



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Journalism and public relations: two training strands

van Ruler, A.A.

Publication date
1997

Published in
European journalism training in transition : the inside view

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

van Ruler, A. A. (1997). Journalism and public relations: two training strands. In J. Bierhoff, & M. Schmidt (Eds.), *European journalism training in transition : the inside view* (pp. 35-37). European Journalism Centre.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

European Journalism Training in Transition **the inside view**

Edited by

Jan Bierhoff

Mogens Schmidt

European Journalism Centre

Maastricht 1997

European Journalism Centre
Sonnevillelunet 10
6221KT Maastricht
The Netherlands
tel: +31 43 325 40 30
fax: +31 43 321 26 26
email: <mailto:secr@ejc.nl>
website: <http://www.ejc.nl>

Contents

- 5 [Preface](#)
Jan Bierhoff, Mogens Schmidt

- 9 [What prospects for young journalists?](#)
Annelie Ewers

- 13 [Journalism training and critical thought](#)
Dominique Vidal

- 17 [What shall we teach? Mapping the curriculum](#)
Brian Winston

- 23 [Journalism education and the groves of academe](#)
Hugh Stephenson

- 27 [A general or a specialised study programme](#)
Ingeborg Hilgert

- 31 [Mid-career training and the media industry](#)
Helmut Ramminger

- 35 Journalism and public relations: two training strands
Betteke van Ruler
- 39 Brave new media world; the era of online journalism
Jan Bierhoff
- 43 Distance learning models in journalism education
Mogens Schmidt
- 47 Educating journalists for a new Europe
Hans-Henrik Holm
- 51 The music of change; journalism training in Eastern Europe
Jan Jirak
- 55 A joint perspective; networking the European journalism schools
Angelo Agostini
- 59 Rethinking the journalistic education
Ami Lönnroth

Preface

Jan Bierhoff, Mogens Schmidt

In a recent speech for the British Publishers Association, George Steiner predicted the end of the novel and a new era of literacy, based on modern technologies. Not literature, but the mass media attract the talent nowadays; what better literary achievement than the authentic journalistic live coverage, he provoked.

This quote is typical for the growing awareness that media environments will not be the same in another decade. Digital technology, emerging new formats and content categories, completely different working conditions, all of this will profoundly alter the face of journalism and consequently have a strong impact on the world of journalism training.

This publication presents a number of views on this imminent change; not a coherent overview, no research findings, no figures. Its pretension is to contribute to the debate about the subject in journalism education circles; European training executives present their views on the various dimensions of their profession.

With the arrival of digital communication, more

is happening than just the addition of another medium. The expansion with film, radio and later television marked important stages in the development of a multi-media landscape, but the communication pattern defined by the press did not change fundamentally. All these media distribute information from a central point. The producers are part of a relatively small professional group. Media users can make a selection, but their role is to consume information. This will change with the online services. Time and space limitations become relative, and media roles reciprocal. Once the communication model changes, journalism cannot remain unaffected. Also journalism educators will have to search for a new paradigm for their training efforts.

An important issue in this respect is the need to differentiate between the various functions of information. Journalism up till now had the status of being relevant for the political process, with a well defined position in the checks and balances of our democratic society. But more and more, media information serves other, more

neutral, more individual needs. Information has in many instances become a highly segmented useful service, amusement, in short a commodity, and is not anymore the process through which a given society develops its democracy and political identity. Journalism schools are first now reacting to this process. Virtually all training programmes still base themselves - often implicitly - on the public purpose of journalism. The practice of graduates working for completely different media settings is silently accepted, but has not yet lead to a differentiated training model.

The inclination to keep all trends, developments into one comprehensive training schedule is understandable from a management point of view, but is no longer adequate. The time seems ripe for at least two models, one that continues to produce the classical journalist and one that begins to educate the various types of information-organisers the media are asking for.

For all training models, irrespective of duration and emphasis, whether serving different functions, the question of the definition of the term 'professionalisation' will arise. What is professional competence? Especially for the more recent job profiles, focusing on the collection of data, it will be important to develop performance norms that go beyond the technical skills and also

include the capability to understand media effects and to make balanced ethical decisions. Such a comprehensive definition of professionalisation (skills, insight, judgement) should in fact be the standard, the reference point for all forms of responsible media action, and for that reason be part of any training programme.

Will journalism schools be able to incorporate all the demands, pressures, sometimes contradictory claims from the media world? What exactly is their role, their mandate? There are at least two positions, quite different from each other, but both part of the expectation pattern of the industry. The one is training as a reflection of the actual needs, with graduates who can easily be slotted in into existing routines. The other is journalism training as a development laboratory where students have the freedom to grow and new ideas, new genres based upon new technologies can be tried out. Schools sometimes are torn between these two poles of being either a follower or an innovator. And the media industry often says it wants the latter but expects the first.

Especially in times of change, it can be helpful to have a basis of comparison. The growing co-operation between European schools of journalism during the past five years has created such a platform. Choices and solutions of others

can be measured against one's own traditions. Colleagues can be a source of consultation and inspiration. Although training methods have traditionally been national in scope, the international contacts start to make an impact. There is a tendency towards convergence, through new initiatives, via implementation of curriculum changes, and in the general opinion climate about journalism education.

A few examples. In the dilemma we mentioned, the choice between a reactive and a pro-active attitude towards the industry, more schools take initiatives which hint at a preference for the exploratory role. This counts for the development of transnational networks, for more or less structural co-operation with partners abroad and for experiments with new media applications. An other example one finds on the level of curriculum development. As a consequence of regular contacts, a consensus about the 'ideal' study programme slowly emerges and steps are taken in that direction. Many school directors now think that quality counts, matureness of graduates is important, as well as a good general education to base the practical training on. Consequently, the post-graduate model meaning a year or longer of vocational training after (or in combination with) a university degree, receives increasing attention.

Also the further training traditions in different European countries strongly influence the ideas about basic education. Realising the fact that change is the only permanent factor, training cannot be an event you attend for only once in a professional career. More and more journalism training institutions therefore have developed instruments to be able to serve the growing need for further training, be that in the format of short injection-courses or long-cycled open university programmes.

A last remark brings us back to the digital technologies which trigger off so much debate. The online services will not only create new standards for publishing, they also will influence the process of learning, including the field of journalism education. Internet and other providers create new opportunities for cross-border training. Large audiences will be able to communicate intensively at relatively low costs. Physical distances will be less important in this setting. Especially for pan-European, or even global initiatives, there are chances to be taken.

Maastricht, July 1997

What prospects for young journalists?

Annelie Ewers

Thinking about the future prospects for young journalists - I cannot help looking back at myself as a young journalist and at the prospects I had when entering the profession at 21 years of age in 1971. Since there is, as we all know, no future without the past, I will simply write down a few words about this journalistic past of mine, as I remember it, and the present, as I see it confronted by the young journalists coming into the media markets all around Europe.

First and most - 25 years ago, I felt that I knew what profession I was trained for. There was no doubt in my mind as to what was a journalist. The duties and responsibilities of the journalist were clear to me and my friends at the Stockholm University journalism school - we were the free, objective defenders of democracy, journalism was a vocation, a mission - not quite like the one of Florence Nightingale but not very far from it either. We would never even consider soiling our sleeves in such base professions as information officers, marketing consultants, lobbyists etc. - these were all our enemies, by definition. And we would never yield to pressure from

anybody, short of God above.

The world of journalism of today, and of the years to come, is and will be, quite a different one. The simple ideology of the do-gooders is no more, the possibilities, demands and challenges are based on new sets of values, where the ethics and morals of the journalists gets more and more individualised by the day.

The changes appear on all levels - new media and new media technology create new job profiles on the media market - professions where young men and women trained in journalism institutions can turn rich and prosperous very quickly (even without any formal training). These young people will have no problems at all with doing infotainment in the morning, commercials at noon and news reporting in the evening. They are just being flexible, responding to market conditions.

Let there be no misunderstanding: this flexibility is needed. It is even logic. You can become somebody in the new world of so called

journalism, just by being a face, and a very young face, at that. You will do even better if you are sort of a multimedia person, if you are prepared to work hard and to adjust to the demands of those who hired you. No revolutionaries wanted, I would say. And no revolutionaries produced, at least not at the Institute of Journalism where I come from.

So - the somewhat blurred vision of what is a journalist is one of the major differences of the journalistic world of today and yesterday. And there are others, like the changes in quantity of available jobs, the emphasis on free-lance work, the increased productivity demands and growing superficiality of media material. And more women found a place in the newsrooms, immediately implying less alcohol and cigarettes - as well as lower wages.

But what about similarities? Well, this is as far as I get without starting to contradict myself. Because - in one way or another - the basic instinct is still there. Not with everyone who likes to call him/herself a journalist, but still with very many. We still want to do a good job. We still think that high credibility with the readers, listeners and viewers is something worth fighting for. Most of us still believe that freedom of expression is something that has to be exercised

and defended every day of our journalistic lives.

To me, this basic instinct is something precious. If we would loose it, we would loose what we still like to think of as independent journalism. We would have to redefine the role of the media in society - and we would, subsequently, have to redefine the concept of democracy as such. If we think this basic instinct is worth saving for the after-world, not to be stored in the museums along with the other dinosaurs - then the question must be - how do we protect it? How is this basic concept of journalistic values to be injected into the systems of young journalists and journalists to be, as a vaccination for life against corruption of all sorts? How, in short, do we prepare our future reporters?

