

COMMENTARIES

Proud to be a journalism educator¹

John Henningham

The program for the 1998 JEA conference was most impressive: more than 60 papers in three parallel sessions, refereeing of papers, a range of paradigms and methods, and much lively debate and dialogue. It is a tonic for any with doubts about the vibrancy and potential of journalism education at the academic, scholarly level.

It is fitting to compare the 1998 achievements with the JEA (then AATEJ) of almost a quarter of a century ago. At a conference in 1976, new member Dr Shelton Gunaratne (then a journalism lecturer at the precursor institution of our host university for this conference) surprised fellow j-educators when he arrived with an academic paper to deliver. It was the first such paper to be presented. In those days the educators' annual conference was, in fact, a three-day annual general meeting. Gunaratne's paper was listened to respectfully by the gathering, and a motion of thanks recorded in the minutes².

I will come back to the journalism educators of a generation ago later in this paper, but first I would like to say a few words about the cultural studies brigade.

The nature of cultural studies and its adequacy to tell us much of any use about the news media has been fully canvassed by Keith Windschuttle (1998a,b). One point of irritation to journalism educators and to scholars of several other disciplines, who have studied news media for a long time, is cultural studies' colonisation of the field of media studies. The cultural studies group, who derive from English departments (which have put on the backburner their traditional emphasis on the study of literature), seem somehow to think that they have invented the study of media — that no-one else had thought to consider the news media until they came along to set things right.

Some cultural studies academics or students with whom I have discussed this issue have misunderstood the position of Windschuttle or myself to the extent of thinking that we oppose the academic study of the news media — when nothing can be further from the truth, as our own writings and research show. They think we are saying that journalism should not be analysed or critiqued and that we believe the role of journalism schools is exclusively to teach practical skills.

The evidence of a century's academic writing and analysis on the media in the United States, largely by journalism educators, seems not to have permeated the cultural studies consciousness. John Hartley (1995) displayed a lamentable ignorance of what journalism educators do, which was rightly lambasted by Myles Breen (1996).

In fact, sociologists such as Tunstall and Halloran in Britain, or Western or Wilson in Australia, or Tuchman or Johnstone or Wright in the United States, or Noelle-Neumann or Donsbach in Germany, or Kato in Japan, or Windahl or Rosengren in Sweden, or political scientists like Mayer, Tiffen and Ward in Australia, have contributed an enormous amount of research and analysis of media practices, media output and media audiences. Much fine news media analysis and historical research has also been published by journalists — for example Souter, Carroll, Chadwick, Lloyd and Bowman.

And in the United States and Canada, and in some other countries, journalism educators as well as specialised communication scholars have built a vast and impressive literature of academic research and theory on the news media. The foremost among them was Wilbur Schramm (a reporter with Associated Press in the 1920s), who through his prodigious writing established the framework for US mass communication studies.

Moreover, the study of this literature is essential in preparing students for careers in the media. As leading US journalism educator Reese Cleghorn has written: "Media studies is a necessary staple of all good journalism schools. Students, don't leave campus without it." (Cleghorn 1994a)

Australia's contribution has been modest, but is on the increase. I might mention my own research path. When moving from journalism into journalism education, I was disappointed at the lack of research studies to give local data in areas solidly researched by North American scholars — such as studies of content, readership and of journalists in newsrooms. In my early work I set out to replicate several of the US studies, if only to provide students with local evidence and the means of comparing their own country's and city's journalism with that of the United States.

I developed an interest in studies of journalists' values and characteristics and found only one such Australian study — which thanks to New Journalist received publication — an honours thesis by a Queensland sociology student, Hart. I found this a useful reference for my PhD research — on television journalists' professional values and understanding of their viewers — and later a national study of journalists, replicating the US Johnstone et al and Weaver & Wilhoit studies.

Fortunately my undergraduate and postgraduate studies, much of it conducted part-time while I was a journalist, gave me a strong foundation in traditional humanities and in social sciences — and, together with my training (mainly on-the-job) in journalism, I had a built-in resistance to flights of fancy or ideological propaganda posing as scholarship, and hence was never seduced by the cultural studies output which began to appear in the 1970s. Many other journalism educators trying to develop an academic career have not been so fortunate, often because of the accident of their administrative location within a communication school. I will return to this point later.

