


This article was downloaded by: 10.3.97.143

On: 01 Dec 2023

Access details: *subscription number*

Publisher: *Routledge*

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: 5 Howick Place, London SW1P 1WG, UK



## **The Handbook of Journalism Studies**

Karin Wahl-Jorgensen, Thomas Hanitzsch

### **Journalism and the Academy**

Publication details

<https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9780203877685.ch3>

Barbie Zelizer

**Published online on: 28 Nov 2008**

**How to cite :-** Barbie Zelizer. 28 Nov 2008, *Journalism and the Academy from: The Handbook of Journalism Studies* Routledge

Accessed on: 01 Dec 2023


<https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9780203877685.ch3>

**PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR DOCUMENT**

Full terms and conditions of use: <https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/legal-notices/terms>

This Document PDF may be used for research, teaching and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproductions, re-distribution, re-selling, loan or sub-licensing, systematic supply or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden.

The publisher does not give any warranty express or implied or make any representation that the contents will be complete or accurate or up to date. The publisher shall not be liable for an loss, actions, claims, proceedings, demand or costs or damages whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with or arising out of the use of this material.



**THE HANDBOOK OF  
JOURNALISM  
STUDIES**

Edited by  
**Karin Wahl-Jorgensen  
Thomas Hanitzsch**

 **Handbook  
Series**

First published 2009  
by Routledge  
270 Madison Ave, New York, NY 10016

Simultaneously published in the UK  
by Routledge  
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

*Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business*

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2008.

“To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge’s collection of thousands of eBooks please go to [www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk](http://www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk)”

© 2009 Taylor & Francis

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

**Trademark Notice:** Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

*Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data*

The handbook of journalism studies / [edited] by Karin Wahl-Jorgensen and Thomas Hanitzsch.

p. cm. — (ICA handbook series)

Includes index.

1. Journalism. I. Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin. II. Hanitzsch, Thomas, 1969-

PN4724.H36 2008

070.4—dc22

2008024854

ISBN 0-203-87768-3 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN10 HB: 0-8058-6342-7

ISBN10 PB: 0-8058-6343-5

ISBN10 EB: 1-4106-1806-4

ISBN13 HB: 978-0-8058-6342-0

ISBN13 PB: 978-0-8058-6343-7

ISBN13 EB: 978-1-4106-1806-1

# 3

## Journalism and the Academy

Barbie Zelizer

Journalism's place in the academy is a project rife with various and sundry complications. As the recognizable forms of journalism take on new dimensions to accommodate the changing circumstances in which journalism exists, the question of journalism's study has developed along an uneven route filled with isolated pockets of disciplinary knowledge. The result is that we have little consensus about the two key terms at the focus of our attention, agreeing only marginally about what journalism is and generating even less agreement about what the academy's relationship with it should be. This chapter discusses the various sources of existential uncertainty underlying journalism's coexistence with the academy and offers a number of suggestions to make their uneven and often symbiotic relationship more mutually aware and fruitful.

### THE SHAPE OF JOURNALISM AND ITS STUDY

In an era when journalism stretches from personalized blogs to satirical relays on late night television and its study appears in places as diverse as communication, literature, business and sociology, considering journalism's place in the academy from anew might seem like an unnecessary attempt to generate alarm about the future viability of a phenomenon that seems to be everywhere. However, in being everywhere, journalism and its study are in fact nowhere. On the one hand, journalism's development has produced a long line of repetitive and unresolved laments over which form, practice or convention might be better suited than their alternatives to qualify as newsmaking convention. On the other hand, its study has not kept step with the wide-ranging and often unanticipated nature of its evolution over time.

The dissonance between journalism and the academy echoes a broader disjunction characterizing journalism's uneven and spotty existence with the world. When George Orwell added newspaper quotations to his first book, critics accused him of "turning what might have been a good book into journalism" (Orwell, 1946, cited in Bromley, 2003), and his collected works were compiled decades later under the unambivalent title *Smothered Under Journalism, 1946* (Orwell, 1999). Similar stories dot the journalistic backgrounds of literary giants like Charles Dickens, Samuel Johnson, John Dos Passos, Andre Malraux, Dylan Thomas and John Hersey. Reactions like these proliferate despite a profound reliance on journalism not only to situate us vis à vis the larger collective but to use that situation as a starting point for more elaborated ways of positioning ourselves and understanding the world.

This is curious, because much of our situated knowledge rests in part on journalism. Where would history be without journalism? What would literature look like? How could we understand the workings of the polity? As a phenomenon, journalism stretches in various forms across all of the ways in which we come together as a collective, and yet the “it’s just journalism” rejoinder persists.