For me preparation reads education. One of the keys - if not the one and only - to journalistic identity and understanding most definitely can and must be found in journalism training as well as in further training of the already trained. But - and I want to be very clear on this - it is not a brainwashed cadre of identical journalistic robots that I am asking for here. I am asking for individual thinking. I am not promoting the idea of written down ethical codes, globally adopted - I am in search of the moral reflection in the mind of every single working journalist.

Because - in my mind - with unreflective journalists doing their job by the book - by anybody's book, in fact, but their own - we are running the risk of, in the end, not being able to identify journalism as a credible or useful profession at all. And we are already halfway there.

“I am not doing media right now”, said this years Nobel Prize winner, the Irish author and poet Seamus Heaney, when asked by journalists to be interviewed. Many others, less powerful and well off, would feel the media are doing them. As a young journalist, 25 years ago, I never ever had the idea either of being done by anybody, or that I should be a part of the doing people. I only had this rather stupid and naive idea of being the voice of the voiceless - and if that one holds any value for the future, remains to be seen.

Annelie Ewers is director of FOJO in Kalmar, Sweden and former president of the European Journalism Training Association.

Journalism training and critical thought

Dominique Vidal

In the capacity of board member of CFPJ (Centre de formation et de perfectionnement des journalistes) and president of AEFJ (Association européenne de formation au journalisme), I have defended for many years a teaching model of our profession in France and in Europe which was - in my view - performing suitably to inspire co-operation with our partners from Asia, the Maghreb, Machrek, and in Africa.

What is this model all about? It's all about providing an intensive, relatively short and basically professional education to students - who have a graduate degree - and hence are supposed to have a good general knowledge and to be fairly specialised. An education, based on practical learning through exercises and training of the required techniques, to be able to practice our profession in the written press, radio and television. The principal virtue of this idea was - as said - to respond to the real needs of our profession.

Is this still the case? I wonder. Particularly in light of the worsening of the information crisis - primarily obvious in France. It all depends, of

course, of the analysis you make. As an example, let's take the case of the national daily press in France. For two significant successes - the new *Le Monde* and the continued progression of *Le Parisien*; there was many failures in just a few months time: *InfoMatin* died, *Libération* was forced to sell itself to an industrial group to survive, *France-Soir* is threatened. The increase of the manufacturing and distribution costs, and the decrease of publicity - primarily in the classified ads - is not good enough a reason to explain such a disaster. In other words, on top of the economic crisis, we are witnessing an identity crisis leading to a content crisis.

The reasons are obvious. The average Frenchman watches one TV news programme in the evening and listens to one morning news edition on the radio. He may be diligent, but not necessarily less critical: in one year time, for instance, confidence in television fell from 60 percent to 45 percent. When people find in the newspaper stand only newspapers which repeat the same information with an obvious delay in comparison with the audio-visual version - and with only authorised

comments - what we call in Le Monde Diplomatique “la pensée unique”, why would they bother to buy them? On top of this: they are expensive : Libération costs 7 fr, which is more expensive than the Sueddeutsche Zeitung, The Independent, La Repubblica or even El Pais and for a much smaller number of pages. In my opinion, what readers are waiting for are completely renewed dailies which add considerable value - in the area of in-depth information and critical distance, specialisation, services, etc.

Here is where the perception of needs diverges. The answer of many business leaders is well known: they have simultaneously reduced the number of journalists and privileged general availability at the cost of specialisation. In other words, they have tried to build teams of ‘all-round’ journalists - in the sense that they are supposed to do everything good - and are at the same time less expensive and more adjustable from an ethical and political viewpoint. This disastrous choice has hastened the decline of the concerned newspapers. I think we should be doing exactly the opposite: invest in the quantitative and qualitative expansion of the newsrooms, so as to build up strong teams capable of renovating the dailies or creating new ones by establishing them better in the French

society. And this reflection goes, I believe, for almost the entire media world, television and radio included.

In the process, suddenly a very demanding profile of journalists pops up. In contrast with the ‘typewriters’ that the press magnates are dreaming of, we now need men and women capable of understanding the world (with a good general knowledge), people who grow their own garden (with a speciality), capable of thinking autonomously (with a critical mind), who believe in their democratic mission (whose professional ethics have become part of themselves). I would like to add an important point, which is not always understood correctly. I do not doubt that the middle class can produce good journalists, men and women who individually are capable to report the reality of a society - there are plenty of examples to prove the correctness of this statement. But collectively, a journalistic class issued from the middle class only would not do its job correctly, especially in light of today’s general social tensions. I would therefore like to add: journalists who - because of their recruitment - reflect the global society, including the most disadvantaged classes.

Is there in France or in Europe one single school director who is confident to say: this is the

portrait of the journalists we are educating? No. Of course not, and it is not only because of us, journalism trainers. By definition, the postgraduate education of journalists depends on the state of the university, or the secondary education. Whatever. Our students, most of the time, come from good families. Their general knowledge, especially in the area of literature and history, is on the decline. University has provided them with very little specialised education. The notion of 'political correctness' has already poisoned their freedom of thought. Starting already from school, their professional ethics sometimes make room for cynicism which is dictated by rough competition in our profession. Are they leaving our schools really 'transformed' ? They may master the techniques, or should I say the journalistic routines, but are they ready to exercise one of the most beautiful professions in this world - in any case one of those professions on which the future of our society depends?

Unfortunately, there is no ready-made solution for the problem. But I am sure of one thing: the model we are so proud of must be screened

against the journalistic needs of the 21st century. Should all universities - being what they are - not re-examine the axiom of postgraduate training? The cultural level being what it is, should we not question the principle of the absolute priority for professional techniques? I would even say this: should journalism schools not become schools of excellence which recruit from each generation and segment of society, and provides combinations of general knowledge, specialisation, ethics and professional training?

Translated from French by Yves Gilson, EJC.

Dominique Vidal is a journalist of Le Monde Diplomatique in Paris and former head of the international department at CFPJ in Paris, France.

What shall we teach? Mapping the curriculum.

Brian Winston

There is, in more than one country, no little confusion as to what legitimately can be considered part of professional journalism training in institutions of higher education. Perhaps a map could be of some use? I offer the following as a preliminary effort. At this stage, I am only concerned with mapping subject matter (what should we teach?), not with delivery modes (inductive or deductive styles, the role of internships etc. etc.).

For the purposes of mapping what we might legitimately teach, let us conceive of journalism as lying within an area where the sphere of information overlaps with the public sphere. I offer this crude definition, of course, in a pragmatic spirit rather to discover a vantage point for map making than to suggest a theoretically nuanced position. Let us just assume that, since not all information lies within the public sphere and not everything within the public sphere is information, our concern lies with what is public and informative.

But, clearly, this embraces more than journalism

and that is the beginning of our difficulties. I would want to position journalism at the heart of these overlapping spheres. In one direction lies commercial speech and in the other the world of the imagination, fiction - what we might call, imaginative communication.

Commercial speech includes public relations and advertising which might well therefore be part of our concerns in a journalism training institution. But advertising is, from the business point of view, a subset of marketing. We are now getting near the boundary of the public sphere/information overlap area. It is surely not the concern of journalism educators to train people to train people in the skills of, say, supermarket product line management. The scheduling of trucks or the organisation of warehouses is likely to be of little interest to us. So somewhere beyond advertising we come to the border of our realm.

Going the other way, we encounter different terrain. We are concerned in journalism with text-based news and visual news. There is another way

of looking at this. We could make the division between text-based and time-based media but new forms are blurring that distinction. Anyway, even time-based media use texts so melding what we current think of as print with what we currently think of as radio and allowing the visual as an addition element seems conceptually preferable in the long term.

However, writing and visualising also belong to imaginative communication. The difference between journalism and imaginative communication is not to be found in differences of techniques necessarily but in what we might call journalism's claim on the real. There is a potential organisational problem here perhaps most clearly seen in the university setting. Creative writing programmes, common in American universities, deal with "non-fiction". At the end of the day, non-fiction creative writing and journalistic feature writing look like pretty much the same thing. This is a prescription for a turf-war.

A similar point can be made on the visual side. Film schools teach documentary, a film genre that depends fundamentally on claiming the real to establish its difference from other, fictional, film forms. Short documentary films or videos look very like longer television news features and

packages.

So journalism education can run from advertising, excluding its more information-less marketing aspects, to text-based or visual imaginative communication, as long as that communication makes some claim on the real.

Let us now enlarge the map:

Advertising can include everything from design through copywriting to technical advertising agency issues such as media buying. Should we decide to include advertising, it is probable we will teach copywriting exactly because it is writing and we are comfortable with that. Emulating the work of agencies in media buying and campaign planning in general is also likely. But design, except in a non-professional sense as part of campaign courses, is, at least traditionally, less likely to be our concern.

A similar approach can be taken to public relations. We are likely to be primarily concerned with media relations as a subset of public relations generally; that is to say, more concerned with teaching the writing (again!) of press releases than with the arts of lobbying. Nevertheless we might determine that an effective education in this field must cover public relations planning

and techniques and that these cannot be understood simply in terms of media relations.

There are two ways of looking at our core enterprise of journalism. If we consider it by current media we have a range of options from newspapers; through magazines to photojournalism, radio and television journalism to the new computer-based media. I suspect most of us would have difficulty recognising as a journalism school any institution which did not teach, at a minimum, newspaper and/or radio.

Given the fluidity of these media at this time, it might be more prudent to conceive of our central area of interest in terms of function rather than specific industrial forms. This way we get a range of activities from reporting through editing to layout, photography, graphics, sound and video and, finally, media management. Again, I suspect not many of us teach media management while most of us would find it hard to recognise a peer who did not teach reporting.