But it is a source of great regret that the major influence on the development of academic mass communication studies in Australia came from the new cultural studies approach from Britain, whose genealogy Windschuttle has traced, rather than from the firmer empirical tradition of North America. (The orientation of the Australian approach is made clear in one major text of the early 1980s, Bonney & Wilson (1983), which launches a full-scale attack on empirical approaches to media study.

At QUT's Media Wars gathering³, Windschuttle was castigated for speaking nonsense or not understanding the intricacies of cultural studies approaches to media, or oversimplifying cultural studies thought or quoting out of context or caricaturing in order to condemn. Yet it is interesting to observe similar conclusions to Windschuttle's from veteran American media researcher Melvin De Fleur:

Another problem is the number of scholars who engage mainly in criticism of the media and their content. These writers make use of ideological, as opposed to scientific, perspectives to reach conclusions about the process and effects of mass communication. They are committed to various forms of critical analysis, whether from a so-called cultural perspective, from an ideology derived from Marxism, or from convictions about hegemony said to be exercised by some broad conspiracy of owners, exporters, the government, or others seeking to exploit audiences.

... critical cultural analysis, or related perspectives based on assumptions of hegemony, are based on a different epistemology shared among those who study the media with these perspectives. Conclusions and interpretations are already decided on before the analysis begins. They are derived a priori from an ideology rather than from unbiased and systematic empirical observation. This is a problem with all politically or religiously derived ideologies. Proof — in the form of empirical evidence obtained from unbiased observation — is not needed. The prior convictions of the already converted provide sufficient verification for whatever conclusions are advanced or claims are made. (De Fleur 1998:93)

And, as others have observed, the empirical methods of the social sciences and some humanities are far closer to journalism than postmodern, subjective approaches to knowledge. This perhaps is one of the sorrows of the dominance of cultural studies approaches: journalists undertaking employment or study in such departments, or students whose commitment is to the practice of journalism, have been bamboozled and perhaps alienated forever from academic scholarship because of the obscurantism, subjectivity and arcane nature of the cultural studies field.

As Windschuttle points out, the leadership of those mega-communication schools which include journalism as a money-earning sub-section is invariably in the hands of cultural studies theorists. Windschuttle has pointed to the betrayal of the hopes and aspirations of students who in their hundreds flock to journalism programs in order to learn something about journalism and its practice. He also points out that the hands-on journalism lecturers tend to remain in junior positions because of their lack of academic credentials while cultural studies theorists occupy their schools' senior positions. Why is this so?

One likely reason is that professional journalists who are engaged by such schools as junior academics and are urged to enrol for higher degrees and conduct research if they are to have any hope of promotion — are then directed into the waffly and anti-journalism research areas foreign to their own professional experience and inclinations. It would not be surprising if they gave up in despair.

I have certainly met people who as a result of studying in communication departments have laboured under the impression that the academic study of media is exclusively the domain of cultural studies, which they have had

difficulty understanding, and I have been happy to show them other ways, other paths.

I must say that journalists with whom I have discussed empirically-based research designs have often been delighted to apprehend the clear-cut set of steps, paralleling their own research experiences, which form the basis of a great range of research projects.

In all, I think journalism educators have been too tolerant and patient with the cultural studies brigade. We have shrugged our shoulders, muttered among ourselves, and left the cultstuds to pursue their hobbies. After all, there are many arcane fields of academic study around — why worry about this one? But in this case, our own discipline has been stealthily colonised by a field which essentially has no interest in what we do (except in generating income through student enrolments) and which may be undermining what we do or have the potential to do.

This is why the Windschuttle challenge is so important. This is a major watershed in the development of our discipline in Australia. From now on, it is our obligation to follow the Windschuttle example by challenging the absurdities and false claims of the cultstudists, to put aside our kindly tolerance and, whenever confronted with academic nonsense, confront the perpetrators with the simple words: “I don’t know what you are talking about.”