Journalism’s coexistence with the academy rests on various sources of existential uncertainty that build from this tension. The most obvious uncertainty stems from the pragmatic questions that underlie journalism’s practice, by which its very definition is tweaked each time supposed interlopers—blogs, citizen journalists, late night TV comedians or reality television—come close to its imagined borders. A second source of uncertainty draws from the pedagogic dimensions surrounding journalism and the academy. How we teach what we think we know is a question with a litany of answers, particularly as journalism’s contours change. And yet those who teach what counts and does not count as journalistic practice and convention have tended to be behind rather than ahead of its rapidly altering parameters. And finally one of the most significant sources of uncertainty surrounds the conceptual dimensions of the relationship—what we study when we think about journalism. In that over the years academics have invoked a variety of prisms through which to consider journalism—among them its craft, its effect, its performance and its technology—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.

This chapter addresses these sources of uncertainty and in so doing thinks through some important challenges facing the study of contemporary journalism. It argues 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. What about journalism and its study has been privileged, and what has been side-stepped? These questions are particularly critical when thinking about journalism studies in its global context, where variance has not been accommodated or even recognized as much as it exists on the ground.

## INTERPRETIVE COMMUNITIES AND THINKING ABOUT JOURNALISM

What academics think relies upon how they think and with whom, and perhaps nowhere has this been as developed as in the sociology of knowledge. Thomas Kuhn (1964) was most directly associated with the now somewhat fundamental notion that inquiry depends on consensus building, on developing shared paradigms that name and characterize problems and procedures in ways that are recognized by the collective. On the way to establishing consensus, individuals favoring competing insights battle over definitions, terms of reference and boundaries of inclusion and exclusion. Once consensus is established, new phenomena tend to be classified by already proven lines. In other words, what we think has a predetermined shape and life-line, which privileges community, solidarity and power.

This notion goes far beyond the work of Kuhn, and it has been implicated in scholarship by Emile Durkheim (1965 [1915]), Robert Park (1940), Michel Foucault (1972), Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann (1966), and Nelson Goodman (1978)—all of whom maintained in different ways that the social group is critical to establishing ways of knowing the world. The idea of interpretive communities, originally suggested by Stanley Fish (1980) and developed in conjunction with journalism by Zelizer (1993), Berkowitz (2000) and others, helps situate the strategies

that go into the sharing of knowledge as integral to the knowledge that results. Recognizing that groups with shared ways of interpreting evidence shed light on the way that questions of value are settled and resettled, the persons, organizations, institutions and fields of inquiry engaged in journalism's analysis become central to understanding what journalism is. As the anthropologist Mary Douglas (1986, p. 8) argued, "true solidarity is only possible to the extent that individuals share the categories of their thought." Inquiry, then, is not just an intellectual act but a social one too.

What this suggests for journalism's study is an invitation to think about the forces involved in giving it shape. In this sense, no one voice in journalism's study is better or more authoritative than the others; nor is there any one unitary vision of journalism to be found. Rather, different voices offer more—and more complete—ways to understand what journalism is, each having evolved in conjunction with its own set of premises about what matters and in which ways.

As an area of inquiry, journalism's study has always been somewhat untenable. Negotiated across three populations—journalists, journalism educators and journalism scholars, the shared concern for journalism that is independently central to each group has not remained at the forefront of their collective endeavors. Rather, journalism's centrality and viability have been way-laid as lamentations have been aired contending that the others fail to understand what is most important: journalists say journalism scholars and educators have no business airing their dirty laundry; journalism scholars say journalists and journalism educators are not theoretical enough; journalism educators say journalists have their heads in the sand and journalism scholars have their heads in the clouds. As each has fixated on who will be best heard above the din of competing voices, the concern for journalism has often been shunted to the side. Underlying the ability to speak about journalism, then, have been tensions about who can mobilize the right to speak over others and who is best positioned to maintain that right.

The alternate voices in journalism's study each constitute an interpretive community of sorts. Each has defined journalism according to its own aims and then has set strategies for how to think about it in conjunction with those aims.

### JOURNALISTS

Journalists are individuals who engage in a broad range of activities associated with newsmaking, including, in Stuart Adam's (1993, p. 12) view, "reporting, criticism, editorializing and the conferral of judgment on the shape of things." Journalism's importance has been undeniable, and while it has been the target of ongoing discourse both in support and critique of its performance, no existing conversation about it has suggested its irrelevance. Rather, contemporary conditions have insisted on journalism's centrality and the crucial role it can play in helping people make sense both of their daily lives and of the ways in which they connect to the larger body politic.

However, not all of journalism's potential has borne out in practice. Contemporary journalists have been under siege from numerous quarters. They live in an economic environment in which falling revenues, fragmentation, branding and bottom-line pressures keep forcing the news to act as a shaky for-profit enterprise across an increased number of outlets. These outlets have not necessarily produced a broader scope of coverage, and many journalists have taken to multi-tasking the same story in ways that previous generations would not recognize. In the United States, every media sector but the ethnic press—mainstream newspapers, broadcast and cable news, the alternative press—is losing its public. Entering a "new era of shrinking ambitions," contemporary journalism is no longer a dependable economic enterprise (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2007).

