices are younger, better educated, less religious, and less politically conservative, one interpretation is that the dimension being measured is an aspect of caution versus risk-taking in news-gathering practices.

Conclusion

The typical Australian journalist is a thirty-something middle-class male with some exposure to tertiary education and with political views a little to the left of center. As a group, Australian journalists are continuing to come to terms with professional values. Most consider their occupation a profession, but many have reservations. Few have entered journalism because of service ideals, and for many, job security comes ahead of many purely professional concerns. However, they do not put a high priority on pay or fringe benefits.

Where differences on professional issues occur, Australian journalists show somewhat less professional commitment than do their colleagues in the United States. This may be because education in journalism is less dominant in Australia, and there is less of a tradition of professional associations.

A strong interest in job security and career advancement may result from an unstable employment environment in the news media, especially with the closures or amalgamations of several major dailies in the past five years. The extremely concentrated ownership of the metropolitan and national press in Australia may have limited journalists' career options.

In their concepts of the roles of the media, Australian journalists show a commitment both to information dissemination and to investigation. Like U.S. journalists, they value both the "participant" and the "neutral" functions suggested by Johnstone, while for the most part rejecting the adversarial role. Their levels of support for the importance of the individual media roles are generally higher than those of the U.S. journalists.

The ethical dimension of professional values in Australia shows a mixed pattern. Subterfuge is generally rejected, as well as invasion of privacy. Confidentiality of sources is almost universally valued. On the other hand, the majority do not oppose the use of leaked government documents or the "badgering of unwilling informants." Responses, which parallel those of U.S. journalists in these areas, raise questions about the adequacy of the questions in evaluating ethical principles.

Indeed, positions on ethical issues are more alike than different in the two countries. This suggests the need to look more deeply into other aspects of national and media cultures in search of the determinants of professional and ethical values.

NOTES

1. But judgments by Australia's High Court in 1992 and 1994, based on its interpretation of representative government as permitting free political discourse, appear to have taken Australia some way in the U.S. direction. In 1992 the court struck down federal government legislation limiting broadcast political advertising during election campaigns, while in 1994 it held in relation to recent defamation actions brought by politicians against newspapers that the constitution involved an implied right of free political speech.

2. These issues are discussed in David Bowman, *The Captive Press* (Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1988); John Henningham, ed. *Issues in Australian Journalism* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1990).

3. John Henningham, "Journalism in the USA and Australia: Some Comparisons," *Australian Journal of Communication* 22 (1995): 77-91. Australia has a population of 17 million.

4. Of total circulation of national and metropolitan dailies, 66 percent is published by Rupert Murdoch's News Ltd, while 22 percent is published by Conrad Black's Fairfax group. Australian-born Murdoch became a U.S. citizen in 1985; Black is a Canadian. The biggest player in the nonmetropolitan market is Irish publisher (and president of the U.S.-based Heinz company), Tony O'Reilly (John Henningham, "Mass Media" in *Institutions in Australian Society*, ed. J. Henningham (Sydney: Oxford University Press, 1995).

5. John W.C. Johnstone, E.J. Slawski, and W.W. Bowman, *The News People* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976); David H. Weaver and G.C. Wilhoit, *The American Journalist*, 2d ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991); John Henningham, *Looking at Television News* (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1988); John Henningham, "Multicultural Journalism: A Profile of Hawaii's Newspeople," *Journalism Quarterly* 70 (autumn 1993): 550-57.

6. David H. Weaver and G.C. Wilhoit, *The American Journalist in the 1990s: A Preliminary Report of Key Findings From a 1992 National Survey of U.S. Journalists* (Arlington: Freedom Forum, 1992).

7. John Henningham, "Australian Journalists' Attitudes to Education," *Australian Journalism Review* 15 (July 1993): 77-90. Further details on the Australian journalists' occupational characteristics are published in John Henningham, "Characteristics and attitudes of Australian journalists," *Electronic Journal of Communication* 4 (1993). Analysis of political journalists' values and ideologies may be found in John Henningham, "Political journalists' political and professional values," *Australian Journal of Political Science* 30 (July 1995): 321-34.

8. Clem Lloyd, *Profession: Journalist* (Sydney: Hale & Iremonger, 1985).

9. W.J. Hudson, "Occupational characteristics of journalism," *First Summer School of Professional Journalism*, vol. 1 (Canberra, 1965): 168.

10. John Henningham, "Is Journalism a Profession?" in *Issues in Australian Journalism*, ed. J. Henningham (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1990).

11. John Henningham, *Journalism's Threat to Freedom of the Press* (University of Queensland Inaugural Lecture series, St Lucia: University of Queensland Press, 1992).

12. Henningham, "Is Journalism a Profession?"

13. Definitions of these terms were not given to or asked of the journalists, and hence we cannot be entirely sure what they had in mind when labelling journalism. The term "craft," referring to skilled work with perhaps a more artistic and individual aspect than the output of a "trade," has some currency among older Australian journalists, perpetuated in an early textbook: L. Revill and C. Roderick, *The Journalist's Craft* (Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1965). The term has some usage in the United States: Penn Kimball, "Journalism: Art, Craft or Profession?" in *The Professions in America*, ed. K. Lynn, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965).

14. Henningham, "Is Journalism a Profession?"

15. Jack M. McLeod and Searle E. Hawley, "Professionalization among Newsmen," *Journalism Quarterly* 41 (autumn 1964): 529-38; Jack M. McLeod and Ramona R. Rush, "Professionalization of Latin American and U.S. journalists," *Journalism Quarterly* 46 (autumn, winter 1969): 583-90, 784-89; Oguz B. Nayman, "Professional Orientations of Journalists: An Introduction to Communicator Analysis Studies," *Gazette* 19 (1973): 195-212.

16. Swen Windahl and Karl Erik Rosengren, "Newsmen's Professionalization: Some Methodological Problems," *Journalism Quarterly* 55 (autumn 1978): 466-73; John Henningham, "Comparisons between Three Versions of the Professional Orientation Index," *Journalism Quarterly* 61 (summer 1984): 302-09. Note that calculation of professional scores in the current Australian study did not involve subtraction of job security scores.

17. Weaver and Wilhoit, *American Journalist*, 95. The factor analysis in the present study used varimax rotation principal components analysis. Three factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1, accounting for 52% of the variance.

18. Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, *The News People*. See Morris Janowitz, "Professional Models in Journalism: The Gatekeeper and the Advocate," *Journalism Quarterly* 52 (1975): 618-26.

19. "Nurses rate highest for ethics and honesty," *The Bulletin*, 30 April 1996, 38.

20. Henningham, "Is Journalism a Profession?"

21. Weaver and Wilhoit, *American Journalist*; R. Kocher, "Bloodhounds or

Missionaries: Role Definitions of German and British Journalists," *European Journal of Communication* 1 (March 1986): 43-64; American Society of Newspaper Editors, *The Changing Face of the Newsroom: A Human Resources Report* (Washington: ASNE, 1989); Aralynn Abare McMane, "Ethical standards of French and U.S. Newspaper Journalists," *Journal of Mass Media Ethics* 8 (1993): 207-18; David Weaver, Klaus Schoenbach, and Beate Schneider, "West German and U.S. Journalists: Similarities and Differences in the 1990s" (paper presented at the annual meeting of AEJMC, Kansas City, 1993); Henningham, *Looking at Television News*; John Henningham, "Ethnic Differences in Journalists' Ethical Attitudes," *Asian Journal of Communication* 4 (1994): 1-11.

22. The scale excluded the confidentiality item ("agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so") because the almost universal level of disapproval resulted in the item having no discriminatory value.