The need for journalism departments

I believe that journalism as an academic discipline can only survive and thrive when Journalism has full departmental status equivalent to that of the other major disciplines of a university. J-educators in aggregated departments should feel no shame in aspiring to departmental autonomy for Journalism — indeed, not to have this aspiration suggests a failure to fully value or appreciate journalism.

As Howard Ziff said in his *Columbia Journalism Review* article, “The closing of the journalistic mind”, “many journalism educators have failed to realize the full implications of the foundation myth of journalism education, enunciated by Joseph Pulitzer in 1902: ‘Journalism is, or ought to be, one of the great and intellectual professions.’” (Ziff 1992: 49)

If we share Pulitzer’s vision, we must share the consequence at the level of preparation for careers in journalism, that in universities Journalism deserves to be on at least an equal footing with other departments, including

vocational departments — Law, Medicine, Architecture, Business, etc. In the other keynote paper to the 1998 JEA conference, Windschuttle (1999) argued passionately for the unique research role of journalism, and suggested specific directions for future inquiry. In speaking of the U.S. experience Ziff (1992: 49) points to the need for journalism educators to take a lead in research:

Journalism departments, rather than creating their own advanced research-degree programs, were content, with notable exceptions, to surrender the field to communications, which trains faculty who have those doctoral degrees widely held as necessary to give intellectual respectability to a journalism faculty. Meanwhile, the communications empire gets bigger and journalism's share of the turf, however tenaciously defended, gets smaller.

The integrity of journalism as a discipline is corrupted if it is academically subservient to a field like cultural studies which is essentially hostile to journalism, ignorant of its practices and *raison d'être*, and ambivalent about journalism's role in a democratic society. (The cultural studies brigade at QUT's "Media Wars" seminar were shrill in disowning suggestions that they didn't like journalism. But can you show me a single piece of cultural studies writing which actually affirms journalism and its noble role, or applauds any example of journalism?)

I have, through JEANet, drawn fellow educators' attention to the articles by Maryland University's Journalism Dean, Reese Cleghorn, asserting the primacy of journalism and giving pointers to the industry on the qualities of good journalism schools (Cleghorn 1994a, 1994b). Cleghorn says of the best journalism schools:

They are the ones that are truly serious about their professional missions, believe in scholarly work related to professional practice and require (at the undergraduate level) a broad range of liberal arts courses... All of them use the word "Journalism" in their names. (Many add the words "and Mass Communication".) Almost all are autonomous academic units and are called "schools" or "colleges". After a century of evolution, it seems clear that a journalism program may be good without this status but it is very unlikely to be among the best. (1994b: 4)

Cleghorn warned against such failings in tertiary journalism courses as: programs where the teachers of practical subjects have lower status in their departments than theoreticians (echoing Windschuttle), and:

Universities that don't get much beyond a "trade school" approach, neglecting scholarship and research. Compared with two decades ago, we have much richer literature and theoretical frameworks — crossing various methodologies. If the scholars are mediocre or disinterested in professional practice (current, past or future), the school might as well not be at a university." (Cleghorn 1994b: 4)

UK journalism educator Peter Cole has also expressed the confusion at the industry level about journalism and media courses:

Our problem ... is that media studies, journalism studies, communications and journalism are confused by schools and their university guidance providers, and by the universities themselves. We have to clear this up, for it is no wonder the employers are confused and wonder at an interviewee who waxes lyrical about bias and semiotics but seems to know little about intros and contacts. (1996: 46)

Journalism education at tertiary level is of course very new in Britain, and an association of educators in the UK has only just been formed. But Cole's comment still holds true in Australia, where journalism education has a much longer history. We educators must make a commitment to educating the media industry about the difference between journalism schools and media or communication schools.

The other dangerous bedfellow of journalism is public relations, and any self-respecting journalism school must resist the planting of PR and other forms of "persuasive communication" within their department. It is a source of confusion to students and of antagonism between staff to join these two opposing disciplines, despite some apparent similarities in form. It may help PR in its mission, but cannot do anything but harm Journalism, which is as distinct from PR as JS Mill is from Machiavelli, or George Washington from Dr Goebbels.

Some plead convergence in the media industry as a need for converged communication departments. I take the view that convergence of information and persuasive roles in the mass media and internet demand an opposite response from journalism education: a determination to preserve a separate identity for journalism so that no one can accuse us of confusing journalism and propaganda.