Towards the "creative" side, it becomes, as I suggested above, more straightforward, at least in a pragmatic sense, for all that it is more complex philosophically. Let us just say that we might teach creative writing as long as it is non-fiction and we would be interested in photography and

film and video on the same basis. I suspect that this sort of distinction will be maintained in new areas such as multi-media programming.

This then is the plane upon which we pitch our tents. Some of us huddle safely in the centre close to newspapers and reporting. Others of us attempt to colonise the entire plateau with hardy spirits encamped at the very edges of marketing or multi-media production.

But there's a problem with our plateau. It is, educationally speaking, somewhat parched. It needs irrigation. That is to say, our curricula do not stand on these subjects alone. In each case, most institutions feel support subjects are necessary if students are to gain an effective understanding of their chosen field. Moreover, in many institutions demands are also made to provide students with general education. Now our map starts to become very much more complicated since these support or background subjects differ as we move from advertising through journalism to the "creative" side. Not only that, some professional specialisms might require elements of other professional specialisms as support subjects. And in some specialisms what is a support subject elsewhere could well become a general education topic.

It is impossible to be exhaustive, so these are simple illustrative lists of what might constitute support subjects. The basic question is: "Is the teaching of this subject useful to students undergoing professional training? Or is more useful to them in a general sense as citizens?" For example, for advertising we might well determine that introductory business studies are a necessity for professional training as are courses in ethics and psychology. If we are using the agency model, we could well want statistics as a necessary prerequisite to a media buying course. It could be we think that the law as it applies to advertising and the history of advertising are also necessary.

With public relations, it is probable that we will think some elements of our own journalism courses are needed, reporting for example. We will might, as with advertising, want to include some general business studies, ethics and psychology, pertinent law as well as the specific history of public relations industry in the curriculum. If we are concerned with more than commercial public relations we could perhaps consider a course in political theory as essential for background and support.

For journalism, media law, history and ethics suggest themselves. Political theory could be also considered important and in some countries (alas,

not mine) knowledge of the national literature could be required. If we look at journalism by function, it might be useful to add basic overview courses on media management, advertising, circulation and so on.

On the "creative" side, background courses could include everything from film history and theory to aesthetics.

So, journalism training institutions can vary enormously in the core range of specialisms. They can vary the background courses deemed necessary to support core specialisms. They can treat subjects within the general education provision of the institution differently depending on which core specialism is involved.

And that is not the end of the matter either, for we have yet to consider media studies, that is the academic study of those activities we teach vocationally. In some countries, there is considerable antipathy between those who are engaged in media vocational training and those who study the media. At its most extreme, there is a certain fearfulness that the academic study of the media will actually harm the teaching of professional skills. But, again, I think a little mapping might help. After all, we are not unique in having such a division. If musicians and

musicologists can co-exists, can't we?

Mass Communication is just as far flung as journalism. At a minimum, it can include elements originally drawn from sociology, political science, philosophy, history, literary criticism, philology, linguistics, psychology and, when we think about media technologies, physics.

Can all this really be avoided? Should it be? Even if we do not all do it, nevertheless I would hope none of us would set our face against the teaching of media history or media ethics, It might also be useful to students to understand what sociologists know of audiences, however imperfect their knowledge is. The current debate about the nature of the public sphere in political science might not be without interest to journalism students. In other words, we are already in our support subjects likely to be in grip of mass communications/media studies one way or another, like it or not.

If we want to move courses from general education into support mode, it is therefore

probable we will be doing nothing more than moving from the parent mass communications discipline (e.g. history) to the specific mass communications application of that discipline (e.g. media history). This could happen elsewhere. For example, instead of a general course in linguistics, there could be a specific course in news writing analysis using discourse analysis techniques.

I want to suggest that this little exercise reveals that mass communication studies is not an "other", much less an "enemy". The mass communications map reveals that it is already bound up with our enterprise.

But this is not the point. The point is that this mapping exercise, the map of the journalism school, reveals that our area is both coherent and legitimate. And that, I would submit, is no small matter.

Brian Winston is Head of the School of Communication, Design and Media, University of Westminster, London, UK.

Journalism education and the groves of academe

Hugh Stephenson

At a recent seminar in Maastricht on journalism education, I was asked to make some remarks based on my ten years of experience as director of the journalism school at City University in London.

The title offered to me was 'Ten Reasons for Being the Director of a Journalism School'. My response was that it would be easier to give a talk with the title: 'Ten Reasons for NOT Being the Director of a Journalism School'. Irony, however, is a dangerous tool and I fear that some in the audience may have taken my ironic points seriously and my serious points ironically.

A decade of experience, however, leaves me convinced that the relationship between the world of academe and the world of journalism is not a bed of roses. Perhaps by listing here briefly some of the problematic areas - both intellectual and practical - I can provoke in others some productive thoughts about the future of journalism education.

In my view by far the most important problem

for those of us who teach journalism within the conventional institutions of third level education is that 'journalism' is not really an academic subject at all. I mean that it is not 'academic' in the sense that it is not based on any accumulated body of theory and knowledge, developed intellectually and passed on from one generation to the next.

In this, clearly, journalism is different from philosophy, or history, or chemistry or any of the traditional academic disciplines represented in our institutions of higher education. It is different, also, from other 'practical' branches of education, such as law, or medicine, or engineering, where pure academic knowledge is clearly linked with professional competence. None of us, I think, would like to be represented by a lawyer, or treated by a doctor, or have our house built by an architect who did not have the necessary academic qualifications. But even the most dedicated journalism educator would accept that it is possible to be a journalist of the highest distinction without the benefit of any formal education in journalism.

As journalism educators, therefore, we have to face the fact that our activity has to be made to fit into an (academic) template which is by no means ideally designed to receive it. This involves a professional balancing act in which it is not at all easy to maintain a stable equilibrium between the various 'pulls' of the academic life and the various 'pushes' of the media outside. As educational institutions we are under pressure to provide students with the kind of total educational experience that will furnish them with as good a base as possible for the rest of their adult lives; and to provide staff with an academic career structure based on teaching and research.

So journalism education gets pulled by academic forces in the directions of communication theory and media studies. At the same time, we are under pressure as journalism schools from the media and from our students to concentrate resources more narrowly on turning out graduates with sufficient professional and technical competence to be effective employees from the moment that they are hired.

The observation that most neatly encapsulates this tension is that fact that the most unkind thing that an academic can say about someone's work is that it is 'journalistic', while the most unkind thing that a journalist can say about

someone's work is that it is 'academic'. This tension may be getting less as the educational level of journalists themselves rises, as journalism programmes integrate some conventional elements of theory, and as academic courses include more 'hands on' work in their curricula. But it is not possible to escape the fundamental truth that the essential core of what we as journalism educators can pass on to our students is not academic in nature, but vocational instruction in the basic skills of our craft.

In this respect journalism education is rather like the teaching of acting or dancing. In all these fields, basic talent is inborn and cannot be taught. Some people have it and most people do not have it. What is more, unlike the case of most regular academic subjects, talent and pure intelligence are not necessarily related. This causes us problems in choosing our students, because traditional academic selection methods tend to be based wholly or mainly on tests of academic achievement alone. We all know that, in practice, academic ability alone is a poor indicator of whether or not someone will make a good journalist.

What we can do for those of our students who have the motivation and the talent required to be journalists is to provide them with the techniques

of the business and with the background knowledge that will make the most of their capacities. But once you describe our educational function in these humble terms you are back again at my starting point: namely that we are engaged in a fundamentally vocational rather than an academic activity and that as a consequence we all have more or less difficulty in making this fit into the more traditional 'groves of academe'.

Hugh Stephenson is professor of Journalism at City University in London, UK and former director of its Department of Journalism.

A general or specialist training

Ingeborg Hilgert

“To the point” - that was one of the requests from the editor of this collection of articles to the authors. Therefore - to the point: do we recommend a specialisation in journalism education?

Answer 1: No, if we are talking about the specialisation for one medium - the press, radio or television. If you do not want to condemn your students to unemployment, you have to teach them the techniques and presentation forms of at least two media. That is true today, and will be even more important in the future. Even if the multi-media-age is at present mainly talked about, sooner or later it will become reality - and it will change the work of journalists. Future journalists have to learn at least the basics of the specific forms of multi media-design, the presentation of electronically distributed information in text, sound and photo/film. A clear negative reply, therefore, to the media-specific specialisation.

Answer 2: The answer is not quite as easy, if we are talking about the professional specialisation of

journalism training - meaning the focus on particular subject areas like culture, sports, economics or politics.

Clearly, no journalists can do without a solid journalistic education - regardless in which medium or at which desk he later wants to work. Amongst the basic requirements are research, news and information selection, editing, the ability to write in various forms of presentation, but also some knowledge in media law, politics and economics.

Also clearly: journalists have to understand society; they need to have knowledge about historical, political and economic structures. In most cases the qualifications which future journalists acquire at high school are not enough. Wherever possible, knowledge gaps have to be filled during the journalism education. Practical training therefore has to be complemented by teaching theoretical knowledge as well.

The question remains: do journalists have to be specialists in a certain area? Writes Claudia Mast,

professor at the University of Hohenheim in her latest handbook on journalism education: “After a long period of specialisation in journalism, we can now see a trend towards de-specialisation. The culture editor who only writes critics about ballet performances is out for most media. They want the all-round-journalists with solid professional knowledge who know how to address their target audience. The exact knowledge of the target audience is getting more important than being a specialist in a certain subject.”

It seems logical that the future of journalism does not rest in ballet-critics. Who only wants to write about the pas de deux will live his arts but starve. But how for instance is the journalist doing who studied economics and is an expert in finance and insurance? He can be sure to earn his living in the future in a newsroom none for the worse. Even though there are no data available, economics and science journalists with specialised knowledge are still in demand.

