"THE NOBLE PATH": JOURNALISM EDUCATION AND JOURNALISM STUDENTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA

David Bockino

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the School of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Chapel Hill
2015

Approved by:

Daniel Kreiss

Penelope Abernathy

Chris Anderson

Rasmus Nielsen

Daniel Riffe

ABSTRACT

David Bockino: "The Noble Path": Journalism Education and Journalism Students in the United States and India
(Under the direction of Daniel Kreiss)

This dissertation is the first multi-national study empirically combining an investigation of journalism education on an individual level with an investigation of journalism education on an organizational level in the United States and India. Viewed holistically, it contributes to what Deuze (2006) has called, "a lack of rigorous scholarship in the field of (international) journalism education and training" (p. 29) and to what Ninan (2007) has called the "pitiably small" body of work on journalism and journalism education in India.

Its specific contributions are three-fold. First, it recasts the history of journalism education (and specifically American journalism education) as the development of a persistent and influential organizational field and utilizes an empirical study of three Indian journalism schools to investigate the influence of this field. This analysis subsequently contributes a new layer of complexity as to why journalism education looks the way it does around the world and suggests that legitimacy within the field is a real concern (and priority) for journalism programs worldwide.

Second, it diverges from previous cross-national survey-based studies of the motivations and attitudes of journalism students by instead deploying the tool of habitus in an effort to understand the inherent complexity of a student's decision to enter journalism school. This design subsequently leads to a less rigid and much deeper examination of these students' values,

attitudes, experiences, and expectations and allows for an exploration of not only the complexity within those motivations but also an investigation as to where those motivations came from and how they developed.

And third, it again utilizes the concept of habitus to investigate the value, worth, and influence of journalism education by exploring the actions and behaviors of journalism students in the United States and India as they prepare to graduate. Unlike previous studies, which have focused on the perceived efficacy of journalism education, this study explores how lessons imparted through journalism education are actually enacted through specific decisions and choices. It suggests, in the end, that the lessons of journalism school that are most utilized by students as they graduate are the ones that can best be personalized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

I first spoke with Leslie Ann, a 21-year-old American journalism major at the University

of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC) in August of her senior year. We discussed her family,

where she was from, and why she chose to come to Chapel Hill. She told me that her affinity for

journalism, and love of newspapers specifically, developed when she began writing a monthly

column for her hometown's local newspaper, the *High Point Enterprise*. While enrolled in

UNC's School of Journalism and Mass Communication, she was exposed to a project called *The*

Durham VOICE. The *VOICE*, described as a "community-building newspaper," helped Leslie

Ann develop a passion for what is commonly known as community journalism. When I asked

her what she hoped to be doing a year from then (i.e. after graduation), she mentioned what she

called her "main conflict:"

> It's a very noble path to go down, you know, to say I want to write for a community
> newspaper for the rest of my life, but it's also maybe not the most realistic path to say
> that I am going to jump into a community newspaper and be there the rest of my life
> because in terms of being able to support myself and support a future family, I don't
> know if that is always going to be a possibility with newspapers (Leslie Ann, personal
> communication, September 2013).

When I spoke with Leslie Ann again in April, less than two weeks before her graduation

from UNC, she had begun working for an experimental digital project at a local broadcast

company. It was a way, she said, to merge her love of community journalism with her newfound

interest in digital story telling and innovation, something that had emerged from her work at

UNC's Reese News Lab. When I mentioned that it seemed she had pivoted a bit in terms of

career path - during our previous conversation, she had never mentioned anything about working

for a website or a broadcast company – she concurred, saying "Yeah, a lot has changed" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014).

A month before my first discussion with Leslie Ann, and nearly nine thousand miles away, I sat down with Mayukh, a 21 year-old Indian pursuing a post-graduate diploma from the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media in Bangalore (IIJNM), India.[1] During our first interview, which occurred in the middle of his second week on campus, Mayukh was in great spirits. He invited me up to his room, which he shared with several other students, and served me hot tea and homemade biscuits, eager to answer questions about his background and choice of schools. When I asked him specifically why he was pursuing journalism, he referenced one of India's more divisive television personalities: "I feel this country needs good journalists, not just biased people. We don't need another Arnab Goswami jumping about like a jackrabbit on the 9 o'clock show. We need somebody who talks sense; I'd like to be that person" (Mayukh, personal communication, July 2013). Mayukh's goal was to work in international reporting for a television network, something that was "more or less decided unless there is something really big that comes up."

When I spoke with him again in March, two months before the end of the school year, Mayukh already had a job – he would be working with the International Data Group in Bangalore, a US-based company that produces such websites and magazines as *PCWorld* and *Macworld*. The position was for a "training journalist," an 11-month appointment after which the

---

[1] While Leslie Ann was pursuing a four-year undergraduate degree from UNC, Mayukh was pursuing a one-year post-graduate diploma program from IIJNM. But because Mayukh (and all the Indian students I interviewed for this project) had previously completed a three-year undergraduate degree and because the American students interviewed for this project were in their senior year of college (i.e. their 4th year), all 26 students can be conceptualized as being in the same "cohort." All the students, furthermore, were planning on graduating in the spring semester.

company would decide whether to keep Mayukh or let him go. When I asked him why he specifically chose this company, Mayukh said:

> Honestly speaking there was no specific reason that I wanted to get to this place. The thing is, the current industry position is not a very sound one with job cuts and everything going on. So, honestly I was one person, it sounds bad, it sounds ugly, but I am a person who had just one thing, "Beggars cannot be choosers." At the moment I have zero to go on. So I have to take anything and everything that comes my way. So I was appearing for every interview and every test that was being conducted. And this clicked (Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014).

Toward the end of our interview, Mayukh mentioned that he'd probably work at IDG for a year or two before eventually entering a Master's program in the United States. As for what discipline he would pursue, he was adamant he would stick with journalism, "proper journalism" as he called it. And once in the United States, it was possible he would stay there; Mayukh's sister worked for the *New York Times* in New York and had suggested that, once he got some experience, it was possible he could join her. When I asked if he'd be interested in that arrangement, Mayukh said: "Sure, why not? Nobody says no to the *New York Times*. That's the holy grail of journalism" (Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014).

Despite the drastic reduction of traditional newsroom jobs (Edmonds, Guskin, Rosenstiel, & Mitchell 2012), a situation exemplified by the travails of a struggling newspaper industry and the declining ratings of television news, journalism as a profession and, consequently, journalism school as an academic entry point, still retains a particular allure among a certain segment of American youth.[2] That same allure exists in India, a country where media consumption and revenue have increased (Indian Entertainment, 2013) and where expanding networks and

---

[2] According to the 2013 Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Enrollments conducted at the Grady College of Journalism & Mass Communication at the University of Georgia, undergraduate enrollment in journalism and mass communication disciplines has increased to 198,410 in 2013 from 137,971 in 1988 while the percentage of those students enrolling in journalism has remained steady (27.7% in 1988 to 26.6% in 2013).

newspapers aggressively seek out graduates from the country's premier journalism institutions (Thussu, 2012).

This allure to work as a journalist was clearly apparent during my conversations with both Leslie Ann and Mayukh. Leslie Ann mentioned that journalism was a "noble path" down which to proceed while Mayukh strongly believed that his country "needed good journalists." During our first interviews, Leslie Ann expressed a desire to work for a community newspaper while Mayukh declared his intentions to work in international reporting for a major television network. But when I spoke with the students several months later, as they prepared to leave journalism school, their initial motivations and plans had been disrupted. Leslie Ann, citing her experience within a UNC News Lab as well as her observations concerning the economic health of community newspapers, was the one going to work for a broadcast company while Mayukh, citing a competitive hiring environment and his own inexperience, would be working on technology websites and magazines, a job that was a bit removed from what he described as "proper journalism."

Previous scholars have investigated the motivations of students like Leslie Ann and Mayukh to pursue journalism and enter journalism school (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007; Hanna & Sanders, 2007; Sanders, Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008; Splichal & Sparks, 1994). Other scholars have analyzed the form and function of journalism programs around the world such as UNC and IIJNM (Folkerts, 2014; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bach, 2003; Gaunt, 1992; Josephi, 2010) while still others have explored the efficacy of journalism education in general (Dickson & Brandon, 2000; Du & Thornburg, 2011; Lepre & Bleske, 2005). But journalism students and journalism schools do not and cannot exist without each other – as illustrated by the above examples, it is difficult to fully understand one without understanding the other. Knowing that

Leslie Ann wanted to work for a community newspaper but decided to work for a broadcast company, for example, becomes much more interesting when placed within the context of the organization through which she was passing, the University of North Carolina's journalism school. And yet despite this important interdependent relationship, no scholar to date has attempted a concurrent cross-national examination of journalism students *and* journalism education.