Meanwhile, some US journalism schools do include PR within their area. Ziff (1992: 49) is critical of the view of journalism as "a sibling of things like

advertising, public relations, and television production". But it is worth noting that Maryland has just decided to drop PR. It has also dropped advertising. Cleghorn told the *New York Times*: "A journalist's mission is to tell the truth... It's not to sell people on something. It's to find out and disseminate the truth in a responsible manner." (Taylor 1998)

Shrinking resources in the public sector mean that journalism education programs must seek industry support and alternative sources of income. (Some, such as Curtin, have been very successful in augmenting income through recruitment of international students.) There has traditionally been little industry support for journalism education/research — but have educators worked hard enough at making their case? Queensland Newspapers' support of QUT's public journalism project is an encouraging sign, as has been the same organisation's commitment to supporting newspaper readership study with UQ's Journalism Department.

Criticisms of j-educators

It is easy to critique those who are not here. (We must applaud the courage of Windschuttle in engaging with cultural studies exponents on their own turf.) But it would be very wrong of journalism educators to assume that their problems are external. In fact, most of them are internal. As Hamlet says: "I must be cruel, only to be kind." (Hamlet, Act III, Sc 4). (If there are any members of English or Cultural Studies departments reading this, I should explain that Hamlet is a play written by a 16th-17th century English dramatist, William Shakespeare.⁴)

As a group, we in Australia have not done enough to show our worth as researchers or theorists. In recent times I have closely perused the curricula vitae of dozens of applicants for journalism teaching positions at universities where I have been a referee or selection committee member. I have been quite disappointed at the research records of the applicants as a group — in terms of such traditional measures as publication of articles in refereed journals, chapters, books or success in competitive grant application. What has not helped my perceptions is the fact that I have at the same time had the job of perusing the curricula vitae of dozens of applicants for promotion and tenure across a range of disciplines within the University of Queensland, as chair of my faculty's T&P committee. J-educators are, to be frank, not up to par in the area of research productivity.

There is an alarming shortage of publications from j-educators in Australian academic journals concerned with media, even those which focus primarily on journalism/news media. And that which is published is often of marginal quality, suggesting flaws in the refereeing processes (or perhaps the absence of such a process). We all know that this is so. Even worse is the lack of output by Australian journalism educators in international journals. I invite you to go through the index of Australian journalism publications published annually in *Australian Studies in Journalism*, and consider the proportion of these being produced by journalism academics.

My university now recognises excellence in teaching as an alternative route to promotion, so long as adequate standards of research output are demonstrated, and it is clear that many journalism educators in Australia prefer the teaching track to the research track. But the balance is wrong. This is not to reduce the importance of teaching, for ultimately this is the single most important thing we do. But good teachers must also become good researchers, and administrators of journalism schools must ensure that outstanding levels of performance in both areas are attained⁵.

Going back to the JEA of the 1970s, and the novelty of Gunaratne's academic paper: the journalism educator of that era was typically a person who had worked as a journalist in print and/or broadcast news media for one or two decades, and who had a BA. Prior to appointment as lecturers or senior lecturers they had little or no teaching experience, they had no research experience, no honours degree, no academic publications. They lacked any form of socialisation into the academic way, as experienced by their university colleagues in most other disciplines through their normal career progression — honours degree, tutoring, article writing, PhD research — with all the associated activities of seminars, conference attendance, being supervised, submitting articles to journals and going through the ordeal of the refereeing process, applying for grants, collaborating with others on research, being mentored. Small wonder that they were taken aback by Gunaratne's initiative. And moreover, most were in the old colleges of advanced education, which gave fewer incentives or opportunities for research than did the better funded universities, and faced heavy teaching commitments plus the very immediate challenge of curriculum design and delivery from scratch. The miracle is that this group performed as well as they did in establishing creditable applied journalism courses which have given thousands of young men and women a start in journalism.

At this point it is important to note that scholarship has various forms of expression, and there is another path for journalism educators who don't feel comfortable with traditional academic research. This is the path of professional activity — the practice of their journalism. Indeed I think this the more appropriate path for many educators who have been steeped in the doing of journalism rather than the teaching of it, and want to maintain their skills and abilities in journalism. Better to be a first-rate journalist than produce second-rate academic material.