Politically, journalists have come under attack from both the left and right, which have argued for different definitions of so-called journalistic performance alongside a political environment that has undercut the journalist's capacity to function in old ways. While the competing and contradictory expectations from left and right have paralyzed aspects of journalism's performance in more stable political systems, the demise of the nation-state in many areas of the world has raised additional questions regarding journalism's optimum operation. All of this has produced an untenable situation for journalists, who have been caught in various kinds of questionable embraces with government, local interests and the military and who, in the United States, have gravitated toward coverage that plays to "safe" political spaces, producing news that is characterized by heightened localism, personalization and oversimplification (State of the News Media, 2007). Journalists have learned to follow various models of practice, not always thoughtfully and none of which have been fully suited to the complexities of today's global political environments.

Technically, journalists have faced new challenges from the blogosphere and other venues, which have made the very accomplishment of newswork tenuous. How journalists cover the news has faded in importance alongside the fact of coverage. Alternative sites like late night television comedy, blogs and online sites like Global Voices have taken the lead in gatekeeping, with journalism "becoming a smaller part of people's information mix" (State of the News Media, 2007). In that regard, people watching sites like Comedy Central's *The Daily Show* have been thought to be better informed about public events than those who watched mainstream news (State of the News Media, 2007).

Lastly, moral scandals involving journalists have abounded. Incidents involving Judith Miller or Jayson Blair in the United States or the Gilligan Affair in Britain have all raised questions about the moral fiber of journalists, paving the way for an insistence on homemade media, or citizen journalism, by which journalists' function is being increasingly taken over and performed by private citizens. That same trend has also meant that the public can see journalism's limitations more easily, leading them to argue, at least in the US case, that the news media are "less accurate, less caring, less moral and more inclined to cover up rather than correct mistakes" (State of the News Media, 2007).

All of this suggests that journalists have not been as effective as they might have been in communicating to the world journalism's centrality and importance. Questions persist about changing definitions of who is a journalist: Does one include Sharon Osbourne or the Weather Channel? Questions also underlie the issue of which technologies are bona fide instruments of newsmaking: Does one include cellular camera phones or reality television? And finally, the fundamental question of what journalism is for has no clear answer. Is its function to only provide information or to more aggressively meld community and public citizenship? Journalism's different functioning in different parts of the world—as in the distinctions separating the developmental journalism prevalent in parts of Asia from the partisan models popular in Southern Europe—has made the question more difficult to answer.

Part of this has derived from the fact that there are a number of competing visions at the core of journalism's self definition. Is it a craft, a profession, a set of practices, a collective of individuals, an industry, an institution, a business or a mindset? In that it is probably a bit of all of these things, there is a need to better figure out how they work off of and sometimes against each other. This is critical, for even basic questions about journalistic tools have really never been addressed and journalism's tools have not been equally valued. Images in particular are one aspect of news that has been unevenly executed, with pictures regularly appearing without captions, without credits and with no identifiable relation to the texts at their side. Yet the turn to images in times of crisis—by which there are more images, more prominent images, bolder images, and larger images—has been poorly matched to the uneven conventions by which images act as news

relays. Following both the terror attacks of September 11 and the launching of the US war on Iraq, there were two and a half times the number of photos in the front sections of a paper like the *New York Times* than it regularly featured in peacetime (Zelizer, 2004). The lack of a clear development of standards, then, is problematic, because visuals have taken over the forefront of journalism's relays even if they have not been sufficiently addressed. Moreover, because their so called "correct usage" has not been figured out, the image's presentation has become an open field, with people crying foul every time journalism's pictures grate their nerves. This means that journalism's hesitancy about doing its job has allowed others—politicians, lobbyists, concerned citizens, bereaved parents, even members of militias—to make the calls instead, and they do so in journalism's name but without journalism's sanction.

Similarly undervalued has been the degree to which crisis has become the default setting for much of journalistic practice. In that there has been much in the news that takes shape on the backs of improvisation, sheer good or bad fortune, and ennui than is typically admitted, the evolution of crisis as the rule rather than the exception of journalism suggests a need to be clearer about how such impulses play into newsmaking. For in leaving crisis out of the picture, journalism has seemed to be a far more predictable and manageable place than it is in actuality.

All of this has rendered journalists a group somewhat out of touch with itself, its critics and its public. Givens such as the needs of the audience, the changing circumstances of newsmaking or the stuff at the margins of the newsroom—like inspiration and creativity—have remained relatively unaddressed. It is no surprise, then, that in the US journalists rank at the bottom of nearly every opinion poll of those whom the public trusts.