Furthermore, despite the recent calls for more comparative studies (Nielsen & Levy, 2010; Schudson, 2011) and the efforts of many scholars to produce multi-national research (Hallin & Mancini, 2004; Hallin & Mancini, 2012; Hanitzsch et al., 2012; Shoemaker & Cohen, 2006; Splichal & Sparks, 1994; Weaver & Willnat, 2012), few media scholars have attempted to incorporate India into their analysis. The country, meanwhile, is sometimes omitted from even the most ambitious multi-national studies. Two recently released and well-received comparative works, for example, Weaver and Willnat's *The Global Journalist in the 21st Century* (2012) and Hallin and Mancini's *Comparing Media Systems Beyond the Western World* (2012), include thirty-three and seven case studies respectively and yet curiously omit India from their otherwise comprehensive analyses. Weaver and Willnat (2012), for their part, noted their omission of India and admitted that, "It would be interesting to compare journalists in India, where media are booming, with journalists in the United States, where media are suffering" (p. 550). And while the authors' two-pronged characterization of media "health" is overly simplistic, I agreed with their assertion that a comparison of journalism in the world's largest and second largest democracies would be an interesting empirical contribution to the comparative media literature.[3]

---

[3] Holistically, "media" in the United States are not suffering – while newspapers and local television networks are losing revenue, new social media sites like Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn and video streaming services like Netflix and YouTube are thriving. On the other hand, while increased literacy and technological advances have allowed newspapers and television to continue to grow in India, many media scholars (see Thussu) have lamented

This dissertation, then, serves as the first multi-national study empirically combining an investigation of journalism education on an individual level with an investigation of journalism education on an organizational level in the United States and India. Viewed holistically, I contribute to what Deuze (2006) has called, "a lack of rigorous scholarship in the field of (international) journalism education and training" (p. 29) and to what Ninan (2007) has called the "pitiably small" body of work on journalism and journalism education in India. My objective, ultimately, was to research deeper and longer, rather than broader and wider, through an overarching three-tiered question that asked: What can a) the development and structure of journalism education on a supranational level, b) the motivations and attitudes of journalism students in the United States and India, and c) the students' experiences in journalism school and immediate vocational decisions tell us about the current state and future of journalism education and, thus, journalism students? I subsequently pursued this inquiry through two years of research in the United States, two visits to India, seventy hours of interview data with students, faculty, alumni, and administrators in both countries, and decades of historical data of accreditation processes, curriculum changes, conference proceedings, and personnel movement.

In the end, my dissertation provides a multi-faceted contribution to previous work on journalism education (Folkerts, 2014; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bach, 2003; Gaunt, 1992; Josephi, 2010), journalism students (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007; Hanna & Sanders, 2007; Sanders, Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008; Splichal & Sparks, 1994), and journalistic professionalism (Schudson & Anderson, 2009; Waisbord, 2013). The contributions to each of these literatures will now be addressed.

---

the perceived decline in journalistic rigor, claiming that the media has been Bollywoodized and have succumbed to the whims of rupee-rich advertisers. To characterize the two media environments with a simple dichotomy – i.e. suffering/booming – is to unnecessarily bracket those regions into large generalizations that tell us little about what is actually going on in the United States and India.

BACKGROUND AND CONTRIBUTIONS

Journalism Education

The most cited multinational work on journalism education is perhaps Gaunt's (1992) *Making the Newsmakers,* a "study of training needs, programs and facilities in 70 countries" (p. 1). The work was released not only as a worldwide survey of training structures but also as an "up-to-date directory of almost 600 training establishments in every region of the world" (p. xi). Arguing that journalism "training is shaped by the social, cultural, economic and political conditions in which it is conducted," the author advanced broad country-specific narratives regarding each region's journalism training. Of the United States, for example, Gaunt included a brief history of U.S. journalism education, from Kansas State College's first course in printing in 1873 onward, before summarizing the current status of training as follows: "The size of complexity of training structures in the United States are the reflection of a large and flourishing communications industry" (p. 34). The author's treatment of India was similar, including a brief history and snapshot of contemporary in-country training programs. He summarized the situation by suggesting that "the communication industry appears to be growing more sensitive to the need for formal training structures and has begun to create its own courses or participate in joint programs organized by professional bodies which is an encouraging sign" (p. 95). The author concluded the book with a brief section entitled "Challenges and Prospects," within which he argued that "long-term prospects point toward the gradual homogenization of both journalism and journalism training" (p. 157).

Subsequent authors emulated this country-by-country approach in their analyses of global journalism education. Ten years after Gaunt's effort, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha released

Journalism Education in Europe and North America, an "attempt to examine in more detail, via case studies in Europe and North America, the various forces that have shaped journalism education in the past and are likely to do so in the future" (p. xiv). Unlike Gaunt, who undertook the process as a single author, Fröhlich and Holtz-Bacha "asked experts in journalism education to write a systematic contribution about the status of journalism education in different countries" (p. xiv). The book subsequently breaks the analyses into four sections, separating each country's essay based upon the system of journalism education (i.e. University-based, institution-based) offered in the respective region. Similar to Gaunt, the authors concluded the book with an "integrative summary" in which they suggested that "The most powerful influences for journalism education are the factors of the societal sphere or the system including the historical and the cultural background of a country, as well as the media structure with its normative and economic background variables" (p. 320).

Assessing the multinational work on journalism education that had been conducted previously, Josephi (2010) then borrowed elements from both Gaunt (the country-by-country approach) and Fröhlich and Holtz-Bach (using a separate author for each chapter) to produce the first book that looked "specifically at journalism education in countries that are classified as partly free and not free with regard to media freedom around the globe" (p. 253). With 126 countries around the world sharing this designation, the author chose twelve case studies for inclusion.[4] The analysis, therefore, is wide-ranging, and because of the multi-author approach, lacks any theoretical or conceptual foundation. Similar to the previously cited works, however, there is a brief conclusion in which the author attempted to untangle the substantive contributions of each chapter. Josephi concluded, for example, that, "journalism education is becoming increasingly similar around the world" and that while "it is startling to discover that the Western

---

[4] The choice of these countries, the author admitted, was based on access to authors in each region.

paradigm of a media informing citizens, acting as a watchdog of government and commenting on societal affairs, is trending to become universal . . . this statement should not mask the complex realities of each country and the gradations in critical journalistic interaction fostered there" (p. 254).

All three of these works point to the myriad factors that shape regional journalism education; two of the works, meanwhile, explicitly point out an increasingly apparent level of homogenization among journalism programs worldwide. But while all of these studies looked outward to explore those factors affecting journalism education (i.e. economic, cultural), none chose to look inward – in essence, to critically analyze journalism education from an organizational vantage point. In an effort to fill this empirical chasm, I adopt, in Chapter 2, the theoretical framework of new institutionalism (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2014) and specifically DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) definition of organizational field – those organizations that "in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life: key suppliers, resource and product consumers, regulatory agencies, and other organizations that produce similar services or products" (p. 148) – in order to re-conceptualize journalism education (and specifically American journalism education) as a persistent and influential organizational field. I explore the manner by which influences from this organizational field have permeated cross-nationally and utilize an empirical study of three Indian journalism schools to specifically investigate the influence of the American journalism education organizational field on these organizations.

Throughout this investigation, I uncover evidence of supranational institutional carriers, the mechanisms by which fields diffuse, including the travels and hiring of faculty and personnel. In addition, I find evidence of "institutional isomorphism," (DiMaggio & Powell,

1983) a conceptual pillar at the heart of new institutionalism that indicates increased

homogeneity among organizations, with the borrowing and adaptation of journalism curriculum.

But I also discover instances of ceremonial conformity (Meyer & Rowan, 1977), a procedure by

which organizations outwardly conform to the field while retaining internal processes and

practices, which in turn supports Scott's notion that organizations operate in "complex

institutional environments" and therefore face a litany of institutional pressures from different

field orientations (Scott, 2014; p. 182). My data and conceptual framework, in the end, allows for

a new layer of complexity – the organizational factor – to be included within the above

discussion concerning why journalism education looks the way it does as well as evidence that

legitimacy within the field is a real concern (and often a real priority) for journalism programs

around the world.

Journalism Students

But journalism schools, of course, cannot exist without individuals who wish to pursue

journalism as a profession. As DiMaggio and Powell (1991) have written, "Institutions, in this

view, are inseparable from the distribution of dispositions: an institution can 'only become

enacted and active' if it, 'like a garment or a house, finds someone who finds an interest in it,

feels sufficiently at home in it to take it on'" (p. 26). My study, therefore, diverges from previous

studies of journalism education to concurrently examine journalism students in the United States

and India.

In terms of cross-national research, the most ambitious and comprehensive study of

aspiring journalists is Splichal and Sparks' survey of first-year journalism students in twenty-two

countries (1994). Utilizing previous work that situates journalism within a larger theoretical

discussion of "professionalism" and recognizing the paucity of research on individuals wishing

to pursue journalism as an occupation, the survey was focused primarily on revealing

"motivations of students for entering the system of professional education in journalism, their

attitudes towards journalism as their future professions, and their specific values" (Splichal &

Sparks, 1994, p. 5). The authors were explicit in what they believed to be their study's primary

takeaway, that attitudes of first-year journalism students around the world suggest that

journalism has indeed become an international "profession" largely immune to differences in

social or economic structure:

> The major finding of this study is undoubtedly that the attitudes of first-year journalism
> students are not determined by the nature of the national social or economic structure of
> the state within which they have been socialized. Despite the wide range of ages and
> situations, and despite the very different substances of the courses upon which they were
> enrolled, a number of striking similarities emerged (Splichal & Sparks, 1994, p. 179).

Subsequent scholars have built off this groundbreaking work, utilizing a similar

methodological design (i.e. a survey) to measure motivations of journalism students in their

respective countries. Hanna and Sanders, for example, used a survey of British undergraduates to

measure motivations for entering a journalism program (2007); they later expanded the analysis

to compare those results with a survey of Spanish journalism students (Sanders, Hanna,

Berganza, & Aranda, 2008). Hovden et al. (2009) used a survey of first-year journalism students

in the Nordic countries to search for national differences in "social recruitment, motivation for

studying journalism, preferences regarding future journalistic working life, views on the role of

journalism in society, attitudes toward the profession, [and] journalistic ideals and ideas about

what are the most important traits for journalists" (p. 152). Alonso (2010), meanwhile, found that

Spanish students have created an image of the "ideal journalist," propagated through, among

other mediums, television shows and movies, and that this image has directly influenced their

decision to pursue the profession. And Bjornsen et al. (2007) conducted a quantitative,

longitudinal panel study of Norwegian journalism students in order to assess changes in professional values as they progressed through their studies and into their early career. Their biggest takeaway from the panel study is what they didn't find: "All in all, we do find it most striking in our results that the significant changes in perceptions between the different phases are so few and so weak" (p. 398).