Universities do recognise the professional activities of their vocational schools as scholarship — for example, the work of architects, musicians, creative writers and artists. One significant impediment to this process for journalism is DETYA's exclusion of newspaper publication from the bibliographic record, which determines part of the research quantum. Journalism educators have not made sufficient fuss about this. Surely a journalism educator demonstrating his or her skills through writing articles in newspapers is doing nothing different from a lecturer in music who composes a sonata. Yet the musical composition is 'counted', while the article is not.

This largely flows from traditional academic contempt for the mass media, and perhaps a feeling among outsiders that anyone can produce newspaper articles. (It is my experience, on the contrary, that the standards of editorial review and constructive criticism of submitted newspaper articles is more demanding and helpful than that of many so-called learned journals.)

The case is there for journalistic professional expression to be accepted as another route to scholarly recognition. If it can be well enough argued, I see no reason why the case should not be heeded. The problem is, however: where is this professional expression of their skills by Australian journalism educators? Where is the body of published evidence, in the form of major feature articles, investigative series, cover stories, documentaries that we can forward to DETYA to make our case? In other words, where is the evidence that journalism educators in significant numbers are maintaining their professional experience and credibility in this way? Where are their Walkleys? I know there are some educators who do write, but there aren't many. And until there are many, and until there is a demonstrable corpus of high quality journalism from our ranks, our case for having journalistic writing accepted as a substitute for traditional scholarship is on thin ice.

Educators as media critics

We should also be aware of the need for journalism academics to play a leading role in appraising and evaluating news media performance. Yet here again, there is a distinction between the approach of journalism educators and that of media studies academics. In essence, journalism educators are one hope, committed to journalism as a profession, and after all their criticisms they do believe in the value of journalism and the news media. Hence there is the need for journalism educators to celebrate the achievements of journalism in addition to criticising its failures.

As Mike Hoyt has pointed out in a *Columbia Journalism Review* column:

press-thumping is all the rage now, and the criticism does indeed become a sort of background whine when it is mere table-banging and finger-wagging. The trick is to do it right. To my mind, the industrial-strength media critic has to perform a mental balancing act. One foot has to be planted firmly outside the business, for distance and perspective and a critical edge. But the other mental foot should be inside the newsroom, for empathy and solidarity with the men and women who take the job seriously. (1998: 71)

And:

We have a surfeit of faux-journalism now; stuff that has the look and feel of news but is really a news-like product whose central concern is profit. But we also have high-quality people producing the real thing, day by day, well out of the limelight. There remains a deep need for the kind of press criticism that supports those people and helps them think their way through an ever more challenging environment. (1998:71)

Conclusions and recommendations

According to one journalism educator I was reading recently: "Journalism education has passed the experimental stage. It has passed the stage of acceptance ... The period of expansion has come, the field of the profession is being covered, and the progress of the work is predictive of greater service in the future." It is perhaps humbling to observe that this comment is from the first issue of *Journalism Quarterly*, published in 1924. It is helpful to be aware that compared with many academic disciplines, we are far from being

the new kid on the block. The 1924 educator was Izil Polson reporting on the curricula of 30 US j-schools. It is interesting to see a little more of what he said:

Four questions that naturally arise regarding professional instruction are: 1. Do those in charge of the instruction have the professional viewpoint, idealism, and ability? 2. Do the schools have vitality, expressed in constructive progress? 3. Are the schools covering the fields of the profession? 4. Is their progress predictive of greater progress in the future? Study of the present status of the schools justifies affirmative answer to these questions. The professional courses in journalism are measuring up to the standards of professional instruction in other fields. (1924: 28)

These questions are worth pondering at century's end.

Fedler et al (1998: 39) suggested strategies for journalism and mass communication programs to improve their status within universities, including "making themselves more central to the mission of their institution; serving larger numbers of students; recruiting more talented students; doing more to help their students find jobs; improving their record of scholarly activity; developing unique programs; ones not duplicated elsewhere in their state; emphasizing intellectual rather than vocational training; and seeking accreditation." All these points are important. The accreditation issue is one worth picking up in Australia.