### JOURNALISM EDUCATORS

The journalism educators have come together around a strong need to educate novices into the craft of journalism. Although vernacular education has differed across locations, it has exhibited similar tendencies regardless of specific locale. In the United States, teaching a vernacular craft began in the humanities around 1900, where newswriting and the history of journalism moved from English departments into the beginnings of a journalism education that eventually expanded into ethics and the law. Other efforts developed in the late 1920s in the social sciences, where the impulse to establish a science of journalism positioned craft—commonly called "skills" courses—as one quarter of a curriculum offering courses in economics, psychology, public opinion and survey research. Journalism educators were thus caught in the tensions between the humanities and social sciences as to which type of inquiry could best teach journalists to be journalists. For many this split still proliferates, reflected in the so-called quantitative/qualitative distinction in approaches to news.

In the United Kingdom, journalism education was set against a longstanding tradition of learning through apprenticeship and a prevalent view that journalism's "technical elements" were "lacking in academic rigor" (Bromley, 1997, p. 334). Practical journalism did not appear on the curriculum until 1937 but only became a setting worthy of academic investigation once sociology and political science, largely through the work of Jeremy Tunstall (1970, 1971), arrived in the late 1960s. In Germany and Latin America, an academic interest was evident first in the social sciences, which pushed journalism education toward sociology and notions of professionalism (Marques de Melo, 1988; Weber, 1948).

In each case, the academic interest among educators helped link journalists to the outside world, but it also did enormous damage to the craft, leveling it down to what James Carey (2000, p. 21) called a "signaling system." At first offering an old-fashioned apprenticeship, journalism



educators over time came to address journalism by dividing it into technologies of production, separating newspapers, magazines, television and radio from each other. Lost in this was a place where all of journalism could be thought of as a whole with many disparate parts. And the resulting curriculum, again in Carey's view, in many cases came to lack "historical understanding, criticism or self-consciousness" (p. 13). In this regard, journalism education generated dissonance across the larger university curriculum. In the humanities it came to be seen as part of "the vernacular, the vulgar" (p. 22). In the social sciences, it came to be seen as a tool for channeling public opinion but not important in and of itself.

### JOURNALISM SCHOLARS

The final population of interest to journalism is the journalism scholars, who despite an enormous body of literature dealing with the values, practices, and impact of journalism, still have not produced a coherent picture of what journalism is. And yet journalism can be found literally across the university curriculum.

Journalism has come to inhabit academic efforts in communication, media studies and journalism schools, as well as the less obvious targets of composition sequences, history, sociology, urban studies, political science, and economics and business. What this means is that much of what has been laid out thus far in terms of creating a distinctive and separate interpretive community has been experienced tenfold within the academy. In that academics often function within the boundaries and confines of disciplinary communities, what they study often takes on the shape of the perspectives set forth by those communities. These disciplines, which are akin to interpretive communities, have helped determine what counts as evidence and in which ways. Similarly, they have made judgment calls about which kinds of research do not count.

How has journalism existed across the curriculum? Journalism has been approached in pockets, each of which has isolated aspects of the phenomenon from the others: Such compartmentalization has worked against a clarification of what journalism is, examining journalism's partial workings rather than its whole. The result has been a terrain of journalism study at war with itself, with journalism educators separated from journalism scholars, humanistic journalism scholars separated from scholars trained in the social sciences, and a slew of independent academic efforts taking place in a variety of disciplines without the shared knowledge crucial to academic inquiry. Alongside these efforts, journalists have long resisted the attempts to microscopically examine their work environment.

This has had problematic ramifications: One has had to do with narrowing the varieties of news. In that scholars have not produced a body of material that reflects all of journalism, they have primarily defined it in ways that drive a specific form of hard news over other alternatives. This metonymic bias of academic studies has thus pushed a growing gap between what Peter Dahlgren (1992, p. 7) called "the realities of journalism and its official presentation of self." Missing for long periods of time have been copy-editors, graphic designers, online journalists, journals of opinion, camera operators, tabloids and satirical late night shows. In other words, the academy has pushed certain focal points in thinking about journalism that do not account for the broad world of what journalism is. The diversity of news has for the most part disappeared.

A similar destiny has met the craft of journalism. The academy's move to professionalize journalists—largely driven by its sociological inquiry—has told journalists that they are professionals, whether or not they want to be, and this has raised the stakes involved in being a journalist, often to the detriment of those practicing the craft. The ramifications of this have been tangible, in that traditional notions of craft have gone under. For instance, imposing codified

rules of entry and exclusion has produced an anti-professionalization position among many European journalists: In the UK, there has been an inability to accommodate the growing number of newly-educated journalists (Bromley, 1997); in France, journalists have developed an overly aggressive style of investigative reporting (Neveu, 1998). As longtime British correspondent James Cameron (1997 [1967], p. 170) put it, “it is fatuous to compensate for our insecurity by calling ourselves members of a profession; it is both pretentious and disabling; we are at our best craftsmen.” And yet craft, itself the defining feature of journalism, has faded to the background of what is necessary to know.