In Chapter 3, I discuss the substantive findings and methodological limitations of these studies, suggesting that their survey designs prevented the authors from a) investigating motivations, attitudes, values, or expectations existing beyond their generalized categories and b) exploring *why* and *how* similarities and differences between groups (i.e. countries, genders, etc.) emerged. Instead of utilizing a survey for my own analysis, then, I instead draw on Bourdieu's (1977) concept of habitus to explore the motivations and expectations of twenty-six journalism students in the United States and India.[5] Habitus, suggests Reay (2004) quoting Bourdieu (1988), "provides a method for simultaneously analyzing 'the experience of social agents and . . . the objective structures which make this experience possible'" (p. 439). According to Bourdieu (1977), it is through habitus - a "matrix of perceptions, appreciations, and actions" as well as a "body of dispositions" (p. 75) - that practice (i.e. agency) is linked to field (i.e. structure). The key here is that habitus allows us to look not only at the individual (and his or her choices, actions, etc.) but also at the structures which surround that individual.

Using an analysis of the "life histories" (Gordon & Lahelma, 2003) of the students, a strategy pursued with in-depth interviews, I ask: "Why did they choose to pursue journalism?" and, more specifically, "Why did they enter a journalism school?" My qualitative interview design paired with the methodological approach of habitus led to a less rigid and much deeper

---

[5] According to Bourdieu, habitus is best utilized as a methodological rather conceptual tool. This is an important distinction many scholars choose to ignore – one author has gone so far as to call habitus "intellectual hair spray" (Reay, 2004).

examination of these students' values, attitudes, experiences, and expectations and allowed me to capture not only the complexity within those motivations but also the complexity of where those motivations came from and how they developed. I found that students in both the United States and India develop an understanding of what a journalist "is" and "does" partly through a set of "occupational norms" (Meyer and Rowan, 1977) that can be traced back to a supranational system of journalism education but that are also molded by cultural, economic, and social influences.

Most importantly, my evidence also shows that putting journalism students into large, generalizable categories (e.g. they enjoyed writing) marginalizes the heterogeneity of these students and, thus, unnecessarily simplifies the reasons behind these students' decisions to enter journalism school. Some students, for example, pursued journalism and entered journalism school primarily for what it is *not* as much as for what it *is.* And while both American and Indian students told me they pursued journalism to "serve the public," students in India were more likely to describe journalism as an agent for critical and cultural change while American students were more likely to describe journalism as a tool to tell previously untold stories, a difference that I suggest can in part be traced to employability upon graduation. This heterogeneity, meanwhile, stands in sharp contrast to the homogeneity (and ceremonial homogeneity) explored in the previous chapter within the context of journalism schools

Journalistic Professionalism

Most scholars around the world would agree, finally, that journalism schools exist, in part, to train future professional journalists. As Gaunt (1992) wrote, "Journalism training perpetuates or modifies professional journalistic practices and molds the perceptions journalist

have of the role and function of the media" (p. 1). Some of the studies mentioned above, in fact, such as the comprehensive twenty-two country survey administered by Splichal and Sparks (1994), set out to measure the extent to which journalism students exhibited a "professional ideology." Josephi (2010), meanwhile, analyzed professionalism in respect to those students emerging from journalism programs in countries with limited media freedom. Of particular note was the observation that journalism students in several of these countries (including Oman, Palestine, Tanzania, Kenya and Brazil) often graduated and took jobs in other communication fields. Complementary to the research on journalism students and journalism education, then, and equally important to this dissertation, is the compendium of literature concerning journalistic professionalism.

The research on journalistic professionalism is extensive and therefore will not be reviewed here in its entirety.[6] Most important to this dissertation and the current conversation surrounding professionalism, however, are the conceptual and methodological choices made by previous authors when exploring the topic. Beam, Weaver, and Brownlee (2009), for example, in an ambitious panel study of four hundred U.S. journalists between 2002 and 2007, examined changes in "journalistic professionalism" by using survey questions to measure four indicators: 1) involvement with professional organizations, 2) perceptions of workplace autonomy, 3) role conceptions, and 4) viewpoints concerning ethically controversial newsgathering practices. The measurement for workplace autonomy, for instance, included Likert-style questions exploring these journalists' ability to "Get Subjects Covered," "Select Stories," and "Decide Aspects to Stress" (p. 283). Among the findings of the five-year study of U.S. journalists were a decrease in professional organization participation and a shift in overall role conceptions.

---

[6] For a comprehensive review of this literature, see Wasibord (2013).

Similar to Beam, Weaver, and Brownlee, Cassidy (2005) used a survey and the four attitudinal clusters advanced by Weaver and Wilhoit (1996) to search for differences in professional "role conceptions" between print and online journalists: "Print newspaper journalists rated the Interpretive/Investigative role conception as significantly more important than online newspaper journalists" (p. 273) while "Online newspaper journalists rated getting information to the public quickly as significantly more important than did print newspaper journalists" (p. 274). Man Chan, Pan, and Lee (2004), meanwhile, took this approach internationally, measuring how Chinese journalists' job satisfaction was related to what the journalists believed their role in society was. And Hanitzsch et al. (2011), in perhaps the most geographically ambitious study of journalistic professionalism, used a survey across eighteen countries to "map journalistic cultures onto a grid of common theoretical denominators and explore their variation across nations" (p. 274). While the authors unveiled "several general patterns of global similarities and differences across journalism cultures," they did find evidence to suggest "the global primacy of role perceptions that are characterized by detachment and non-involvement" (p. 286).

In short, these works suggest that journalistic professionalism, although defined differently across the studies, can nevertheless be explored through a series of tightly defined survey questions designed to measure traits or characteristics of journalists around the world. According to Beam, Weaver, and Brownlee (2009), although "one criticism of the traits approach was that it [is] imprecise," the tactic has nevertheless, "been influential in the study of professions and has provided the theoretical foundation for much of the scholarship on journalism as a profession or semi-profession" (p. 279).

Scholars such as Waisbord (2013), however, have recently challenged this taxonomic approach to the concept of professionalism, arguing that "professionalism is not about certain attributes but instead how it interacts with and maintains relevancy across certain fields" (p. 11). The author, building off the conceptual contributions of previous sociology of the professions scholars like Abbott (1998) and Larson (1977), suggested that looking at global journalistic professionalism is an "analytical kaleidoscope" – with one turn, you see one thing, with another turn, you see something else entirely. Regardless of whether one uses the vast amount of literature on professionalism, some of which is referenced above, to find multi-national similarities (which exist) or multi-national differences (which also exist), the more interesting question, says Waisbord, is instead *how* journalists use their work – the production of news - to carve out an autonomous segment within society. The author calls this concept "occupational jurisdiction," an argument based on Larson's discussion (1977) of a "professional project" and which is said to ask: Is there a unifying consensus among journalists regarding how they go about their work? The discussion, in many ways, echoes Schudson and Anderson's (2009) contention that situating journalists on the professional ladder between "plumbers and neurosurgeons" is analytically fruitless – rather it is the consequences of journalists, as an aggregate collective, trying to (or not trying to) establish themselves as an autonomous field that remains the more intriguing inquiry.

Schudson and Anderson also argued that "Any investigation into issues of professionalism, objectivity, and truth seeking in journalism specifically should move from the question of whether journalism is or is not a profession to the more interesting analysis of the circumstances in which journalists attempt to turn themselves into professional people" (p. 90). To that end, it is surprising that Waisbord (2013), in the first ever book-length work on

journalistic professionalism, completely forgoes any discussion of journalism students or

journalism education in the creation of "professional people." Nor do any of the previously cited

works regarding journalism education or journalism students cross categorical lines to pursue a

concurrent study of education *and* students *and* the relationship between the two. This study,

then, will fill that empirical and conceptual gap - to examine the role of journalism education as

a mechanism toward the potential creation of professional journalists not through a taxonomic

approach but rather through a broad qualitative inquiry that incorporates analyses at both an

individual as well as an organizational level.

If Chapter 2 examines journalism education and Chapter 3 examines journalism students

then the final empirical chapter of this dissertation merges the two levels of analysis. In Chapter

4, after examining and detailing the processes these students go through on the eve of graduation

in both countries, I apply the concept of "institutional habitus" - "the impact of a cultural group

or social class on an individual's behavior as it is mediated through an organization" (Reay,

1998, p. 521) – to analyze the influence journalism education has on journalism students. Unlike

previous literature, the chapter does not focus on what journalism schools are *trying* to teach,

what students *said* they learned, or what journalism schools *should* be teaching but instead

focuses on how lessons imparted through journalism education were incorporated into a

student's larger "habitus" and subsequently enacted through specific decisions or choices on the

eve of graduation. This inquiry, I believe, therefore exists as a necessary complement to the

broad survey-based examinations of previous scholars concerning journalistic professionalism as

well as a supplement to those works that attempt to measure the efficacy of journalism education

(Dickson & Brandon, 2000; Du & Thornburg, 2011; Lepre & Bleske, 2005) by investigating a

real and tangible application of journalism education on the action and/or behavior of these

students. My findings, furthermore, suggest that the most influential lessons of journalism education (at least at this one moment in time) are, in fact, those lessons that directly affect a student's livelihood and that can therefore be personalized to one's own situation.

In sum, my analysis regarding a) the influence of a supranationally extended organizational field and the subsequent increased homogeneity of journalism programs around the world, b) the inherent heterogeneity of journalism students frequently masked through the rigidity of empirical investigations, and c) the personalization of the lessons of journalism education at a specific moment in time for journalism students in the United States and India suggests the benefits of a malleable and adaptable journalistic curriculum, one tailored more to the needs of the individual students, and their personal (including regional) intricacies, than to the needs (or the requests) of the larger organizational field. A larger discussion regarding this overall takeaway is advanced in the conclusion of this dissertation.