Research funded by the Freedom Forum into the perceptions of heads of leading journalism schools indicated a better relationship with the industry and with host universities than in the past, with much still to be done. "Above all, journalism-mass communication school administrators recognize that their programs cannot remain static. They must continue to respond to and anticipate changes in the professions and on their campuses. They also recognize fully that adequate funding — internal and external — is the ultimate key to the success of their programs." (Anderson 1997: 39)

It is not good enough for us simply to realise that Journalism is a unique discipline which is not only worthy of departmental status within universities, but, as a university discipline, is endangered through not being a free-standing department. We must indeed act to ensure that journalism schools either gain or retain departmental status. But in an environment of shrinking resources within universities and a consequent urge to amalgamate disciplines, this may require a radical rethinking of our strategies for preserving

journalism education as a viable discipline. Essentially, our professional obligation must be to preservation of journalism education — as a means of enhancing the worth and significance of journalism itself as an occupation and profession.

As I have argued elsewhere (Henningham 1994), it is difficult to establish a viable stand-alone journalism school without a critical mass of academic staff to provide the depth and variety (both in teaching and scholarship) that any department must have. Towards this end we can increase our efforts to receive funding from within universities based on fair formulae which recognise the costs of our kind of teaching. But we need to be mindful of the pressures within universities as government funding contracts. It seems reasonable for a vocational discipline such as ours to be able to call more readily on our industry for support than other, non-vocational disciplines. We can look to industry for meaningful financial support, for example in funding academic positions. But these strategies will probably not be enough.

We must in addition rethink our relationships with fellow journalism schools. The business schools of the University of NSW and the University of Sydney — both large and well-funded departments — set a challenging precedent in 1998 with their decision to merge. The aim of the merger was to produce one of the leading business schools in the world — and more immediately, to head off international competition in Asia from US and European rivals (Spencer 1998). The combined school will initially have revenue of \$30 million a year and more than 2,000 students. This may well be the way in which our small and fragmented journalism schools can survive as viable academic units, heading off the colonisation from both the media studies and applied/persuasive communications groups. A merger of j-schools across institutions is far more meaningful than the easier (but still important) option of running combined seminar programs, fostering staff interaction or even permitting cross-credit of subjects. A merged department leads to the ability to frame a curriculum, organise research programs and deploy staff in a way that makes best use of resources, benefits from economies of scale, and maintains the integrity of the focus on journalism.

Our loyalty to journalism education must be paramount. We must do all we can to strengthen the concept of journalism as an academic discipline and to ensure the survival and growth of journalism as a major and respected academic entity.

I have thrown around some criticisms but would like to finish on an upbeat. Some years ago I was pleased to publish a piece by Chris Masters in which

he declared his pride in being a journalist (Masters 1988). It was interesting that he made a latter-day conversion into journalism, having seen himself first as a filmmaker. Similar to CS Lewis's discovery that he was a Christian when riding on the top of a double-decker London bus, Masters came to the realisation that the term 'journalist' designated his occupation, and realised how proud he was to be a journalist — just in time to receive a Walkley award! We must be proud to be journalists, and we must be proud to be journalism educators. The days of feeling second-class citizens within academic institutions are past. Our profession in its ideal form; our discipline is second to none in its valuing of truth and its commitment to sharing truth with all. And we are training and educating the journalists of tomorrow. What can be more important than that?

Notes

1 The original version of this paper was presented as a keynote address at the annual conference, Journalism Education Association, Central Queensland University, Yeppoon, December 1998.

2 Gunaratne, Shelton (1976). "The background to the non-aligned newspool", paper presented to the annual meeting of the Australian Association for Tertiary Education in Journalism, Sydney University, 7 December, 1976. The paper was published in the international mass communication journal *Gazette* [24(1):20-35, 1978]. (In 1979 I managed to have some half dozen papers included in the first JEA conference to be held at the University of Queensland, although against some opposition. As I say, much has changed.)