The same narrow fate has met diverse international forms of journalism. Though the practice of journalism has taken on unique shape in the various regions in which it has been practiced, the vast majority of scholarship has focused on journalism in its US venues. In that much of this research has been US-centered, standing in as a very limited but honorific gold standard for a wide range of journalistic practices implemented around the world, this has left unaddressed those kinds of journalism practiced beyond journalism’s Western core (i.e., Gunaratne, 1998; Hallin & Mancini, 2004; Zhao, 1998). It has also left unanswered the many question marks about journalism that dot the global horizon.

Equally important, though much of journalism’s history has been wrapped up in the history of the nation-state, in today’s global age we are hard pressed to argue that that linkage works anymore. Though one of globalization’s key effects has been to undermine the nation state’s centrality, what kind of alternative impulse should be behind the journalistic apparatus it creates instead? Examples here are the contrary cases of capitalism and religious fundamentalism, both of which have created new boundaries of inclusion and exclusion, thereby adjusting the answer of what journalism is for by gravitating toward modes of journalistic practice awry with the impulses for so-called free information relay.

What all of these circumstances suggest is that journalism scholars have not done enough to tend the ties that bind them back to journalism in all of its forms. This is of critical importance, in that there has developed a body of knowledge about journalism that largely preaches to the converted but does little to create a shared frame of reference about how journalism works or what journalism is for.

### TYPES OF INQUIRY

Within the academy, there have been five main types of inquiry into journalism—sociology, history, language studies, political science, and cultural analysis. Proposed largely as a heuristic device that implies more mutual exclusivity than exists in real practice, these are not the only disciplines that have addressed journalism. But the perspectives they provide offer a glimpse of the range of alternatives through which journalism can be conceptualized. The underlying assumptions that each frame has imposed on its examination of the journalistic world say much about how different prisms on journalism have created a picture that is at best partial.

Each frame offers a different way to address the question of why journalism matters: sociology has addressed how journalism matters; history how it used to matter; language studies through which verbal and visual tools it matters; political science how it ought to matter; and cultural analysis how it matters differently. Lost here, or at least dropped into the backdrop of the research setting, has been the way in which each of these answers comes to bear on the larger question of why academics should be addressing journalism to begin with.

*Sociology* has offered the default setting for thinking about how journalism works. Largely built upon a memorable body of work called the ethnographies of news or the newsroom studies

of the seventies (Fishman, 1980; Gans, 1979; Tuchman, 1978), sociological inquiry by and large has created a picture of journalism that focuses on people rather than documents, on relationships, work routines, and other formulaic interactions across members of the community who are involved in gathering and presenting news. Sociology has established the idea that journalists function as sociological beings, with norms, practices and routines (Tunstall, 1971; Waisbord, 2002; Weaver & Wilhoit, 1996), that they exist in organizational, institutional and structural settings (Breed, 1955; Epstein, 1973; McManus, 1994), that they invoke something akin to ideology in their newswork (Gitlin, 1980; Glasgow University Media Group 1976), and that their activities have effects (i.e., Lang & Lang, 1953).

In that sociology has largely favored the study of dominant practices over deviant ones and freezing moments within the news-making process for analysis rather than considering the whole phenomenon, it has created a picture of journalism from which much other inquiry proceeds. The emphasis here on behavior and effect more than meaning, on pattern more than violation, on the collective more than the individual, has helped advance a view of journalists as professionals, albeit not very successful ones (Henningham, 1985). This work has remained somewhat captured by its past, in that early canonical work has yet to address fully the more contemporary trends toward conglomeratization, corporatization, standardization, personalization, convergence, and the multiple (often differently normative) nature of journalistic work in its more recent forms (Benson & Neveu, 2004; Cottle, 2000). Moreover, this work has been primarily structured within the confines of US sociology, and its pictures of primarily mainstream news organizations in the United States have assumed a universal voice in standing for our understanding of journalism.

*History* and the inquiry of news have evolved largely from the earliest expansions of journalistic academic curricula. Central in establishing the longevity of journalism and journalistic practice, the history of news has used the past—its lessons, triumphs, and tragedies—as a way to understand contemporary journalism. Within this frame, what has drawn academic attention has tended to be that which has persisted. However, the picture has been a narrowly drawn one.

Largely dependent on documents rather than people, historical inquiry can be divided into three main kinds of documents—journalism history writ small, as in memoirs, biographies and organizational histories (i.e., Gates, 1978); history writ midway, organized around temporal periods, themes and events, like “the penny press” or “war journalism” (i.e., Nerone, 1994; Schudson, 1978); and history writ large, where the concern primarily surrounds the linkage between the nation state and the news media (i.e., Curran & Seaton, 1985). Each differs substantially by the country being considered, as work from Australia and France suggests (Kuhn, 1995; Mayer, 1964). Missing here has been a conscious twinning of the role that writing history plays for both journalists and the academy: The histories of journalistic practice published primarily in US journalism schools with the aim of legitimating journalism as a field of inquiry do not reflect the generalized, so-called objective histories that followed the model of German historicism (Carey, 1974; Scannell, 2002). Not enough effort has been invested in figuring out how to better combine the two. Here too a focus on largely US history (and its progressive bias) has bypassed the extremely rich and varied evolution of journalistic practice elsewhere in the world. Not surprisingly, much of this scholarship has had to wrestle with the question of who can lay claim to the past. The issue of “whose journalism history” remains to this day an underlying challenge to those doing historical inquiry.