METHOD

The Design

The research direction described above emerged concurrently with my early data collection and analysis. My research design, in fact, followed Luker's (2008) suggestion to approach social science research inductively utilizing a two-tiered process. One, the researcher should find an interesting "case" and simply start investigating it. And two, the researcher should simultaneously engage relevant literature in an effort to situate the data both substantively and conceptually.

My own case, then, emerged from two observations. The first was that while media scholars remain open to casting a critical eye on journalism education, there is less emphasis on

rigorous empirical work relating to the transition between journalism education and practice. While scholars have frequently argued about the proper structure of a journalism school (Deuze, 2006; MacDonald, 2006; Newton, 2013; Pavlik, 2013; Reese & Cohen, 2000; Schramm, 1947) or whether journalism education should be beholden to the academy or to the industry (see Folkerts, Hamilton, Lemann, 2013; Sloan, 1990), less work has been done to understand the experiences of these students as they enter journalism school, go through the curriculum, and enter the working world. From this observation, then, emerged my curiosity regarding the influences that affect a journalism student's transition to the workplace. My second observation was the relative lack of research concerning the Indian media market described earlier. But if the contrasting media markets lend themselves well to comparison, as Weaver and Willnat (2012) have suggested, I believed there was no reason to limit the research to working journalists specifically. Instead, I wished to incorporate this observation with the former, that is, to study the journalism student's experience within the contrasting environments of the United States and India.

I next sought an object of analysis that would allow me to pursue this combined inquiry. Incorporating access and time restraints into my consideration, the idea was to develop panels of final-year journalism students in the United States and India and to follow them as they graduated from school. Following previous longitudinal qualitative studies that have utilized groups because of their geographic locations (Du Bois-Reymond, 1998; Gordon & Lahelma, 2003; MacDonald, Shildrick, Webster, & Simpson, 2005), willingness to participate (Bagnoli, 2003; Thomson, 2007) or educational standing (Taylor, 2003), I pursued a purposive sample. The justification in using purposive samples stems from the "case-based" aspect of qualitative research (Burawoy, 1998; Small, 2009); that is, it is often more epistemologically valuable to

contextualize a specific group of people in the larger economic, political, and societal environment, than to fruitlessly search for a "generalizable" sample.

During my first visit to India, however, and keeping Becker's (1992) suggestion in mind (keep the "case" open, perpetually), I began to realize that I needed to expand this inquiry far beyond these individual students. Over the course of the next year, the students in my panels connected me to faculty who connected me to Deans who connected me to alumni. I interviewed the founders of two fledgling Indian journalism schools, listened to the students debate contemporary journalistic issues, and studied school websites and curricula. At one Indian institute, I was granted access to the library's archives where I found explicit links to renowned faculty from prominent U.S. journalism schools. Larger themes emerged and my initial study of journalism students soon became a concurrent study of journalism education. In some ways, my methods harkened back to Burawoy's extended case method (1998) in that I was taking evidence of specific phenomena (e.g., a student's experience in journalism school) and linking it with larger influences (e.g., the structure of journalism education). In other ways, my methods resembled those of Hemingway (2008) in that I was exploring and examining non-human actors (e.g. syllabi and curriculum) as much as human ones. In the end, the study became three-fold: a cross-national exploration of 1) journalism education, 2) journalism students, and 3) the relationship between journalism students *and* journalism education.

The Data

The evolution of my research design was directly related to my data gathering methods, of which there were three components. The first were two sets of interviews with students in each country. The first interviews were conducted at the beginning of their final year of studies;

the second interviews were conducted at the end. This design was meant to address the two primary limitations to previous comparative research designs (Hanitzsch et al., 2012; Shoemaker & Cohen, 2006; Splichal & Sparks, 1994). The first limitation is temporal – that is, surveys and focus groups collect merely a snapshot of information, attained at a single moment of time. The second limitation is substantive – that is, there is no way to know if the participants are sharing long-held beliefs or simply expressing their opinions for that particular day. Longitudinal qualitative interviewing attempts to address both these issues. By conducting interviews at six-month intervals, I was able to analyze both changing behaviors and attitudes as well as properly contextualize the answers at each stage of the process. During our initial interview, for example, one of my Indian students discussed how she wanted to go into travel journalism and write long-form features for an Indian magazine. When I returned six months later, she had temporarily abandoned travel writing and was instead enamored with crime reporting, spending several hours each night combing the Bangalore police stations. What does this mean? What were the influences that led to this transition? In this case, the *change* is far more interesting than the responses. My design, then, not only helped me uncover the attitudes, expectations, and reflections of these students as they progressed through their journalism programs but also helped me interpret the change over time (Holland, Thomson, & Henderson, 2006) while simultaneously allowing for an examination of the "apparent discordance between what people say and what they do," (Thomson, 2007, p. 572).

Furthermore, I treated my two student panels conceptually as one. With that approach, the twenty-six journalism students were conceptualized as part of the same cohort – all were between the ages of 20 and 22 when I first contacted them, all were beginning their fourth year of higher education, and all expected to graduate within the academic year. From there, I was

granted comparative elasticity, in that my analysis was unbounded by strict and often arbitrary

boundaries. The most obvious analytical comparison, of course, is by nation-state – to compare,

for example, the values, motivations, actions, and goals of the American students to the Indian

students. But this is simply one possibility; as Splichal and Sparks' (1994) noted in their

conclusion, differences between nation-states are often unremarkable:

> Since intracountry differences are often the same or even greater than those between the countries, we
> cannot assume that any 'national' (e.g., political, ideological, economic, or cultural) characteristic
> influences these differences. However, the heterogeneity within all countries suggests that there could
> exist some explanatory variables below the 'national level, having either a systemic character (e.g., the
> type of school, specific conditions for entering the school, specializations, etc. which ought to result in
> variability of opinions and values between the students at different universities or colleges) or an
> individual with similar sociodemographic characteristics (p. 182).

My design, therefore, allowed me to analyze the data beyond the limits of the initial

American vs. Indian comparisons in order to explore the most interesting patterns and processes.

In this sense, it didn't matter if my panels consisted of individuals from New Jersey or North

Carolina, Calcutta or Chennai. Those distinctions mattered, of course, but the differences

emerged from the evidence rather than from an initial sample-based hypothesis. For example, it

is possible that the cultural attitudes toward journalism are different among Bengalis than they

are of Tamils. In that case, there is no reason to believe that the motivations for wanting to be a

journalist should be similar among students from those respective regions.

To develop these panels of students, my objective was to select one nationally recognized

journalism program in each country. For the American side, I chose to use students from the

University I am currently attending as a Ph.D. student, the University of North Carolina at

Chapel Hill. The UNC School of Journalism and Mass Communication is an accredited and

nationally recognized journalism program that has been described as "one of the premier

programs in journalism and mass communication" by the United States Accrediting Council on

Education in Journalism and Mass Communications.[7] The school has approximately fifty full-time faculty and eight hundred undergraduate students while offering nine separate majors and specializations spanning the larger categories of strategic communication (e.g. Advertising and Public Relations) and journalism (e.g. Reporting, Multimedia, Broadcast & Electronic Journalism) (About the school, 2014). The students for the project were required to be majoring in a journalism-specific discipline, were self-selected, and were solicited through in-class requests for participation, faculty recommendations, and snowball sampling. A total of eleven students, three males and eight females, agreed to participate. All eleven participated in the first round of interviews; nine participated in the second round.[8]

On the Indian side, I created an initial database of possible journalism programs through discussions with American faculty familiar with Indian journalism education as well as through a cross-examination of five lists compiled from Outlook Magazine, India Education, IndiaToday.com, ChiliBreeze.com, and Way2College.com comprising the supposed top journalism schools in the country. I sent introductory emails to each school asking if they would like to be a part of the research; three responded positively. Because of travel commitments and funding limitations, one school was eliminated from consideration while two schools, one in Chennai and one in Bangalore, were visited to gauge the feasibility of collaboration. The Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media (IIJNM) in Bangalore, a one-year post graduate journalism school founded in 2001 by the BS&G Foundation, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to "promoting democratic values and institutions in India" (About IIJNM), offered

---

[7] There is no "official" ranking of journalism schools in the United States. Various third party entities, however, often attempt their own rankings. For two examples, see: "Top 10 Journalism Schools in the U.S.," http://education-portal.com/top_10_journalism_schools.html and "Survey – The Top 20 Journalism Schools," https://rtdna.org/article/survey_the_top_20_journalism_schools#.UuAyRvZOm2w.
[8] One student dropped out of school while the other did not respond to multiple interview requests.

substantial access to faculty and students, as well as room and board on campus, and was therefore selected for participation.

I made two separate trips to IIJNM, one in July 2013 and one in March 2014. The school is situated on five acres of land outside Bangalore, in an area the Administration Officer told me was entirely empty twenty years ago, and is surrounded primarily by small villages and farmland. Late at night, the trip from the city center to the school can take around thirty to thirty-five minutes by car. But at rush hour, because of the city's decision to construct an elevated metro in the middle of Mysore Road, the main thoroughfare to IIJNM, the trip can take upwards of two to three hours. The school's primary facility is a 30,000 square-foot, gated, open-air, two-story structure consisting of classrooms, a television production studio, two auditoriums, faculty and administration offices, and several editing suites. The building, with its long exposed corridors, is constructed in a way in which you are never too far from the outside world – this was done on purpose, to allow the students to learn and think late into the night without feeling pent up and constrained (Frank, personal communication, July 2013). Down the road from the school's main building are the students' dormitories, a small group of buildings designated by gender, as well as the school's cafeteria. Adjacent to the student dormitories are three separate one-bedroom apartments, housing both permanent and visiting faculty and guests.