Answer 3: regardless whether you would rather deal with the pas de deux or the Dow Jones - a university education and therefore a specialisation is recommendable for anybody who later wants to work as a journalist at the political, culture, economics or science desk. And this is not only true because most broadcasters and many big

publishing houses in Germany nowadays demand a university degree which thus improves job prospects. What is more, in the best of cases a university education does not only teach specialised knowledge in a certain subject area, it also trains the ability to work methodological. Once you have learned to deal with a certain subject in a concentrated and systematic manner, it will be easier to tackle a new subject fast and concisely - and that will also help in everyday journalism. Therefore, even an education outside the usual “journalistic” fields can be profitable.

Another question is, where and in which order one gets all these qualifications - meaning the practical journalistic abilities, the general social and political education and the academic qualification in a certain subject area. The usual way into journalism in Germany still leads via the, mostly two year long voluntariat, the practical all-round training in the newsroom; most people who do a voluntariat nowadays have a university degree. The possibilities to study journalism are manifold - as main or subsidiary subject or as additional qualification after a first university degree. Finally, there are the schools of journalism; confessional or owned and run by publishing houses, and two independent: the Deutsche Journalistenschule in Munich and the Kölner Schule - Institut für Publizistik.

With this I come from the general theme of journalism education in Germany to the particulars of that education in Cologne. That is the reason, why the editors of this booklet picked out me to write something on the question of specialisation: the Cologne school is after all specialised to train journalists for the political and economics desks. Founded in 1968 the school was the first to combine practical journalistic training with academic studies: the studies of “Social Macro-Economics”. This education which only exists at the University of Cologne, combines macro-economics with political science and sociology. Initial plans of the founders of the Cologne School to also educate journalistic specialists in the areas of law, natural sciences and medicine, were never carried out, because we soon found out that even the co-ordination of the journalistic education with only one academic subject proved to be quite a challenge for time reasons alone.

The first three training semesters are devoted to basic training in journalism: students learn basic knowledge of journalistic working techniques (amongst others: research, editing, interview techniques) and different forms of presentation, as well as knowledge in media, local politics, the law, history etc. After the third semester the academic studies start; from then on the students

are as familiar with the overcrowded auditoriums of the university as they are with the slightly more cosy teaching rooms of the Cologne school. The students acquire their economic and political knowledge mainly during the university studies, but also at the school lectures on political and economic topics are part of the programme.

The students acquire competence in journalism in the training newsroom of the school. From the third semester onwards they write articles for the media, mostly with a political or economic focus: for example a supplement for the Rhein-Sieg-Rundschau on the subject “What does the decision on the German capital mean for the region?”, an article on “Courier Services” for the magazine Impulse, a feature on “Children and Advertising” for the West-German Broadcasting Corporation. The main line is decided by the editors from these media, but the intensive work on the details is done in the training newsroom. There, the students have to present their texts for discussion. And from that follows: revise, do more research, correct, complement, revise, till the final version is “there”.

Working in the training newsroom is not enough. The practical test comes in the semester break: the training plan contains six internships all in all, with local newspapers, in the PR departments of

companies and organisations, at economic and political desks and with radio.

The practical test shows: our concept works. That is not only true for the internships but also for the ultimate test: the students from our school sometimes already have a job guaranteed even before they finish the education.

The Cologne way into journalism is just one of many. Specialisation on a certain subject area during the journalistic training is one possibility, academic studies before or after are others.

A provocative remark at the end: there still are chances for the side-liner who neither graduated from university nor went to a journalism school - if he has the necessary curiosity, the ability to absorb new things, linguistic talent and an analytical mind.

translated from German by Urte Sonnenberg, EJC

Ingeborg Hilgert is professor and director of the Kölner Schule, Institut für Publizistik in Cologne, Germany.

Mid-career training and the media industry

Helmut Ramminger

In many professions in Europe some training has to be undergone by candidates, and in most cases the representatives of the profession have a say in how the candidates for their profession are being trained. Otherwise the training would not be accepted as adequate.

Since the early days of the printed press, journalists were assumed to be talented people, who received all the necessary training in the newsroom or as reporters 'on the beat'. This training system worked in many European countries, and in Austria as well, until the late sixties, when suddenly editors, newspaper publishers and journalists' unions began to feel uneasy about it. Apparently this on the job training for journalism trainees tended to become insufficient in the eyes of the profession. On the other hand there were the universities with faculties on the science of mass communication, but those who had graduated from them were not always welcome in the news offices. Editors preferred graduates from a wide range of studies - from law to biology - but not from mass communication.

Because of this situation, in Austria the publishers' association and the journalists' union discussed in their respective organisations ideas and methods on how to improve the training of young journalists. Basic training courses and follow up courses parallel to their training in the news office were thought to be the adequate way to train young journalists.

As both the publishers and the unions did not want anybody, for example the state, to interfere with their profession, but were interested in mutually accepted standards of training, they decided to initiate their own joint training institution for journalists, the Kuratorium für Journalistenausbildung, KfJ (Council for Training of Journalists).

The publishers of periodicals joined in from the beginning, and only a short time after the foundation of the KfJ the Austrian Broadcasting Corporation ORF joined the association as a member too. Thus, the bigger part of the industry has a say in the curricula of the courses, and accepts the training as being adequate for future

journalists. We think that this very tight link with the industry has several disadvantages, but also some great advantages.

The decisions of any body of representation usually reflect the common denominator. For publishers this means that training should be short and cheap, because it should be available for the smaller publishing houses too, which cannot afford high training costs and additional staff to cover the work of a trainee being on a course. Moreover, the trainee should be trained in his specific field of operation, i.e. either news agency or newspaper, periodical or radio journalism. The training should be comprehensive to such an extent as to convey all the knowledge that has been missed during school days. The unions want journalists to be trained thoroughly and as journalistic all rounders, so as to increase their market value and make them more flexible in choosing from what jobs are available. Broadcasters prefer specialists and think that much of the knowledge a journalist needs in a print medium is useless for a broadcaster.

So to meet the common denominator we have to offer a relatively short basic training course (12 weeks) based on practical exercises in all fields of journalism, but also containing such subjects as press law, ethics in journalism, basic economic

and political knowledge. Compared to other journalism schools like the Henri Nannen Schule in Hamburg we would wish to be able to extend the duration of the basic training to be able to go in depth with the various subjects.

Another disadvantage is that the industry sends the trainees recruited by them, and recruitment in the industry depends largely on the "lucky chance". There are many young people who want to become journalists and who apply to newspapers, to periodicals and to broadcasters. When there is the need for a newcomer in a newsroom, an applicant is picked from the waiting list or from the free lancers and given a chance. Sometimes the newspaper realises only after having paid for the basic training course that the trainee was not worth training.

The advantages of such training - established in accordance with the profession - are that we don't have to assess the trainees being admitted to the basic training course. A further advantage is that the industry and the union regard this sort of training as adequate, and in fact trainees having successfully attended the basic training are regarded as fully fledged journalists, and treated and paid accordingly.

In our basic training courses there are trainees

from the whole range of the profession: from daily and weekly newspapers, from periodicals and from the broadcasters; there are even trainees from the PR field. Thus, the trainees not only get information on the various fields of journalism from their trainers, they also have a chance to exchange their mutual experiences. This broadens the horizon of the trainees and enables much more understanding for the working conditions in the various fields of journalism.

Another advantage of this system is that, as the participants of the basic training course are selected by their editors and sent by their publishers, the participants already have some experience of journalistic work. Some have little experience, but nonetheless the training can build on something and need not start from zero.

Furthermore the industry as a whole accepts the expertise of our institution with regard to training, also with regard to advanced and mid-career training. This means that we also offer advanced and mid-career training courses right up to management courses for journalists or informative workshops on current issues. These workshops cover a wide range of topics from Internet for journalists to creative writing, from photo journalism to infographics. The publishers and the unions, even individual journalists

approach us, when they find that a certain topic should be dealt with in a seminar or workshop. This ensures that we can offer interesting courses on top of our basic training programme, using the industry as a whole for "brainstorming" new ideas.

To maintain good relations with the industry is not too difficult under the circumstances described. We are invited by our board members regularly to inform the decision making bodies of their respective organisations. These decision makers also have a positive attitude towards training in general and our journalism training specifically. The more difficult task is to maintain good contacts and convince those responsible for the training expenses in the "front line" i.e. editors, sub-editors on the one hand, and managers of publishing companies on the other hand. While most of them are convinced of the importance of proper training for journalists, managers and editors often find it expensive to send a young journalist to the basic training course, which means paying for the course, paying the trainee's salary, paying travel expenses, and paying someone who does the trainees job during his absence.

Yet, the contacts with the profession are in general very good. One of the reasons is that the

profession also provides the trainers, and so, editors and publishers know that the trainees are being confronted with the reality of the news rooms. Another reason for the good contacts with the industry is the fact that about a sixth of the Austrian journalists by now have gone through the basic training system, and about a third of the Austrian journalists have used and are regular users of our advanced and mid-career training seminars. This constant contact with the industry and the individual journalists is necessary to maintain and even improve the good links with the profession.

Helmut Rammingner is managing director of the Kuratorium für Journalistenausbildung in Salzburg, Austria.

Journalism and public relations: two training strands

Betteke van Ruler

Public relations, nowadays often called communication management, is a rapidly growing professional field. It is interesting to know that the amount of communication professionals in for instance The Netherlands exceeds the amount of journalists at least 2,5 times.

As in all emerging markets all universities and other educational institutes want to fish in the same pond and are developing curricula in public relations, publicity, organisational communication, communication management, social communication etc., for reasons of clarity here called 'public relations', in short PR.