The study of journalism’s *languages* has assumed that journalists’ messages are neither transparent nor simplistic but the result of constructed activity on the part of speakers. Developed primarily only during the past 35 years or so, this area has been markedly European and Australian in development (i.e., Bell, 1991; Van Dijk, 1987). The combination of formal features of language—such as grammar, syntax and word choice—with less formal ones—such as storytell-

ing frames, textual patterns, and narratives—has grown to address verbal language, sound, still and moving visuals, and patterns of interactivity.

There have been three kinds of language study—informal study, which uses language as a backdrop without examining extensively its features, such as content analysis and semiology (Hartley, 1982; Schramm, 1959); formal study, such as sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and critical linguistics (Fowler, 1991; Greatbatch, 1988); and the study of the pragmatics of language, as in the patterns of language use in the news that are shaped by narrative and storytelling conventions, rhetoric, and framing (Campbell, 1991; Gamson, 1989). This inquiry has gone in different directions, with framing largely focused on the political aspects of news language and narrative and storytelling targeting its cultural aspects and particularly alternative forms like tabloids or newzines (i.e., Bird, 1990; Reese, Gandy Jr., & Grant, 2001). In stressing not only the shape of language itself but also its role in larger social and cultural life, this largely microanalytic work suffers from a lack of applicability to other kinds of inquiry. At the same time, though, its beginning premise that language is ideological challenges both traditional mainstream news scholarship as well as journalistic claims that the news is a reflection of the real.

*Political scientists* have long held a normative interest in journalism, querying how journalism “ought” to operate under optimum conditions. Interested in examining journalism through a vested interest in the political world, an assumption of interdependency between politics and journalism motivates this inquiry. Thus, many scholars have clarified how journalism can better serve its publics. Political science inquiry has ranged from broad considerations of the media’s role in different types of political systems, such as the classic *Four Theories of the Press* (Siebert, Peterson, & Schramm, 1956) to studies of political campaign behavior, journalistic models and roles and the sourcing patterns of reporters and officials (i.e., Graber, McQuail, & Norris, 1998; Sigal, 1973). Also of relevance is the extensive literature on public journalism (Rosen, 1999).

Largely US in focus, although some parallel work has been done by scholars of government and politics in the United Kingdom, Latin America and Eastern Europe (i.e., Fox, 1988; Schlesinger & Tumber, 1995; Splichal & Sparks, 1994), this work has considered journalism’s larger “political” role in making news, such as journalism at its highest echelons—the publishers, boards of directors, managing editors—more often than at its low-ranking individual journalists. Many of these studies have been motivated by normative impulses and have concluded on notes of recuperation, which suggest that journalism is and should be in tune with more general political impulses in the society at large.

Finally, the *cultural analysis* of journalism has tended to see itself as the “bad boy” in the neighborhood. It has defined itself as querying the givens behind journalism’s own sense of self, seeking to examine what is important to journalists themselves and exploring the cultural symbol systems by which reporters make sense of their profession. In assuming a lack of unity within journalism—in news-gathering routines, norms, values, technologies, and assumptions about what is important, appropriate, and preferred—and in its research perspective, which uses various conceptual tools to explain journalism, much of this inquiry has followed two strains, largely paralleling those evident in models of US and British cultural studies—the former focusing on problems of meaning, group identity and social change (i.e., Ettema & Glasser, 1998; Pauly, 1988; Steiner, 1992), the latter on its intersection with power and patterns of domination (i.e., Hall, 1973; Hartley, 1992). This work has looked at much of what has not been addressed in the other areas of inquiry—worldviews, practices, breaches, form, representations, and audiences—but all with an eye to figuring out how it comes to mean, necessitating some consideration of the blurred lines between different kinds of newswork—such as tabloid and mainstream (Lumby, 1999; Sparks & Tulloch, 2000), mainstream and online (Allan, 2006), newswork and the non-news world (Eason, 1984; Manoff & Schudson, 1986). The value of some of this work, however,

has been challenged by the field's own ambivalence about journalism's reverence for facts, truth and reality, all of which have been objects of negotiation and relativization when seen from a cultural lens.