During my time at IIJNM, the administrators at the school graciously provided me with an apartment to stay on campus, an office in the school's main facility, and full access to interview IIJNM's student body. During my first visit, the Vice-Dean of the school also arranged for me to meet with the entire student body (approximately 75 students) to introduce the research and to ask for participants; a subsequent email was sent with additional details on what the study would entail. Twenty-five students indicated interest in participating and fifteen were randomly

chosen as the study's official "panel." As the IIJNM student body skews significantly female, the sample consists of fourteen females and one male.

As mentioned above, however, my panel interviews with students from UNC and IIJNM comprised only one component of my project. The second data-gathering component of the study, therefore, consisted of one-off interviews with faculty and alumni from three separate Indian journalism schools. While there has been substantial research and reflection in regard to American journalism education, I found that there has been comparatively little done with the Indian market. These interviews, then, helped me fill that gap, by extending the analysis of the students' experiences and allowing me to contextualize my interview data within a larger organizational and institutional environment. Beyond IIJNM, then I visited two other Indian journalism schools – the Asian College of Journalism (ACJ) in Chennai and the Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) in Delhi.

I visited ACJ in July 2013 off the invitation of Dean Nalini Rajan, just as the program's new academic year was beginning. The campus is located about ten kilometers south of Chennai's city center in an area called Taramani, built back off a main thoroughfare via two dirt roads, and clustered around other academic entities such as the Institute of Chemical Technology and the Institute of Textile Technology. The school sits on an area of 80,000 square feet and includes both the main education facility and student housing. According to its own website, the ACJ campus includes:

> ten large computer labs; eight classrooms, big and small, fitted with modern teaching aids; a large hi-tech multimedia lecture hall; a spacious and well stocked library; a workshop facility and a seminar room each; print and new media edit desks with latest production software; two conference halls, two digital TV studios with multi-camera shooting floors and attached production control rooms; ten digital TV edit suites; a digital radio studio section equipped for audio recording, editing and multi-track mixing; a commodious canteen and students' common rooms (About Us – Location).

I came away particularly impressed with ACJ's library, a space in which I spent considerable time between interviews with faculty members. As the website suggests, it was spacious and well stocked; equally importantly, the employees who worked there were knowledgeable and helpful and allowed me to pick through their vast collection of books related to Indian media and journalism.

I visited IIMC, finally, in March 2014 off the invitation of one of the school's Associate Professors. The main branch of IIMC is located within the sprawling metropolis of New Delhi, the capital of India and home to around twenty-two million people. The campus is situated directly adjacent to Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), one of India's largest - it covers approximately a thousand acres - and most prestigious universities. While there is no direct affiliation and little to no collaboration, IIMC's proximity to this expansive bastion of learning is a welcome perk for the school's faculty, some of whom enjoy taking long walks through JNU's quiet grounds.

The campus of IIMC itself is centered around a three-story red brick building housing faculty offices, classrooms, two production studios, a four hundred person auditorium and, according to its own website, "the largest specialized library in mass communication in the country" (Library). Surrounding the main IIMC facility are units for student and faculty housing as well as a small convenience store, meaning there are always people moving about even when classes aren't in session. During the few days I was on campus, in fact, I was simply one of many international visitors; the school's position as the country's pre-eminent mass communication institute meant that there was ample collaboration with many media-related entities and dozens of visitors throughout the entire academic year.[9]

---

[9] Additional details concerning IIMC will be discussed in Chapter 2.

My time spent on these campuses, furthermore, allowed me to pursue the final component of my data - a prolonged examination and continuous exploration of curricula, brochures, websites, and any other relevant material. The goal was to follow the data, and to track experiences mentioned in the student and faculty interviews back to their core components. Other media scholars have made similar methodological choices (Anderson, 2013; Boczkowski, 2004; Kreiss, 2012; Nielsen, 2012), describing their field site as a "network" or "assemblage." As Nielsen (2012) wrote in his methodological appendix, "analysis must start by producing and validating data that captures the multiplicity of actors and perspectives involved in a situation that is not always well understood or broadly known in advance" (p. 190). Anderson (2013), for example, described his work as "network ethnography," and collaborated with a social network analyst to chart the landscape of the Philadelphia news ecosystem. When an American student told me, then, that their most memorable experience at school was an extracurricular magazine project, I made sure to seek out that magazine, to explore its content and to understand its origins. When an Indian student mentioned that a news feature they had put together had found its way to *The Hoot*, the country's most popular media blog, I found the story and spoke to the professor responsible for distributing it. While this incessant data collection was admittedly time-consuming, it allowed me to adequately trace the influence of certain occurrences. And throughout the entire process, I developed, modified, stretched, contracted, and abandoned various theories and reconceptualized my findings.

In the end, I spent two years collecting and analyzing data. I made two trips to India, spending nearly a month in Delhi, Chennai and Bangalore. I conducted nearly sixty hours of interviews, including two sets of interviews with my student panels and close to twenty interviews with various Indian faculty and alumni. Those interviews resulted in over 1,000 pages

and 500,000 words of transcribed interview data. I sat in on speeches given by the Directors of IIJNM and IIMC as well as the Dean of UNC, analyzed both U.S. and Indian journalism school websites and student publications, and documented the history of journalism education in both countries.

A final thought concerning my methodological design: most comparative media studies, such as many of the ones described in this introduction, are undertaken with the help of scholars in multiple countries (Fröhlich & Holtz-Bach, 2003; Hanitzsch et al., 2011; Josephi, 2010; Splichal & Sparks, 1994). The reasons for this – language, time, money - are obvious. I believe, however, there is analytical value in an individual scholar conducting a comparative study on journalism and journalism education. While some scholars have touted the cultural benefits of having individual country directors, I believe that an inductive approach is often more conducive to a single author, allowing the researcher to effectively and efficiently locate themes within his or her larger dataset. What is missed through cultural nuances, therefore, is gained through analytical continuity. And while it has indeed been a difficult and time-consuming endeavor, I believe the work within this dissertation is a fruitful methodological and substantive contribution to the larger body of research on journalism students, journalism education, and journalistic professionalism.

CHAPTER 2: THE SCHOOLS

Tucked away in the library archives of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) in Delhi, catalogued alongside bound editions of *Advertising Age* and *Journalism Studies,* are the early editions of the school's own academic journal, *Communicator.* Within the early issues of this journal, described by the school's website as a "general forum for communication scholarship and application" (Publication) are two speeches delivered to the school's student body by Wilbur Schramm, founder of the University of Illinois' Institute of Communications Research and Stanford University's Institute of Communications Research and popularly recognized as one of the founders of the United States' mass communication research tradition. As he introduced Schramm to the student body in 1968, the school's Director, Shri I.P. Tewari, referenced the influence the American had in developing a global network of mass communication research:

> The most important thing to remember is that before [Schramm's] arrival on the scene, mass communication was considered only a trade and the communicators at best taken to be practitioners in the trade. But for his zeal and his pioneering efforts, mass communication would not have acquired the academic status it has acquired all over the world today (Schramm, 1968).

During his speech, the American scholar used vibrant examples from regions around the world – including Colombia, Samoa, and the Ivory Coast - to explain what he believed was the purpose of the newly formed Institute:

> What we believe now is that the mass media do have certain powerful effects in some situations when they are used in certain ways. The important thing is to know how to use for maximum effectiveness. If I were to state the function of this Institute, it would be – to learn how to use mass media, how, where and when to use them (Schramm, 1968).

Schramm, in fact, had been instrumental in the creation of IIMC in 1965. Tewari, in his introduction for the American scholar, noted that IIMC "owed [its] origin" (Schramm, 1968) to an international scholarly team led by Schramm. This influence is similarly recognized today on the school's website, which says "the blueprint for the Institute was drawn up by a team of internationally renowned mass communication specialists, representatives of UNESCO and of the media in the country" (About Us), a team that was primarily headed by Schramm. And according to one Indian scholar, Schramm's influence mirrored those of other American communication scholars who had visited India at the time; in the aggregate, these visits "had left an indelible impression on the genesis and the growth of Indian Journalism and Mass Communication" (Murthy, 2010).

Over three decades later, the American influence on the development of Indian journalism education continued. In the early 2000s, another prominent U.S. scholar, Sree Sreenivasan from Columbia University, came to Bangalore to assist a fledgling Indian journalism school, the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media, develop the curriculum for its own post-graduate journalism program. Similar to IIMC's reference to Schramm and UNESCO, the influence of Sreenivasan and Columbia is visibly touted on IIJNM's website today; Sreenivasan, for example, is listed as a member of the school's "International Advisory Board," a select group of individuals meant to help "guide the institution" (International Advisory Board). And on the "About IIJNM" page as well as in the school's two-page brochure, the program's curriculum is described as one "that has been developed in association with the Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, New York" (About IIJNM; IIJNM Brochure).

Taken at face value, these declarations seem to suggest what proponents of the theoretical foundation of new institutionalism would term institutional isomorphism – "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: p. 149). In this case, the emerging Indian journalism schools emulated the structures of the American programs, modeling themselves "after similar organizations in their field they perceive[d] to be more legitimate or successful" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 152). But the reality is a little more complicated than that. During an interview with the Vice Dean of IIJNM, for example, I was told that while Sreenivasan did indeed come over to IIJNM to help develop the curriculum for the school in its early days, how much of that curriculum was adapted is questionable. Although the Vice Dean had not yet joined the Institute at that time, she told me: "from what I hear, people were told that they should really follow that curriculum and that led to a bit of revolt because that curriculum apparently did not suit the Indian conditions" (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013). Instead, the development of IIJNM's curriculum became more of a dynamic process, changing concurrently with shifts in the Indian media industry. If so, the reference to Columbia on IIJNM's website should be conceptualized not as an example of mimetic isomorphism but rather as an example of what Meyer and Rowan (1977) have called "ceremonial conformity," a situation where organizations build "gaps between their formal structures and actual work activities" in an effort to "reflect institutional rules" (p. 341).