For a long time many educators and professionals have seen public relations as a natural alternative professional field for journalists. That is why journalism schools offer their students courses in public relations. But also, marketing and business schools have developed PR curricula, not to speak of the speech departments, the pedagogical training colleges, the art schools, etc. Are they all aiming at the same professional field? Yes. But do they all hold the same professional views

concerning that field? The answer is: no. Academies know that just having skills and personality is not enough. So they added general management skills to the programmes. Unfortunately, in most of the curricula it is not specifically articulated what exactly needs to be managed.

To give insight into the current perspectives to be found in existing curricula I constructed a typology. Of course, a typology is not a pure reconstruction of reality, but it does reflect reality and is, insofar, recognisable.

I found the following:

1. Curricula within journalism put an emphasis on two items: general knowledge of the world and publicise the unknown. All efforts go into publicity and making public; the theories that are taught are theories of mass communication and mass media. Essence of these curricula is: how to tell the world your story.
2. Curricula within arts and literature have

emphasis on a slightly different item: the production of a well-targeted story. All concern goes to message production, rhetorics and information processing, and to theories about that. Essence of these curricula: how to tell a target group your story, and inspire them.

3. Curricula within economics and business studies have an emphasis on marketing corporate goals. All concern goes to strategic persuasion and theories that help to persuade. Essence of these curricula: how to convince the target group of what the organisation wants them to think.

4. Curricula within social sciences and communication sciences have again another emphasis, namely on the social and psychological processes of communication. All concern goes to research and theory building as such. Essence of these curricula: how to be a good researcher in questions concerning (mass) communication.

The main problem of public relations education is that none of the afore mentioned models fits very well in current theories of public relations. Several public relations theorists see PR as based in communication theory. Communication theory is currently moving away from the linear transfer models of sending a message to a passive receiver to an interactive model of

communication, in which not only the sender participates, but also the receiver plays its part. Unfortunately many professionals, much of the professional literature, and much of the education material still handle communication as 'a thing to transfer'. Therefore, much attention is given to the logistics of the transfer, and the planning of the media you need as channel, instead of concentrating on the creation of meaning. This is a theme only the communication sciences teach their students as essential element of communication.

Within the public relations practice no-one sees PR as the transfer of messages or the creation of meaning as such. It is almost exclusively seen as an instrument, with which one wants to reach certain targets; e.g. public relations as a 'functional' use of communication theory. Curricula that neglect the fact that there is 'something' to be managed are pricing themselves out of the market. But, according to communication theory, it is of no use to translate that 'something' into the management of bringing the selected target groups to just thinking what an organisation wants them to think.

Public relations is better understood as the systematic, well-organised exchange of messages

to influence both publics and organisations. Recent public relations theories do indeed show such an 'intermediary' view on the essence of the job.

What do public relations professionals do or should be doing within such an intermediary view on their profession? They should help organisations to manage their communication, by means of identifying issues, researching public opinion, counselling management, and evaluating programmes, as well as writing press releases or stories for an internal newsletter. On top of this comes helping the management and to communicate with, understand, and manage conflicts with strategic publics that limit the ability of an organisation to pursue its goals. Just like the financial manager helps the CEO with economic strategies, and the personnel manager helps to plan the social affairs, the communication manager helps to plan the communication with publics. Therefore, public relations is a separate discipline just as marketing,

finance and personnel are separate disciplines within an organisation.

Theorists like Grunig argue that it is not that important whether a public relations department is placed in a school of journalism, speech or business, as long as it is clear that public relations is not a speciality of journalism or speech or something else for that matter, and as long as it has autonomy. But within established educational institutions, it is difficult to get recent public relations theories accepted and implemented. For the education of modern PR professionals it is much better to build a curriculum as a new educational field in an autonomous, but interdisciplinary environment. To know which fields should be enclosed, public relations can best be seen as a boundary spanning position between organisation and environment. From that point of view, it is necessary to teach all about organisations, about environments, and about the public relations profession, and to train skills in order to be a real boundary spanning professional.

Betteke van Ruler is professor at the Faculty of Communication and Journalism in Utrecht, the Netherlands.

Brave new media world; the era of online journalism

Jan Bierhoff

The arrival of digital media and the explosive growth of electronic services will have a serious impact on the roles and production routines of journalism. These changes find their origin in several new techniques: digitalisation, data-compression, network-intelligence and telecommunications technology. Technological developments will not only influence the publishing process, but also the face of journalism.

The amount and direction of change is still an open question. The craft of collecting, selecting and combining relevant information will not become obsolete and the provision of context to the news will remain important, if not become crucial. But the way this task is accomplished, will certainly change. It is thinkable that there will be a split between traditional journalism and the mere provision of information. Already now, seen from a consumers point of view, one can distinguish between three different levels in new media offers:

- journalism; the news part of the new media

services Traditional values like balanced presentation, editorial comment and control of other powers in society are as relevant as for the traditional media.

- online interaction; the exchange of information via bulletin boards and news groups. Other criteria apply here, but users are increasingly urging for a framework based on journalistic values. The role of moderator, structuring the discussion, can be seen as a new genre in journalism.

- information services; tailored news, hypertext data collections. Users perceive these services as commodities, consumption goods. The frame of reference is not longer a journalistic one.

It is likely that all these forms of information production will be developed within the same media groups, sometimes within the same publication. Will this lead to the end of journalism as we know it? There are media watchers who predict the triumph of electronic information gathering, in which the consumer

him or herself can successfully navigate on the sea of data. More realistic is the situation in which there will be a continued need for the selector, the provider of hierarchies of relevance and of context, the opinionator, in short the traditional journalist.

But there will be different routines. The journalist will more and more become the producer of an end product: what he writes will immediately be read; the whole chain of intermediate functions: gatekeepers, sub-editors, printers, distributors, will disappear. It will be you, the wire, the screen and me, buddy. Time will have a completely different meaning, with constant instead of interval deadlines.

The journalist has also to come to terms with the paradoxical situation of vast, almost endless production and transport capacities, and the demand for only small, comprehensive, tailored sections from this enormous potential. It is the paradox of the hard disk and the computerscreen, the difference between what can be stored and what can be made visible.

The prevailing communication model will be less top-down, linear, with information streams from the few to the many, and more horizontal: exchange based, with levelled positions for the

different players in the information process. So, if this is going to be the work place for the future journalist, what kind of person should he/she be? Let us take a look on the provisional profile of the modern journalist.

First: the mindset. The media will be looking for flexible people, professionals with the ability to quickly adopt new routines and work environments. The future journalists should also be reader-oriented, attentive, with respect for feedback on publications. Readiness for follow-up, for a real dialogue, will be required. So far for missionary zeal.

Second: the tricks of the trade, the typical new media skills. The newest journalist should be an able organiser of information pieces. He has to wrap all sorts of relevant sources around news facts, make links to reference documents, historic material, contrasting views. There is already a word for this skill: annotative journalism. Then, he has to be able to design search paths, logical structures, taking the interested reader to the most relevant pieces of information. He also has to understand the nature of the prime interface: the computer screen. On that tiny display, there will be more than text; the future journalist must skilfully combine text elements, images (coming soon: real time video), and

soundbites (just arrived: real time audio). All our senses have to be tickled, and the journalist will be the artist at the keyboard.

Furthermore, on top of the permanent deadline, there is the permanent availability of old news, of previously produced material. Within the logic of hyperlinking, this will keep its relevance, so has to be maintained, kept updated. Journalists will have to revisit their earlier production, instead of constantly looking ahead.

Third: the professional attitude. It is quite obvious that teamwork will be the basis of online journalism. Specialists on various aspects of the information production (content, form, information organisation, technology) will have to work closely together and integrate their skills, at equal footing. This leaves little room for the loner, the slightly eccentric news hound, the romantic stereotype of the trade.

Given the development character of digital media, and this will be the case for at least another decade, new applications will constantly be tried out.

The borderlines between journalism, service information and commercial use of the medium will be vague or even non-existent. Journalists will

have to deal with this fact on the basis of ethical and professional standards.

This point maps out a future battleground. It is quite clear that the chances for commercial exploitation of electronically available information will put pressure on journalists. The tradition of independent news gathering will not automatically be respected by the management of the multi-media companies. When all information actions become plannable, measurable and payable per digit, there are no in-built guarantees for the political relevance of journalism. Journalists will have to defend the integrity of reporting and ultimately to develop new formats which entail both the new opportunities and the traditional values.

Now who will educate the coming generation of digital journalists? Given the speed of development of new technologies and applications, it will be extremely difficult for the existing training institutions to come with an immediate answer. Today's investments may be outdated before they can become effective. It is simply too early to redefine the journalistic study programme completely. Small scale experimenting and a bit of patience until this media whirlwind has eased off, seems to be the right strategy. The media however need their new personnel right

now, to keep in pace with the competition, to have a strategic presence in the new media field. This is a challenge for mainly the mid-career institutions, who can act and react more swiftly, and should enter the market with courses to retrain working journalists and give additional training to young graduates.

The way these people should be trained will also be subject to change. For the moment, the demand is clearly for the multi-skilled jack-of-all-trades, willing to explore all the dimensions of the new technology. But soon one will notice a certain specialisation of roles, emphasising the different aspects of teamwork online publishing: research, control, presentation, design, marketing. By that time, the schools should be ready to assume their role for the era of digital communication.

Jan Bierhoff is managing director of the European Journalism Centre in Maastricht, the Netherlands.