Each frame for studying journalism has emerged as a singular and particular prism on the news, creating a need for more explicit and comprehensive sharing across frames. Not only would such sharing help generate an appreciation for journalism at the moment of its creation, but it would offset the nearsightedness with which much scholarship on journalism has been set in place. How scholars tend to conceptualize news, newsmaking, journalism, journalists, and the news media, which explanatory frames they use to explore these issues, and from which fields of inquiry they borrow in shaping their assumptions are all questions in need of further clarity. Adopting multiple views is necessary not only because journalism scholarship has not produced a body of scholarly material that reflects all of journalism, but it has not produced a body of scholars who are familiar with what is being done across the board of scholarly inquiry. There is both insufficient consensus about journalism and about the academy that studies it. The result, then, is an existential uncertainty that draws from pragmatic, pedagogic and conceptual dimensions of the relationship between journalism and the academy.

### FUTURE CORRECTIVES

Numerous correctives can help resolve journalism's existential uncertainty. Positioning journalism as the core of a mix of academic perspectives from which it can most fruitfully prosper is essential. Recognizing journalism as an act of expression links directly with the humanities in much the same way that recognizing journalism's impact links directly with the social sciences, and those alternate views need to be made explicit as equally valued but nonetheless partial prisms on what journalism is. Keeping that inquiry porous—so that it is possible to examine not only what many of us know about journalism, but how we have agreed on what we know—is no less important. Similarly, keeping craft, education and research together in the curriculum will help us understand journalism more fully. In this regard, journalism studies is about making a setting to include different kinds of engagement with journalism—both those who practice journalism, those who teach others to practice journalism, and those who teach yet others to think critically about what that practice means. None of this is a new idea: Everett Dennis (1984) made a similar call over twenty years ago, and such a notion underlies both the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education and the European Erasmus Mundus program in journalism and media.

In some places there has already begun to be movement toward tweaking the foundation of journalism's study. The founding of two parallel academic journals in the late 1990s—*Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism* and *Journalism Studies*—reflects a need for a concentrated place to air the concerns about journalism that arose from academic inquiry. New research centers have developed that are devoted to journalism studies and to the study of certain aspects of journalistic performance—trauma, religion, and online journalism, among others. And finally, a Journalism Studies Interest Group (now Division) was recently established at the International Communication Association, with the intention of bringing together journalism theory, research and education. In all cases, these efforts have provided a corrective to the limitations of journalism's inquiry in its existing frameworks.

All of this is a long way of saying that we need to figure out how to make journalism simultaneously more of the world while keeping it at the forefront of our imagination. Finding a clearer template for the mutual engagement of journalism and the academy depends on our being ahead

of journalism's development—on anticipating where it needs to go and on envisioning broad and creative ways in which it might go there. Journalism is too important to not address the issues raised in these pages, but if it does not wrestle with them quickly, it remains questionable as to what kind of a future it will face.

## REFERENCES

- Adam, G. S. (1993). *Notes toward a definition of journalism*. St. Petersburg, FL: Poynter Institute.
- Allan, S. (2006). *Online news*. New York: Open University Press.
- Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2004). *Bourdieu and the sociology of journalism*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Berkowitz, D. (2000). Doing double duty. *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, 1(2), 125–143.
- Berger, P., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality*. Garden City, NJ: Anchor Books.
- Bird, S. E. (1990). *For enquiring minds*. Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press.
- Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom. *Social Forces*, 33, 326–335.
- Bromley, M. (1997). The end of journalism? Changes in workplace practices in the press and broadcasting in the 1990s. In M. Bromley & T. O'Malley (Eds.), *A journalism reader* (pp. 330–150). London: Routledge.
- Bromley, M. (2003). Objectivity and the other Orwell. *Media History*, 9(2), 123–135.
- Cameron, J. (1997 [1967]). Journalism: A trade. In *Point of departure*. London: Arthur Barker; reprinted in M. Bromley & T. O'Malley (Eds.), *A journalism reader* (pp. 170–173). London: Routledge.
- Campbell, R. (1991). *60 Minutes and the News*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Carey, J. (1974). The problem of journalism history. *Journalism History*, 1(1), Spring, 3–5, 27.
- Carey, J. (2000). Some notes on journalism education. *Journalism: Theory, Practice and Criticism*, 1(1), 12–23.
- Cottle, S. (2000). New(s) times: Towards a “second wave“ of news ethnography. *Communications*, 25(1), 19–41.
- Curran, J., & Seaton, J. (1985). *Power without responsibility*. London: Fontana.
- Dahlgren, P. (1992). Introduction. In P. Dahlgren & C. Sparks (Eds.), *Journalism and popular culture* (pp. 1–23). London: Sage.
- Dennis, E. (1984). *Planning for curricular change: A report on the future of journalism and mass communication education*. Eugene: School of Journalism, University of Oregon.
- Douglas, M. (1986). *How institutions think*. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Durkheim, E. (1965 [1915]). *The elementary forms of the religious life*. New York: Free Press.
- Eason, D. (1984). On journalistic authority: The Janet Cooke scandal. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 3, 429–447.
- Epstein, E. J. (1973). *News from nowhere*. New York: Random House.
- Ettema, J., & Glasser, T. (1998). *Custodians of conscience*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Fish, S. (1980). *Is there a text in this class?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Fox, E. (1988). *Media and politics in Latin America: the struggle for democracy*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Fishman, M. (1980). *Manufacturing the news*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. London: Tavistock.
- Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news*. London: Routledge.
- Ganson, W. (1989). News as framing. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 33(2), 157–161.
- Gans, H. (1979). *Deciding what's news*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gates, G. P. (1978). *Airtime: The inside story of CBS news*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Gitlin, T. (1980). *The whole world is watching*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Glasgow University Media Group. (1976). *Bad news*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Graber, D., McQuail, D., & Norris, P. (Eds.). (1998). *The politics of news: The news of politics*. Washington, DC: CQ Press.