Many scholars have recently called for a re-conceptualization and re-organization of journalism education (Deuze, 2006; MacDonald, 2006; Mensing, 2010; Pavlik, 2013; Reese & Cohen, 2000). To do so, however, requires an understanding of why journalism education is the way it is – only then might scholars and practitioners have the wherewithal to pursue substantial

change. What is lacking, furthermore, from previous discussions of journalism education around the world (Folkerts, 2014; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bach, 2003; Gaunt, 1992; Josephi, 2010) is an analysis of journalism education from an organizational vantage point. As DiMaggio (1991) has said, "to understand the institutionalization of organizational *forms,* we must first understand the institutionalization and structuring of organizational *fields"*(p. 276).

The purpose of this chapter, then, is to first re-conceptualize journalism education (and specifically American journalism education) utilizing an organizational framework and, second, to assess the manner by which influences from these organizations have permeated cross-nationally through an empirical examination of three Indian journalism schools. While I employ the theoretical foundations of new institutionalism (see Meyer & Rowan, 1977; DiMaggio & Powell, 1983; DiMaggio & Powell, 1991; Scott, 2014), I also take into consideration Bourdieu's notion of "institutionalization as a variable" (Benson & Neveu, 2005, p. 12) and Scott's (2014) suggestion to treat the apparent decoupling of formal structure and work activity specifically as an "empirical question" (p. 187). In this case, I do not assume that organizations within this field gravitate toward homogeneity - a key conceptual pillar within the new institutionalism literature. Instead, homogenization toward a Western journalism education model is considered, explored, and assessed as part of the empirical investigation rather than presented as a preordained conceptual argument.

This investigation, then, adds an empirical component to the arguments of those scholars who have suggested that journalism educators in emerging markets such as India and China rely far too heavily on the structure, materials, and ideas of Western programs, often at the expense of regional needs (Eapen, 1991; Guo, 2010). My own evidence supports this assertion, but only to a point, as I found instances of both "institutional isomorphism" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983) as

well as "ceremonial conformity" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) within my investigation, indicating that these journalism schools are, in fact, orientated toward many different fields.

The chapter is laid out as follows. First, I introduce the theoretical framework of new institutionalism and review its previous application to the study of media organizations. Next, I delve specifically into the concept of organizational fields, discuss the manner by which fields are structured, and recast the history of American journalism education as the structuration of a persistent and influential organizational field. Using that conceptual foundation, I present my case – an empirical study of Indian journalism education using data gathered through visits to three Indian journalism schools, interviews with administrators, faculty, alumni, and students, and qualitative analyses of relevant websites, curriculum, syllabi, and historical documents. I locate elements within the three organizations by which this field is or is not maintained and discuss the level to which (and manner by which) these Indian schools have been influenced by American journalism education. To conclude, I discuss the implications of my findings as it pertains to journalism education around the world.

NEW INSTITUTIONALISM

The history of social science has forever been fraught with "a tension between those theorists who emphasize structural and cultural constraints on action and those who emphasize the ability of individual actors to 'make a difference' in the flow of events" (Scott, 2014, p. 92). Contemporary work on institutions, then, of which one strand has been labeled new institutionalism in organizational analysis, has been explained as a "reaction against the behavioral revolution of recent decades, which interpreted collective political and economic behavior as the aggregate consequence of individual choice" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991, p. 2) as

33

well as "common skepticism toward atomistic accounts of social processes and a common conviction that institutional arrangements and social processes matter" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991, p. 3). The advent of new institutionalism was, in essence, a push to look beyond the actor-specific models of previous scholarship and to contextualize the decisions made by individuals and the outcomes of those decisions inside the larger environment within which these actors operate.

The "new" in "new institutionalism" refers to the theoretical shift away from the tenets of "old institutionalism" and the work conducted by previous scholars such as Selznick. While DiMaggio and Powell expertly lay out the multitude of differences in their seminal work on the framework (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991), a few differences are of note for this dissertation. First, while old institutionalism focused on organizational constraint due to "vested interests," new institutionalism focuses on the relationship between "stability and legitimacy." In essence, organizations conform to institutional norms and procedures to establish their position within the larger institutional environment.

Second, while old institutionalism detailed the "informal interaction" of organizations, and stressed how these "informal structures deviated from and constrained aspects of formal structure," (DiMaggio & Powell, 1991, p. 13) new institutionalism instead places those non-rational processes and procedures squarely on the foundation of the institution itself, emphasizing cultural norms and inter-organizational influences.

Third, while old institutionalism conceptualized the organization as embedded in the local community, new institutionalism expands that conceptualization outwards, envisioning the organization on a field, sector, or society level. The new institutionalist approach, therefore, diverts attention away from intra-organizational relations, including the conflicts of interest that

develop within and between them, and into a more macro-level view of the structure of organizational environments – for example, the "culture, ritual, ceremony, and higher-level structures" (p. 12) that affect organizations' procedures and operations. Using this theoretical model, the researcher can locate "shared systems of rules that both constrain the inclination and capacity of actors to optimize as well as privilege some groups whose interests are secured by prevailing rewards and sanctions" (p. 11).

A number of questions arise from this discussion. First, what are the elements upon which institutions are formed? Scott, in his thorough evaluation of institutional-based thought, proposed three analytical elements that comprise institutions: regulative, normative, and cultural-cognitive (Scott, 2014). "One possible approach," the author suggests, "would be to view all of the facets as contributing, in interdependent and mutually reinforcing ways, to a powerful social framework – one that encapsulates and exhibits the celebrated strength and resilience of these structures" (p. 59).

The first element consists of explicit regulatory processes established to both police current behavior as well as influence future behavior. These regulatory procedures can be both formal – such as written laws or codes – and informal – such as the shunning of members who do not or cannot conform to taken-for-granted routines or processes. The second element consists of normative rules that "introduce a prescriptive, evaluative, and obligatory dimension into social life" (p. 64) and suggests the importance of both values (i.e. preferred or desirable ideas and conceptions) and norms (i.e. specific processes on how things should be done). These beliefs, furthermore, do not exist simply as an aspirational priority; they are instead considered more of a roadmap, an expectation "of how specified actors are supposed to behave" (p. 64). Failure to adhere to these rules, therefore, could result in the de-legitimation of the organization from the

institutional environment (i.e. through the regulative processes mentioned above.) The third

element consists of cultural-cognitive elements. These elements are "the shared conceptions that

constitute the nature of social reality and the frames through which meaning is made" (p. 67).

Operating as the "major distinguishing feature of neo-institutionalism within sociology and

organizational studies," the cultural-cognitive pillar of the theoretical framework allows the

researcher to study the processes by which actors ascribe meaning to objects and activities.

A second question that emerges from this theoretical viewpoint: how do institutions

persist and diffuse? Scott has identified four types of institutional carriers, "fundamental

mechanisms that allow us to account for how ideas move through space and time, who or what is

transporting them, and how they may be transformed by their journey" (p. 95). The four types

are: symbolic systems, relational systems, activities, and artifacts. Symbolic systems are most

easily understood by the "collection of symbols" which helps constitute the institution. These

symbols could be rules, laws, expectations, schemas, or frames by which actors within the

institution operate. Relational systems are formal or informal "networks of social positions"

within the organization or organizations. They include, among other things, systems of

governance, shared inter-organizational identities or groups of authority. Activities, meanwhile,

could include job roles, routines, habits, and standardized scripts for social behavior. And

artifacts, finally, represent the explicit material manifestation of the institutionalized structure

and can include "objects complying with mandated specifications" or "objects meeting

conventions, standards." Many institutional carriers, of course, can cross these categorical lines.

An organizational "Code of Ethics," for example, can be both a material object as well as a

symbolic representation of how actors *should* behave as well as a regulative reminder of what

will happen if they don't. Scott's typology of institutional carriers, therefore, should be utilized

simply as a conceptual starting point and as a roadmap for more in-depth empirical exploration of institutional forms and structures.

A handful of scholars have utilized a new institutional framework to conceptualize the news media as an institution (Boczkowski, 2010; Cook, 1998; Lowrey, 2011; Lowrey, 2012; Sparrow, 1999). Viewed this way, the media are no longer seen as a collection of individuals or organizations that collect and distribute bits of information to consumers. They are, instead, discussed more as a unified entity, a "durable social structure" that is "resistant to change" and "preserved and modified by human behavior" (Scott, 2014).

Lowrey (2012), for example, utilized institutional theory against the backdrop of transaction cost economics to explore a scarcity of innovation within media outlets: "Leaders of traditional news outlets over the past 30 years have wrung their hands and called for change in the face of financial, technological, and cultural disruption. And then, so often, they have stayed the course" (p. 214). This apparent aversion to innovation is a result of a complex system of pressures where, "Ultimately, connection and acceptance within the institutional and cultural realms . . . are necessary for long-term survival" (p. 228). These dynamics are the result of the organization being a part of a larger "institution" – the news media – which influences the way the organization operates on a day-to-day basis. Instead of distinct instrumental orientation, then, in which the organization uses market research and analysis to pursue well-defined economic and individual goals (i.e. growing the audience, selling more advertising), the organization instead responds to normative, regulative, and cultural-cognitive pressures, bowing to the larger institutional framework in an effort to maintain stability within its organizational field. The innovation that is pursued, furthermore, is "cursory or ceremonial - enough to appear progressive to a wider society that is aware of the disconnect between a changing society and a creaky,

traditional journalism, but not so much as to actually disrupt traditional routines or institutional arrangements (such as legal policies)" (p. 231).