3 The Media Wars seminar was centred around a debate between Keith Windschuttle and John Hartley, each of whom presented a lengthy keynote paper. All papers presented at the seminar were published in a special issue of the seminar's sponsoring journal *Media International Australia* (MIA No. 90, February 1999) — except Windschuttle's! The flavour of the gathering is captured in the ABC Media Report's program of 10th December 1998 (On the Web at www.abc.net.au/rn/talks/8.30/mediarpt/mstories/mr981210.htm) Windschuttle's paper was published in *Australian Studies in Journalism*, 7, 1998.

4 An unscripted comment during the presentation of this paper was misunderstood by one listener (who communicated it to the U.S. discussion list *Journet*) as asserting that a major university's English Department no longer taught Shakespeare. Fortunately the Bard continues to be taught within our universities,

particularly in Drama units. The error was corrected and in the process led to interesting discussion about the relative emphasis given to classic literature in Modern English curricula. As a graduate of a traditional canon-based concept of English literature studies, I am personally saddened that students can graduate in English without every studying a play by Shakespeare or indeed having much brush at all with literary classics. It is my expectation that in the 21st Century the pendulum will swing back towards an appreciation of literature for its own sake and a recognition of the value of distinguishing works of enduring quality from other, more ephemeral, forms of expression.

5 (Breen's new book (1998) is a welcome start to a more active role by journalism educators as a group in asserting their academic credentials. It shows that journalism educators can publish theory when they are pushed, and many have been sharing their own theoretical perspectives with students and colleagues over many years.)

References

- Anderson, D. (1997). *The Leaders: Guiding Journalism Education into the 21st Century*. San Francisco: Freedom Forum Pacific Coast Centre. [Summary at www.freedomforum.org/educationanderson_survey_summary.asp]
- Bonney, B. & Wilson, H. (1983). *Australia's Commercial Media*. South Melbourne: Macmillan.
- Breen, M. (1996). *Modernity and journalism education: a respectable paradigm*. *Australian Journal of Communication* 23: 91-103.
- Breen, M. (ed) (1998). *Journalism: Theory and Practice*. Sydney: Macleay Press.
- Cleghorn, R. (1994a). *Here it is: a user's manual for j-schools*. *American Journalism Review*, September: 4,11.
- Cleghorn, R (1994b) *Toward the future: looking at j-schools*. *American Journalism Review*, October: 4.
- Cole, P. (1996). *Are journalists born — or trained?* *British Journalism Review* 7 (2): 42-48.
- DeFleur, M. (1998). *Where have all the milestones gone? The decline of significant research on the process and effects of mass communication*. *Mass Communication & Society* 1 (1/2): 85-98.
- Fedler, F., Carey, A. & Counts, T. (1998). *Journalism's status in academia: a candidate for elimination*. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator* 53 (2): 31-39.

- Hartley, J. (1995). *Journalism and modernity*. Australian Journal of Communication 22: 20-30.
- Henningham, J. (1994). *A suggested core curriculum in journalism education*. Australian Journalism Review 16: 83-93.
- Hoyt, M. (1998). *Why we are here?* Columbia Journalism Review July/August: 71.
- Masters, C. (1988). *Taking pride in journalism*. Australian Journalism Review 10: 4-10.
- Polson, I. (1924). *Survey shows progress*. Journalism Quarterly 1: 97-98.
- Spencer, M. (1998). *Business schools merged*. The Australian (Higher Education), 3 June: 33.
- Taylor, P. (1998). *Maryland drops public relations program from J-school*. free (Freedom Forum) [www.freedomforum.org/education/1998/11/10pubrelations.asp]
- Windschuttle, K. (1998a). *Cultural studies versus journalism*. In Myles Breen (ed) (1998): *Journalism: Theory and Practice*, Sydney: Macleay Press.
- Windschuttle, K. (1998b). *Journalism versus cultural studies*. Australian Studies in Journalism 7: 3-31.
- Windschuttle, K. (1999). *Journalism and the Western tradition*. Australian Journalism Review 21(1): 50-67.
- Ziff, H. (1992). *The closing of the journalistic mind*. Columbia Journalism Review, Jan/Feb: 49-51.

Author

John Henningham is Foundation Professor of Journalism and Head of the Journalism Department at the University of Queensland.