Distance learning models in journalism training

Mogens Schmidt

It is early morning in Glasgow, Jim Jameson of The Daily Mail is looking for the latest messages from teachers and colleagues taking part in the online course in advanced environmental journalism. In Bari, Luisa Manzoni is doing the same. She is working free lance for several local media in Puglia and joined the course thanks to a scholarship from the Italian Union of Journalists. And at a little more civilised time of the day, Natalia Fokina logs on in Novosibirsk. She is going to write some more on her assignment on nuclear pollution in Siberia together with her Swedish and Dutch co-students and at the same time, she will be preparing a piece on the same topic for her daily magazine on the local radio.

It is not quite true, this picture, but in a short time from now, this scenario will be quite normal. The European Journalism Centre is planning to launch four online courses for journalists in 1997. Electronic masterclasses for journalists from all over Europe will be one more option for journalists who want to keep on studying. Further training will not only be night courses or one week enhancement courses, but

will also be available via computer. And in such a format more flexible and economic than before - and maybe on the same quality level as the best international further training right now.

As the need for lifelong learning continues to grow and neither business nor groups of professionals can afford full-time study, more and more flexibility is required in the educational system. For these professional groups like journalists, a delivery system is needed that meets their individual requirements to study at their own convenience of time and place and at their own pace and that, at the same time, also meets their need to study co-operatively and collaboratively in a way that shares and extends their expertise and creativity.

Today's journalist is busy. Besides the investment needed, it takes too much time to join a continuous programme of further training. At the same time, however, a more advanced training of the journalist is more necessary than ever. The professional demands to journalist are growing. There are enormous quantities of information

available and at the same time, time pressure is increasing simply because modern electronic communication makes it possible to circulate information faster than ever. Today's journalist must develop his or hers ability to collect, organise and analyse these great amounts of information often in a very short time. He or she must be able to give priority, to organise and to analyse. This changes the journalist's ability to do research the most efficient and reliable way and it more clearly than ever confronts the journalist with both professional and academic challenges.

On top of this comes the need for a certain specialisation. Because of the rapid growth in the amount of information that journalists have to handle, it will be necessary for journalists to cultivate a specialised field as an area where they have the necessary academic background to cope with accessing and validating the right sources. In several ways, the computer mediated courses will mediate the old distinction between academic and vocational training. Both aspects will be kept together in advanced further training.

The set-up of computer mediated courses for journalists will be on track with their professional work environment. It will be easy for them to access computer hardware and software that will connect to appropriate networks, either from

home or job. A fast growing number of journalists are already using Internet every day for research purposes and are quite confident with its procedures. This may facilitate training that takes place also via Internet and that involves many procedures similar to those used in electronic research.

The computer mediated training will for instance combine the specific training with access to electronic mail, newsgroups, distribution lists, electronic journals, databases, libraries, stock quotations, online sources of information and news services. As more institutions on all levels are connected to each other for administrative applications of networked information, such as transcript exchanges and reporting financial and student information to government agencies; so too will these courses continue to explore and exploit these connections.

It is possible to create frequent interaction between teachers and students and among students themselves with a minimum of effort and a maximum of spontaneity. During training, conversation can be carried on without the participants having to be simultaneously at a particular place. Assignments, queries, questions can be logged in at any time of the day with an extended frame in which to consider the reply.

The students will have a maximum of flexibility of navigation, control and feedback for self-assessment. The courses will offer good opportunities for self-directed and self-managed personal development, and additional benefit when dealing with further training for a well-trained group of professionals.

In order however, to facilitate the social process in such a course, it is wise to have at least a limited number of on-site seminars to launch and assess the course. It is a general experience from these kinds of training programmes that the level of interactivity and the quality of the social climate in these virtual classes increases when students have had the chance to meet. By starting online courses with onsite seminars, the results for the individual journalist will no doubt be optimised.

Instead of unwittingly supporting isolated efforts by the individual distance learners, computer mediated distance courses encourage discussion and collaboration between the participants. Such courses will promote long distance collaboration among journalists and content specialists in the

selected areas. During computer mediated further training, the international dimension in the training is also intensified. Students and faculty can participate in the course from different parts of Europe, even from the whole world, irrespective of time zones. It brings different cultures and different approaches to education into a much closer juxtaposition and raises further issues. Maybe this aspect is one of the most important, as journalism itself becomes more and more international. Much journalistic research is international by nature and dealing with such desks as business and finance and environment; you need to work together with colleagues from other countries. In these courses, collaboration and co-operative teaching go hand in hand. Along the learning process, there will be several opportunities to transform learning into writing and editing by taking on assignments together with colleagues from other countries. Ambitious and realistic at the same time.

Mogens Schmidt is director of programmes at the European Journalism Centre in Maastricht, the Netherlands.

Educating journalists for a new Europe

Hans-Henrik Holm

Europe has changed and is changing. On the one hand Europe is coming together, more than 380 million people divided into 15 states have started the slow and painful process of intensifying co-operation and relinquishing parts of their national sovereignty. On the other hand, Europe seems to be falling apart. Smaller regions like Catalonia in Spain, Scotland in Great Britain and Friesland in the Netherlands demand cultural, political and economic autonomy.

The process of coming together/falling apart has been fuelled by two major events. One is the breakdown of the communist ideology and the resulting reintegration of Eastern Europe into the European process. The other is the process of globalisation.

The intensification of economic, political, cultural and communicative relations across borders in Europe is transforming the nature of the state. States are no longer in exclusive control over their territories. A process of internationalisation is affecting most states and will affect still larger parts of European society.

Journalism education, however, is still moulded by its domestic base. Journalism has always been a national profession first and foremost. Journalists work in their national language. They direct themselves to national audiences. They relate to the national government. The term foreign editor signifies that the outside has been seen as a special area, important but secluded. In spite of the advent of international media like CNN, BBC world, Euronews and a few international papers like *The European* this is still the way it is. Thus journalism education has also been very national. The structure of journalism education in the different European countries has been shaped by the different media cultures. In some countries it is a vocational on-the-job-training with little or no formal schooling. In other countries it is an academic subject that is part of a university degree structure.

The contents of journalism education is also very different from country to country. The subject reflects a strong focus on the national sphere. Subjects that relate to globalisation and the coming together of Europe are most often

compartmentalised as special subjects - if they are on the journalist's educational curriculum at all. European media law is virtually absent from journalistic education. European history, European economics, European politics, European culture, minorities in Europe and the outside world, Europe and immigration, Europe and the environment, European media.... the list is a long one.

The net effect has been to reinforce the national character of the media. This, in turn, has reinforced scepticism and national stereotypes within Europe. Journalists and media use popular perceptions of national stereotypes and journalistic storyboards for relating news from countries other than their own. The same event in one country - i.e. a corruption scandal in Italy is reported quite differently in France, Spain, Germany and Britain. International news is still used to reinforce existing stereotypes in the media.

The increased deregulation of electronic media has resulted in an increased market orientation of radio and TV. More people today watch the same programmes on TV. The same game shows are popular in all countries. The same soap operas get a high number of viewers everywhere. The format of the newsreports are becoming increasingly

similar. However, this "unification" seems to have strengthened rather than weakened national stereotypes. The development of a mass market for TV has trivialised a lot of TV productions, and has not, it seems, furthered international understanding.

At the same time, the globalisation of technological communication creates an increasing number of people who use international communication to select and access information directly. New international media are created as an answer to this demand. We need a journalist education that can meet this demand.

The central question is how do we escape national stereotypes in journalism education. How do we break the mould of a nationally biased understanding of media and news? The process involves two steps. The first step is the internationalisation of education. In many countries in Europe this process has started. More international subjects are being introduced into the curriculum. Some countries have started international journalism programmes where they bring in foreign students as a part of their training programmes. Small scale international projects are initiated where schools co-operate on producing joint magazines, radio or TV programmes. Students travel to other countries.

Teachers visit each other's schools. The national education gain a broader perspective on how to do things nationally by comparing it to how it is done in other countries. International organisations like EJTA have been created to facilitate this sort of internationalisation of the journalism education. The European Commission has been supporting the so-called Euroreporter projects. These projects involve getting a few students and a few teachers together for a few days to make a joint production of magazines, radio programmes or TV stories.

All of these activities are important and perhaps even necessary steps as part of a first phase in internationalisation. but the impact is limited and long range at best. Often these smaller projects result in reinforcing the stereotypes rather than changing them. The north Europeans get their perception of the disorganised south Europeans confirmed and the south Europeans confirm their biased perceptions of the constipated and uncreative northerners. Many if not most of these smaller projects may have negative consequences if they are not part of a process of building transnational understanding.

The second step is to create a transnational European journalism education. This is so far in its infancy in Europe, but it is the main challenge

for the coming decade of journalism education in Europe.

Transnationalising journalism education in Europe involves changes in the perspective from one nation studying other nations to one of achieving a truly comparative understanding of national difference and similarities. It involves an understanding of what is common about European history. It involves an understanding of what a European identity is and is not. It involves the ability to look critically at your own cultural background and stereotypes. Not in order to discard them, but in order to build on them and to transcend the confines of them.

This all sounds very good, but also very lofty. Let me, therefore, conclude by relating how we in Denmark, the Netherlands and Wales have come together on a small scale to try and experiment with programmes that work towards achieving these lofty goals.

Within the last ten years, it has become increasingly apparent that a "new Europe" needed a new kind of European journalism and that this, in turn, required a new kind of transnational journalism education. To this end, in 1989, two journalism schools in two different European countries pooled their resources and began a

transcultural diploma course called "Europe in the World". Created and developed by Danmarks Journalisthøjskole in Århus and the School voor Journalistiek en Voorlichting in Utrecht, this programme has run successfully since 1990 and more than ninety students have graduated in "Eurojournalism". In 1993, the same two schools went one step further and expanded the Europe in the World concept into a one year master's degree in European Journalism Studies. This was accomplished through co-operation with a third partner, the Centre for Journalism Studies at the University of Wales Cardiff. In 1994, the first degrees were awarded to eleven journalists from eight different countries. The MA course is now in its third year with increasing numbers of interested applicants.