While Lowrey conceptualized the news media as an institution in an effort to examine its relationship to innovation and rational economic decision-making, Cook (1998), instead, conceptualized the news media as an institution in order to examine the political ramifications of such an arrangement. He did so by situating the news media as a singular entity, a political institution, beholden to the taken-for-granted routines that both constrict and enable organizations operating within the institution. This institution is not simply political; it has, instead, "become part of government," (p. 86) creating an environment where "it is increasingly tough to envision government operating without the news media's communicative abilities" (p. 119).

But while these scholars have used institutional approaches to discuss the role of the news media within both economic and political contexts, no media scholar to date has a) incorporated journalism education into the discussion or b) expanded the institutional context to a supranational level. Zelizer (2004) has argued that journalism scholarship benefits greatly from a robust multi-disciplinary approach and that scholars have successfully incorporated theoretical frameworks from, among other disciplines, sociology, political science, and history to enhance our understanding of journalistic work. To that end, an examination of journalism education specifically within the framework of new institutionalism will help us understand not only what journalism education looks like around the world but, more importantly, why it looks the way it does.

AMERICAN JOURNALISM EDUCATION AS AN ORGANIZATIONAL FIELD

While many early organizational scholars concentrated on exploring and explaining heterogeneity among organizational structure, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) set out to do the very opposite - to examine "why there is such a startling homogeneity of organizational forms and practices" (p. 148). In one of new institutionalism's most heavily cited papers,[10] the authors suggested that once a group of organization becomes structured into what they called an "organizational field," "powerful forces emerge that lead them to become more similar to one another" (p. 148). The authors explain this procedure as institutional isomorphism, a "constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (p. 149). There are three mechanisms, furthermore, by which institutional isomorphic change within an organizational field occurs – coercive isomorphism, mimetic isomorphism, and normative isomorphism. The first, coercive isomorphism, is a mechanism that "results from both formal and informal pressures exerted on organizations by other organizations upon which they are dependent" (p. 150). The second, mimetic isomorphism, is a process by which "organizations model themselves on other organizations" (p. 151) in order to reduce uncertainty in their environment and to seek legitimacy within the field. And the third, normative isomorphism, is a process primarily resulting from the professionalization and "collective struggle" (p. 152) of the members of a certain occupation to define the boundaries by which their occupation can be defined.

But isomorphic change, during which organizations that "produce similar services or products" begin to resemble each other, can only occur *after* the structuration of an organizational field. This structuration, according to DiMaggio and Powell (1983), consists of

---

[10] According to Google Scholar, the paper has been cited nearly 28,000 times.

four parts: "an increase in the extent of interaction among organizations in the field; the emergence of sharply defined interorganizational structures of domination and patterns of coalition; an increase in the information load with which organizations in a field must contend; and the development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise" (p. 148). Scott (2014), meanwhile, has contributed a few other indicators:

> [The] extent of agreement on the institutional logics guiding activities within the field or on the issues around which participants are engaged, increased isomorphism of structural forms within populations in the field (i.e., organizations embracing a limited repertoire of archetypes and employing a limited range of collective activities), increased structural equivalence of organizational sets within the field, and increased clarity of field boundaries (p. 235).

Using these authors' conceptualization of field structuration, I now turn to the history of journalism education in the United States. For the purposes of this paper, I will not attempt to construct a comprehensive chronological account – that story has already been told (see Folkerts, 2014; Sloan 1990) – but rather to utilize previous literature on the history of journalism education to isolate a pattern of events that suggest the emergence of "organizations that, in the aggregate, constitute a recognized area of institutional life" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148). I will then document two instances – the convening of the World Journalism Education Council and the release of the UNESCO *Model Curricula* document - by which this field has permeated outward beyond the United States.

From the beginning of the 20th century, when journalism programs begin to emerge at, among other universities, the University of Missouri, Columbia University, and the University of Wisconsin, collaboration among colleagues was frequent. In 1912, for example, "eighteen journalism educators voted to organize the American Association of Teachers in Journalism (AATJ)" (Folkerts, 2014, p. 234) in an effort to "create an annual meeting and to provide information about schools and teaching" (p. 235); five years later, a separate entity "the

American Association of Schools and Departments of Journalism (AASDJ), was created as a 'sister' organization to AATJ" (p. 235). In 1923, yet another organization, the American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE), pushed these schools to develop a classification system of journalism education - in essence, a way to rank the quality of education being provided. This system was delayed, partly due to a lack of funds and partly due to the economic hurdles of the Great Depression.

On January 21st, 1939, however, a consortium of various industry and educational organizations agreed to "establish a national agency called the National Council for Education in Journalism" (p. 238), the precursor to the Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) and a system by which journalism schools could be measured against an agreed-upon standard. The evolution of this collaboration marks the beginning of the American journalism education organizational field and clearly demonstrates "an increase in the extent of interaction among organizations in the field" as well as "the development of a mutual awareness among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148).

Furthermore, as collaborative organizations such as ACEJMC emerged, debate over journalism curriculum flourished. An early issue of *Journalism Bulletin,* a publication distributed by AATJ and that would later become *Journalism Quarterly,* "was dedicated to curriculum and addressed some of those questions" (p. 238). While each program had its own curriculum nuances, there were also significant similarities in what was being offered, indicating growing "isomorphism among structural forms." A 1937 survey among thirty-two AASDJ schools, for example, found that:

> all offered courses in reporting, copyreading, and feature writing. Ninety-three percent offered
> courses in advertising and in the history of journalism. Journalism law and editorial writing
> courses were offered in 87% of the schools whereas 80% offered courses in business management.

Other frequently offered courses included community newspaper and contemporary affairs (p. 241).

The process of establishing a proper accreditation process, however, would continue for decades. In 1945, a new organization, the American Council on Education for Journalism (ACEJ) was granted the responsibility of accrediting journalism schools and "within two years, ACEJ had accredited thirty-five schools in one or more sequences" (p. 258). More than that, legitimacy within the field was now an openly debated topic. At a 1957 convention, for example, University of North Carolina Dean and AEJ[11] President Norval Neil Luxon questioned the value of some of the smaller journalism programs in the United States, remarking that only a few of the schools had "outstanding libraries, with nationally recognized departments in the humanities and the social sciences, with rigid requirements for the first two years' work in the liberal arts, with adequate budgets for the journalism units, with staff members interested and actively engaged in research as well as in teaching and service" (Folkerts, 2014, p. 259). Luxon, in a brazen reference to what new institutionalists would term coercive isomorphism and an indication of "sharply defined interorganizational structures of domination" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 148), suggested that if these schools "did not measure up to other professional schools they should either immediately raise standard or take steps toward 'termination of journalism instruction at [their] institution'" (Folkerts, 2014, p. 259).

Unfortunately, this push toward standardization led to a noticeable level of organizational inertia. In an early 1980s article published in the *ASNE Bulletin*, Everette Dennis, Dean at the University of Oregon and president of AEJMC, was "amazed 'to find that most courses' listed in a 1928 monograph differed little from journalism school catalogues in the 1980s. He said structures and formats of the courses in those early years, not only their titles,

---

[11] AEJ was the new name of the AATJ.

were 'almost a carbon copy' of the syllabus of 1980s courses" (Folkerts, 2014, p. 264). Signaling the continuing awareness "among participants in a set of organizations that they are involved in a common enterprise," Dennis created an ad hoc committee called the National Task Force on the Future of Journalism and Mass Communication, the "first full-scale assessment of journalism education to be conducted" (p. 264). While Folkerts has suggested, "it is difficult to measure the impact of the Oregon Report," she also remarked that "many universities consulted it when revising their curricula" and that it "sparked an increase in activity between professionals and academics" (p. 268).

In 2015, the scope of the American journalism education organizational field is best represented by the influence and character of two organizations - AEJMC, "the oldest and largest alliance of journalism and mass communication educators and administrators at the college level" (About) and ACEJMC, "the agency responsible for the evaluation of professional journalism and mass communications programs in colleges and universities" (Homepage). The mission of AEJMC, made up of 3,700 educators, 18 divisions, 10 interest groups, and two commissions, is "to promote the highest possible standards for journalism and mass communication education." ACEJMC, meanwhile, currently accredits 108 professional programs in the United States and beyond while expecting graduates of journalism and mass communications programs to "write correctly and clearly in forms and styles appropriate for the communications professions, audiences and purposes they serve" and "demonstrate an understanding of professional ethical principles and work ethically in pursuit of truth, accuracy, fairness and diversity" (Principles of Accreditation). Journalism programs in the U.S. wishing to achieve accreditation, then, face both coercive pressures to adhere to these standards (or risk not

being accredited) as well as mimetic ones, in the sense that organizations new to the process seek to reduce uncertainty by simply mirroring an accredited organization's curriculum structure.

Furthermore, although they can be said to have originated in the United States, these institutional pressures can also cross borders. Other scholars, in fact, have noted the influence American universities have had on organizations outside of their own country. Krucken and Meier, for example, in their discussion of college and universities, suggested that, "the United States is an important point of reference within international organizations, which actively promote the essentials of what it means to be a modern university organization" (Krucken & Meier, 2006, p. 242). And Moon and Wotipka, in an analysis of global business education, argued that, "The literature on management education, which has developed extensively over the last two decades, portrays modern management education generally as the invention of the American education system" (Moon & Wotipka, 2006, p. 122). Both sets of scholars see the American university model as a focal point for mimicry and imitation among colleges and schools outside of the country. And similar to these scholars, I will now show that elements of the American journalism education organizational field have indeed filtered outside its national boundaries by examining two institutional carriers originating from AEJMC, one of the most important organizations within the field.