- Greatbatch, D. (1988). A turn-taking system for British news interviews. *Language in Society*, 17(3), 401–430.
- Gunaratne, S. (1998). Old wine in a new bottle: Public journalism, developmental journalism and social responsibility. In M. E. Roloff (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 21* (pp. 276–321). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hall, S. (1973). The determinations of news photographs. In S. Cohen & J. Young (Eds.), *The manufacture of news* (pp. 176–190). London: Sage.
- Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hartley, J. (1982). *Understanding news*. London: Methuen.
- Hartley, J. (1992). *The politics of pictures*. London: Routledge.
- Henningham, J. (1985). Journalism as a profession: A reexamination. *Australian Journal of Communication*, 8, 1–17.
- Kuhn, R. (1995). *The media in France*. London: Routledge.
- Kuhn, T. (1964). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, K., & Lang, E. (1953). The unique perspective of television and its effect. *American Sociological Review*, 18(1), 103–112.
- Lumby, C. (1999). *Gotcha: Life in a tabloid world*. Sydney: Allen and Unwin.
- Manoff, R., & Schudson, M. (1986). *Reading the news*. New York: Pantheon.
- Marques de Melo, J. (1988). Communication theory and research in Latin America. *Media, Culture and Society*, 10(4), 405–418.
- Mayer, H. (1964). *The press in Australia*. Melbourne: Lansdowne.
- McManus, J. (1994). *Market driven journalism: Let the citizen beware*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nerone, J. (1994). *Violence against the press*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neveu, E. (1998). Media and politics in French political science. *European Journal of Political Research*, 33(4), 439–458.
- Orwell, G. (1946). Why I write. *Gangrel*, Summer.
- Orwell, G. (1999). *Smothered under journalism, 1946*. London: Martin Secker and Warburg, LTD.
- Pauly, J. (1988). Rupert Murdoch and the demonology of professional journalism. In J. Carey (Ed.), *Media, myths and narratives* (pp. 246–261). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Park, R. E. (1940). News as a form of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 45, March, 669–686.
- Project for Excellence in Journalism. (2007). *State of the news media: An annual report on American journalism*. Washington, DC: Project for Excellence in Journalism.
- Reese, S., Gandy Jr., O., & Grant, A. (Eds.). (2001). *Framing public life*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Rosen, J. (1999). *What are journalists for?* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Scannell, P. (2002). History, media and communication In K. B. Jensen (Ed.), *A handbook of media and communication research* (pp. 191–205). London: Routledge.
- Schlesinger, P., & Tumber, H. (1995). *Reporting crime*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Schudson, M. (1978). *Discovering the news*. New York: Basic Books.
- Schramm, W. (1959). *One day in the world's press*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Siebert, F., Peterson, T., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four theories of the press*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Sigal, L. (1973). *Reporters and officials*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- Sparks, C., & Tulloch, J. (2000). *Tabloid tales*. New York: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Splichal, S., & Sparks, C. (1994). *Journalists for the 21st century*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Steiner, L. (1992). Construction of gender in news reporting textbooks, 1890–1990. *Journalism Monographs*, 135, October, 1–48.
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news*. New York: Free Press.
- Tunstall, J. (1970). *The Westminster lobby correspondents: A sociological study of national political journalism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Tunstall, J. (1971). *Journalists at work*. London: Constable.
- Van Dijk, T. (1987). *News as discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

- Waisbord, S. (2002). *Watchdog journalism in South America*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Weaver, D., & Wilhoit, G. C. (1996). *The American journalist in the 1990s*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Weber, M. (1948). Politics as a vocation. In *From Max Weber: Essays in sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Zelizer, B. (1993). Journalists as interpretive communities. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 10(3), 219–237.
- Zelizer, B. (2004). When war is reduced to a photograph. In S. Allan & B. Zelizer (Eds.), *Reporting war*. London: Routledge.
- Zelizer, B. (2004). *Taking journalism seriously: News and the academy* (pp. 115–113). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zhao, Y. (1998). *Media, market and democracy in China: Between the party line and the bottom line*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.