The guiding philosophy behind both programmes is that journalism education in Europe needs to become transnational and transcultural and thereby truly European. The focus of both programmes is to transform national journalists into transnational journalists, but to do so with respect for each journalist's cultural background.

To this end, each programme attempts to utilise the respective skills and training of each participant, but expanding these skills to a level at which everyone begins to transcend his or her own national journalistic prejudices or habits. This is accomplished by moving the students across borders and exposing them to three very different styles of education at three separate institutions. They study in the Netherlands and Denmark and - for the MA course - also in Great Britain. In both courses, students learn from integrated syllabi, developed by a board of studies with representatives from all participating institutions. The students study politics with emphasis on the philosophy of nationalism; regional economics; European history since World War II; International relations; comparative European media; EU economics; and pan-European broadcast law. Research trips take them to Brussels and other locations. Teachers from both or all three participating institutions share in the formal evaluations of course work and examinations as well as revisions and modifications of the courses.

Hans-Henrik Holm is professor of Political Science and head of the international department at the Danish School of Journalism in Århus, Denmark

The music of change; journalism training in Eastern Europe

Jan Jirak

The following observations may be understood as a unique experience of one school of journalism as well as a more general reflection on the development of journalistic education in 'post-communist' countries.

Undoubtedly, there are many specific features which cannot be easily transferred from one country to another. Almost undoubtedly, there are - at least - some features which can be put into consideration in rethinking the shape of journalistic education in any school or any country.

The basic (or pre-graduate) journalistic education in Czechoslovakia before 1989 was provided by the Faculty of Journalism within the framework of Charles University, Prague, and Comenius University, Bratislava, both state universities. The mid-career training was provided either by the same schools, or by the Union of Czechoslovak Journalists. The university journalistic education was concentrated on the 'role of the socialistic journalist' as a disseminator of the will of the ruling party and its ideology.

One of the key concepts of any media research was the 'effectiveness' or 'incidence' of the journalistic work and of 'propaganda' as a core part of journalism. The vocational training played the minor role in the journalistic education and was mostly concentrated on 'creativity', i.e. creative writing skills, style and genres in print journalism, pronunciation, speech skills and some basics of handling camera and editing in audio-visual media. The general backbone of the curriculum was formed by the history of journalism and linguistics. The courses in marxist-leninist philosophy and related subjects were an obligatory part of any university curriculum. Checking sources, balanced coverage, independence, professional ethics, law etc. were unknown concepts in the journalistic curriculum.

The fundamental change of the 'social paradigm' in 1989 led to cancelling of all courses related to the ideological and propaganda orientated role of journalists. Not much has been left. Naturally, the concept of journalistic education which could replace the 'old' one was what we were looking for.

There are - generally speaking - two possible ways to improve the journalistic education in the period of a very fundamental transition of the whole society, including mass media and journalism. The first possibility is to stay into one's own (national) tradition, to analyse it, and to examine it, to follow the demands of the sociocultural context in its current stage. The other one is to look around and to get the inspiration from other ('western') schools and to try to improve the journalistic education in the country following the advice and models used elsewhere. This a way to meet the standards of the profession and the education quite easily. One way does not exclude the other and both ways have their specific advantages and limitations.

The period of transition is a period of uncertainty about 'right' and 'wrong' steps including changes in the content of education, and any inspiration is welcome.

In 1990, the School of Journalism of Charles University, Prague, was cancelled and the School of Social Sciences has been established. In the 'constitution' of the new school, there is a paragraph announcing that 'the School of Social Sciences, Charles University will be developing the journalistic education and will offer the study

programme based upon the concept of the free press in the open society, supporting the knowledge and education which may lead to a true independence of students and future journalists'.

In autumn 1990, almost a year after the fall of an iron curtain, the first contacts with our colleagues from western Europe took place (the US professionals and scholars came earlier - as far as I can remember, the first American media scholar appeared in our school in early March. Both European and American colleagues stressed the necessity to improve the standards of vocational training as a condition sine qua non for any further development of journalistic education in the country.

In the meantime and under the influence of our international partners the changes took place. The main aim of all the changes was to develop a curriculum which is comparable with curricula in other schools and countries. In other words, we followed mostly the 'possibility 2' ('looking for the inspiration').

The changes were concentrated primarily on following items:

- to enlarge and improve the vocational training;
- to change the teaching staff. Especially, to

attract working journalists to the school and to led them teach the students;

- to upgrade the equipment, and
- to establish a set of courses of 'a general journalistic education'.

With the great help of our colleagues, especially from the 'Gutenberg Group' of EJTA with whom we succeeded to get a TEMPUS project 'Restructuring of Journalistic Education at Charles University' for 3 years (1992-1994), we have built up a set of core courses in journalistic skills (news writing and editing) and upgraded the equipment. From the very beginning, the implementation of changes in the teaching staff was the most difficult (however crucial) task. The possibility to attract 'new faces', working journalists, wasn't there. The image of the school was not very positive, the salaries and status of teachers not very promising and at the same time the possibilities within the profession almost without limits. Journalists have an average income comparable in proportion with income of their 'western' colleagues and there is no unemployment in the media. In fact the media are still, even in 1996, looking for new people.

One of the most useful items of the TEMPUS project was the establishing of 'compact courses' concentrated on vocational training. Two groups

of students from two schools of the Gutenberg Group, led by two teachers, agreed on some broad topics, gathered information and then met for one week and produced one issue of a magazine or two issues of a newspaper. That was the most effective way of sharing experiences and teaching methods.

Generally, if any school is willing to change its curriculum in journalism, the way to share teaching methods has to be solved. My belief is that it works not only for schools in transition. However, the implementation of skill-orientated courses was successful (though probably did not meet all the expectations of our partners). Students started to produce training newspapers and magazines. We are proud of the first and only e-mail newsletter which is produced both in Czech and English by the students of the first year and sent all over the world via Internet. 'On deadline writing' became an mandatory part of the teaching methods.

All these changes took place before 1995 and since that time the stagnation of the journalistic education in our school is almost touchable. According to my observations, the development of skill oriented courses somehow 'hit the ceiling' because of the accepted professional standards. The journalistic education is deeply rooted in the

standards of the profession itself. Because of the financial situation, most of the students work as part-time or full-time journalists during their studies and have no reason to think about improvement of the professional standards.

There is one big gap however, which was unpredictable in the beginning of the nineties. The level of general knowledge of the society as a whole in the profession and in the media is now very low. In other words, the concentration on the 'possibility 2' may lead towards lack of knowledge of the real sociocultural and political conditions of the journalistic profession. Journalistic standards cannot be easily transferred from one society to another without examining the specific situation. Nowadays, the non-existing research on media and journalism in the country is one of the main weaknesses of the journalistic education.

Jan Jirak is professor and vice dean at the Institute for Communication Studies and Journalism at Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic.

A joint perspective; networking the European journalism schools

Angelo Agostini

The scope and role of journalism education within the European information system can be seen from three perspectives. It is not a matter of different or conflicting points of view. A thorough analysis should indeed assess them within the framework of their steady interaction. However, a brief essay must necessarily apply a selective outlook?

The age-old debate on alternative choices between university curriculum with academic courses aimed at supplying a general culture and specific professional training, devoted to the typical techniques of journalism is still going on. The alternative between academic studies and professional schools has however largely been overtaken by two factors. First, the successful Northern-European pattern of polytechnic schools, that picked out the best items of professional training and university curricula and combined them in a very original teaching method.

Secondly, it must be acknowledged that, while professional schools have had to supplement their

curricula in order to supply their students with a better basic training, universities have been compelled to include in their academic programs sizable courses on practical journalism, as well as apprenticeship. Without such changes, neither the former nor the latter would have been able to meet the challenges that emerged in the last few years.

We often ask whether journalism can be learned or you have to be a born journalist? The issue is now rather old-fashioned, as suggested by the large number of alumni of schools or university departments of journalism who are members of the editorial staff of European newspapers, news agencies, radio and TV stations. In some European countries, the schools of journalism have for decades now been institutional actors in the nation's journalistic tradition.

It would nevertheless be foolish to thus rule out the problem. It is instead advisable to acknowledge the fact that the need lately expressed by the information industry for constant improvement and modernising did pave

the way to the full recognition of the central relevance of training in the world of professional journalism as well.

European journalism has during the three last decades experienced swift, unceasing and most widespread change due to many concurrent reasons: technological advancement in the publishing business; television achieving the status of journalistic medium; the sudden burgeoning of a specific market for communication; the assertion of information as framework and tool for social, economic and cultural development in Western countries; and, finally, the crisis of the market for traditional journalistic work, that hit many European countries from the '80 onwards.

Such change quickly dissolved problems that looked insurmountable, it compelled journalism education to leave established patterns and plans behind, and to deal with the issues of technological growth and, above all, of the continuing revolution into which journalism seems to be. When journalism ceased to be a seemingly simple profession as far as techniques and goals are concerned, when journalism no longer could identify with the reporter who finds out a piece of news for the editor to arrange it for publication, then the related training had to

conform quickly.

In what are a journalist and a PR person different? How should students be trained: only for news-based jobs or, more generally, as communication professionals? Is it enough for the young journalist of the '90s to learn how to check on sources and how to write a piece of news or should he/she be well trained on publishing technologies, on the techniques of TV production, on electronic devices?

These might sound as irrelevant questions. Actually, they shaped the battleground for the great challenge of the European journalism education pattern for journalists in the '80s and the '90s. As a general rule, the schools of journalism had a positive reaction to the above-listed questions and impressed a powerful progressive trend on curricula and programs, in view of innovation and modernisation, and they also promoted, along with basic training courses, a number of mid-career programmes.

Most change, however, was brought by digital revolution. At first, electronic technologies were introduced in newspaper publishing (to which schools, with massive efforts, had to adjust) and then, more recently, the journalistic adventure on electronic highways took off.

Journalists are today required to have many and very different professional skills. A good journalist cannot merely be a good reporter or a talented editor. He/she must also be an expert in graphics, or a budget manager, or a work-team manager, or a marketing manager, an expert in publishing software or an hypertext author, or a multimedia script-writer. To sum up, a good journalist must add to his/her traditional skills one of the many abilities that digital revolution and the increasingly complex features of newsroom management have introduced into the profession of journalist.

If this is how digital revolution affects the professional world, it is hence easy to figure out the changes brought about by the awareness of the magnitude of innovation in journalism education. The young person wishing to become a foreign correspondent had to necessarily add a course on databanks to his/her schedule on political geography. The apprenticeship of a future crime reporter is to be supplemented with a similarly accurate learning program on the dynamic pattern of news processing, on how to organise jobs and works in the editor's office, on the psychological interactions going on in teamwork. A true revolution for those who were used to working on the established standards of the traditional profession (professional training)

and for those who had relied on the passing down of a sound general cultural heritage (university training).

A survey on The New Roles and Tasks of Journalism, organised by EJTA suggests that the keystone was the process-oriented pattern now typifying schedules in schools and university departments of journalism. National and international programs fostered such trend. The EU exchange programs promoted by EJTA, through the "Euroreporter" courses, were definitely a very valuable experience. By actually "making" magazines and newspapers, news agencies and TV or radio broadcasts, a large number of schools have re-created in their classrooms the schemes, the pace, the tension, the organisation of work typical of a real editorial desk.

The great advantage lies in the fact that the schools were able to freely experiment with the solutions and patterns that were fittest for innovation, with no constraints arising from production or market requirements. A freedom that very few publishing businesses have enjoyed in the last few years. The results came quickly. Quite a few schools of journalism have been called upon by publishing businesses for setting up on-line services for widely circulated or local

newspapers, prototypes of on-line or CD-ROM multimedia services, experimental news agencies projects for Internet, organisational patterns for the intensive use of databanks in editorial work. This happened in Sweden, Denmark, The Netherlands, France, Italy and is happening now in many other European countries.

Further advantages add to this new "shape" of European journalism education. On the one side, a substantial benefit: by experimenting innovation with their young students, the schools acquire know-how and skills that will in the end lead to profitable relationships with businesses which in turn will positively affect the schools in terms of investments, exchanges, experiences. On the other side is a great immaterial benefit, perhaps more important than the former. In fact, many schools have intensified their production of information at the local level, providing the "communities" where they are located with a wealth of independent and enterprising voices as far as journalistic information is concerned. But, first and foremost, the schools of journalism, taken as a whole, are becoming a basic actor for the

diffusion of the necessary knowledge for granting as wide as possible access to Information Society. That is, they are becoming the promoters of what is now generally defined as one of the basic citizenship rights for the year 2000. This is the real revolution.

Angelo Agostini is director of the Istituto per la Formazione al Giornalismo in Bologna, Italy and former vice president of the European Journalism Training Association.

Rethinking the journalistic education

Ami Lönnroth

Who has got the power over the curricula in the European journalism schools?

That is a question that must find an answer before even a qualified guess about the future of journalism training can be made. During 1996/1997 when I was doing my study on journalism training in a number of schools, I was struck by two aspects:

1. The production orientation, that is the high quality of the practical training in the schools I visited.
2. The lack of deep-going reflection on the education and on the media one educates for, not least among the students who are above all eager to get out into the world and do the real thing.

As far as I can see, after having spent more than 30 years in newspaper offices, this reflects the general mentality of the media. Journalism is a very qualified handicraft but hardly an intellectual activity.

As long as the handicraft isn't put into question, this doesn't pose any big problems. A refinement of journalistic skills seasoned with a little general knowledge, a few drops of ethics and maybe some teaspoonfuls of foreign languages seems to be a good general recipe to follow.

But what if the handicraft is put into question? That, I think, is the situation where we find ourselves now. Journalism is undergoing radical changes. The structural remodelling of the media that has been talked about at least since the late sixties seems to be there now. Newspapers fold, others diminish their circulation. Publishers "slim" their organisations as well as their products. New layout concepts suggest a concentration on form rather than on content. Web versions are created with varying results, seen from a professional perspective. Efforts are made to adapt to the new media world and attract the young readers who seem less and less keen on the traditional newspaper. In some countries "free papers", financed by advertisements, and with a minimum of journalistically processed information, seem to be

the answer to the same problem.

A great variety of commercial radio channels and TV channels are part of the new media picture. This we all know. But does it affect the journalism training in any way?

How could it affect the journalism training? Let me quote two critical voices from my survey: "What we really lack here is democratic schooling. Journalism is linked with democracy - but that is never talked about. There is too little of critical thinking. In stead a form of neoliberalism - the dividing line between journalism and publicity is hardly distinguishable" (student). "I don't believe in internships in the media. The students will gain some routines and methods that are old and out of fashion and can't be used in the future. The school can prepare students to be innovative journalists. The media don't. They're a conservative force" (professor of journalism).

I quote these two because they stand out from the rest in the many conversations I took part in and interviews that I conducted. They question the whole system of education and media respectively. Inherent in their criticism is a vision of what journalism should be and to their mind isn't.

Democratic schooling, critical thinking, innovative journalists are three positive catchwords to build on in formulating this vision. Very often words like these are used in solemn speeches, but what if they could be implemented in a more practical way, proper to the traditions of journalism training?

Well, it would be unfair to say that this isn't happening. During my visits to EJTA schools, I witnessed educational efforts that point towards a more critical, questioning and at the same time playful future journalism. A few examples: At IHECS (Brussels) the journalism students learn to question the picture of reality presented by the media in a course called "Les oublis de l'information sociale" (the forgotten parts of social information). At Comenius University in Bratislava, the students learn to question themselves as well as the authorities they'll be confronted with in their work with the help of role-play and other psychological methods. This is done within the framework of the subject called "heuristics". The Danish school of journalism (DJH) in Århus has undergone fundamental changes in the curriculum in order to stimulate the creative talents of the students at the same time as their critical thinking and psychological sensitivity is being trained. An effort to do away with the

professional rigidity, the "tyranny of the genres". At Hogeschool Katholieke Leergangen, Tilburg, the whole curriculum is being remodelled in order to break down barriers between practical and theoretical subjects, an effort to see journalism training as a whole.

These changes indicate, as I see it, a wish on the

part of the schools to implement a journalistic philosophy that could act as resistance against manipulations both from market forces and political forces, including the politicising that goes on within educational institutions and authorities.

So, do I then mean to say that the schools

Journalism training in Europe 1997

This report consists of:

1. the results of a survey sent out to all EJTA 66 schools and answered by 56. It also includes
2. a summary of discussions on journalism training, held at the AGM in Paris in 1996 and
3. the result of a self-evaluation study conducted in 8 selected EJTA-schools.

My personal assessment is mainly based on that smaller study. Here I present some facts about journalism training based on the big survey.

- A majority of EJTA schools train students for all types of media, including multi-media.
- The curricula are on the whole very practically oriented. The practical orientation is shown also in the recruiting of teachers. The survey shows a strong predominance of practically trained teachers.
- There is a predominance of men among teachers and of women among students.

- The majority of students in EJTA schools study on undergraduate level.
- Foreign languages are taught as a subject in half of the schools that responded to the demand to send in their curricula. Foreign languages are however used by many more schools as a tool in international exchange.
- EJTA schools are keen co-operators. 43 schools report international cooperation in a number of fields, most frequently in student exchange.
- New teaching methods are being developed above all in new technology.
- High drop-out rates are reported in 12 out of 56 schools.
- 48 (out of 56) schools report that their students often get work after graduation.

The final version of the report will be printed in the autumn of 1997 and can then be obtained from the EJTA or EJC- secretariat in Maastricht.

themselves have the power over the curriculum? Yes, I think they do, more than they believe themselves. Educational institutions, that is my experience, often feel they are the victims of educational authorities. In reality, there is probably a lot of freedom to manoeuvre within given limits.

A bigger threat to journalism education is probably the market, the industry. There is a lot of uncertainty on the media market. Not a good ground for creative new ideas. Especially not for journalism schools too eager to adapt to demands from the industry. I can see no reason why the industry should control the journalism schools (economically or psychologically) when it apparently has difficulties controlling itself. Also, it shouldn't be forgotten that critical voices are heard more and more from inside the media, perhaps most markedly in the American media but also in some of the European countries. They should also be heard in the journalism schools.

As far as I can judge, interesting educational efforts are being made in many EJTA-schools.

But what is lacking is a deeper reflection on them. I think there is a need for a solid philosophy of journalism training based on reflection on the educational practice. A joint effort could be made within the frame-work of EJTA.

Ami Lönnroth is a journalist at the Svenska Dagbladet and was in 1995/96 a guest professor of journalism at Stockholm university. In the academic year 1996/97 she conducted the EJTA-study "Journalism training in Europe 1997".

Copyright by the European Journalism Centre, Maastricht, the Netherlands, 1997