In 2007, for example, AEJMC "served as the convener" for the World Journalism Education Council (WJEC), an organization made up of members from twenty-eight journalism education associations from six continents and designed to "provide a common space for journalism educators from around the world and to focus on issues that are universal in the field" (World Journalism Council). During the first meeting of this council, the organization suggested eleven principles they deemed paramount to global journalism education, an artifact that can in

many ways be seen as an institutional carrier (see Scott, 2014). The second and fourth principle, for example, state the following:

> SECOND: At the heart of journalism education is a balance of conceptual, philosophical and skills-based content. While it is also interdisciplinary, journalism education is an academic field in its own right with a distinctive body of knowledge and theory.

> FOURTH: Journalism curriculum includes a variety of skills courses and the study of journalism ethics, history, media structures/institutions at national and international level, critical analysis of media content and journalism as a profession. It includes coursework on the social, political and cultural role of media in society and sometimes includes coursework dealing with media management and economics. In some countries, journalism education includes allied fields like public relations, advertising, and broadcast production (Declaration of Principles).

The WJEC's Code of Principles, then, can be conceptualized as a coercive pressure within the field – "cultural expectations within which organizations function" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 150) – as well as a normative expectation developed by the field to "define the conditions and methods of their work" (p. 152).[12]

Also presented at this conference was a document entitled *Model Curricula for Journalism Education* (Model Curricula, 2007). In the foreword to the document, the UNESCO Assistant Director-General for Communication and Information Abdul Waheed Khan explained its purpose as follows:

> As the lead UN agency in promoting freedom of expression and access to information and knowledge, UNESCO has taken various initiatives to improve the quality of journalism education worldwide. In December 2005, in response to numerous requests from Member States for help in the design of journalism education curricula, UNESCO convened an experts' consultative meeting in Paris. Major outputs of the consultation were the identification of courses, which should be included in a journalism curriculum (p. 4).

This expert team of four then sought out the advice of twenty "senior journalism educators" worldwide who were "deemed to have considerable experience working in

---

[12] While journalism programs are not explicitly forced to follow this code, the strong language within the WJEC Code of Principles (e.g. "We, the undersigned representatives of professional journalism education associations") suggests its status as a "coercive pressure" as well as a "normative" one.

developing countries and emerging democracies" (p. 4).[13] Once the advice of these consultants

was incorporated, a "revised draft design" was released with "a list of courses for both

undergraduate and post-graduate levels, brief descriptions of each course and an outline of

fundamental journalism competencies." Journalism educators from developing countries or

emerging democracies around the world were then asked to write syllabi for seventeen core

courses.

The one hundred and sixty page UNESCO document is freely available online via the

organization's website. Besides Khan's foreword, there is also a short introductory section

detailing what these experts believe journalism education should entail:

> A journalism education should teach students how to identify news and recognize the story in a
> complex field of fact and opinion, how to conduct journalistic research, and how to write for,
> illustrate, edit and produce material for various media formats (newspapers and magazines, radio
> and television, and online and multimedia operations) and for their particular audiences. It should
> give them the knowledge and training to reflect on journalism ethics and best practices in
> journalism, and on the role of journalism in society, the history of journalism, media law, and the
> political economy of media (including ownership, organization and competition). It should teach
> them how to cover political and social issues of particular importance to their own society through
> courses developed in co-operation with other departments in the college or university. It should
> ensure that they develop both a broad general knowledge and the foundation of specialized
> knowledge in a field important to journalism. It should ensure that they develop — or that they
> have as a prerequisite — the linguistic ability necessary for journalistic work in their country,
> including, where this is required, the ability to work in local indigenous or vernacular languages. It
> should prepare them to adapt to technological developments and other changes in the news media.
> journalism competencies (p. 6).

The authors explain that "journalism is taught at various levels" and therefore the

document is designed to offer model curricula for a three or four-year bachelor's program, a two-

year master's program, and a two-year diploma program. To give a brief example, a model three-

year undergraduate degree would have six terms. The first term of the first year would include

courses on Writing; Logic, Evidence and Research; General Knowledge; and Arts/Science

Courses. The second term of the first year would include Reporting and Writing; Media Law;

---

[13] Professor Michael Cobden, Inglish Professor, University of King's College; Professor Gordon Stuart Adam,
Professor Emeritus, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, and Journalism Scholarship Fellow; Professor Hans-
Henrik Holm, Jean Monnet Professor, Head of Department Danish School of Journalism; Magda Abu-Fadil,
Director, Journalism Training Program, Regional External Programs, American University of Beirut.

and more Arts/Science Courses. Throughout the document, the information gets progressively more specific, including detailed course descriptions and week-by-week sample syllabi of each course including recommended readings and possible discussion questions.

This document was introduced as a true collaborative effort - contributors taught and researched at universities in Canada, Denmark, Lebanon, Qatar, Singapore, South Africa, France and others. But further investigation reveals significant connections to the already established field of American journalism education. One contributor to the four-member expert committee, a Professor in Denmark, for example, spent three years as a Fellow at the University of California, Berkeley and Stanford University and three years as an Adjunct Professor at Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism (Om os). Another member of this committee, a Professor in Beirut, received both her BA and MA from the American University in Washington, DC (Wise Summit). "Experts who attended the fist Consultative Meeting on Journalism Education" to create the document in December 2005 had similar ties to American journalism education (Model Curricula). A Professor of Media Sociology in France, for example, holds degrees from Stanford University and the Annenberg School of Communications at the University of Pennsylvania (Faculty). And the CV of another of these experts, a Professor at Rhodes University in South Africa, reveals frequent visits to the United States in the 1990s including one to the Poynter Institute "to attend a seminar on Journalism Education" (Brief CV).

What does this all mean? At a minimum, it indicates that the organizational field of American journalism education has permeated outward, potentially crossing national boundaries. The building blocks of the WJEC and the UNESCO document, for example, can both be traced back AEJMC, one of the most important organizations for American journalism education. But institutional carriers do not, on their face, indicate isomorphism or mimicry. As Scott has written,

"most organizations operate in complex institutional environments and confront fragmented and contending institutional pressures" (p. 182). In other words, knowing that the WJEC and the UNESCO document contain elements of or influences from the American journalism education field does not automatically suggest that journalism schools around the world will acquiesce to their normative, coercive, or mimetic pressures. It is possible, for example, that some schools will acquiesce completely, prioritizing legitimacy from the American journalism organizational field above all other pressures or demands. But it is equally possible that some journalism schools will prioritize legitimacy from other entities, such as its government or the local media industry. In that case, it is conceivable that faculty and administration from these schools will be exposed to the institutional carriers mentioned above, but that their influence will be minimized by the organization's specific orientation. The precise influence of institutional carriers emerging from an organizational field, therefore, demands further empirical research.

The balance of this chapter takes up that challenge. It applies the conceptualization of American journalism education as an organizational field with supranational institutional carriers to the empirical study of three Indian journalism schools – the Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) in New Delhi, the Asian College of Journalism (ACJ) in Chennai, and the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media (IIJNM) in Bangalore – to investigate the level to which and the manner by which these organizations are influenced by institutional carriers of the field.

FIELD NOTES: INDIAN JOURNALISM EDUCATION

Overview

The next section of this chapter is laid out as follows: First, I introduce the three schools used in the empirical study while reviewing my method. Next, I discuss the "filtering of

personnel" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983), an oft-discussed institutional carrier involving the movement of individuals between organizations, and how that filtering can and does lead to both normative and mimetic isomorphism. Then, I explore the level of homogeneity and heterogeneity across the curriculum of these programs. Finally, I explore and discuss the "complex institutional environments" (Scott, 2014, p. 182) in which these schools exist.

To begin, a brief introduction to Indian journalism education and the three schools used for the empirical study is in order. While much has been written about the professionalization of journalism as an occupation and the subsequent history of journalism education from a Western, and specifically American, perspective (Folkerts, 2014; Fröhlich & Holtz-Bacha, C, 2003; Sloan, 1990), comparatively less has been written about the history of Indian journalism education. Eapen (1991), for one, has suggested that the first formal journalism training in the Indian sub-continent was introduced at the University of Punjab, Lahore in the early 1940s by Professor P.P. Singh, a recent recipient of a Master's degree in journalism from the University of Missouri.[14] Heavily influenced by the curriculum and textbooks used during his studies at Missouri, Singh was one of a number of Indian scholars at that time to develop Indian journalism programs based on American ideas and concepts. A decade later, the first "full-fledged Journalism Department in the country" (Eapen, 1991) was organized at Hislop Christian College, Nagpur University and was led by the American Fulbright scholar Dr. Roland E. Wolseley, a graduate of the Medill School of Journalism at Northwestern University (Ronald Wolseley).

Not long after the inauguration of the journalism program at Nagpur, as discussed in the introduction to this chapter, came the creation of the Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) in 1965 with the assistance of UNESCO and Wilbur Schramm. Although IIMC's origins

---

[14] This was before the partition of Pakistan and India in 1947.

were as an institute of mass communication, its position today as a pillar, leader and influencer

of Indian journalism education – traditionally, a key cog in the mass communication curriculum -

is undeniable. Various third-party analysts and critics consistently rank IIMC as one of the best

journalism schools in the country (Top 10 Journalism Colleges in India; Top 10: Other

Professional Colleges). Potential journalism students from all over the country often name the

school as providing one of, if not *the,* best program in the country (IIJNM, ACJ, IIJNM students,

personal communication, July/August 2013 and March 2014). Its faculty members, although

obviously biased, are explicit in their praise of the school (IIMC faculty members, personal

communication, March 2104). And in a cross-national comparison of journalism training around

the world, Gaunt wrote "there is little doubt that the Indian Institute of Mass Communication,

located in New Delhi, is the best equipped, best funded and most prestigious training institution

in India" (Gaunt, 1992, p. 93).

If IIMC is the grandfather of Indian journalism programs, then the Asian College of

Journalism (ACJ) in Chennai and the Indian Institute of Journalism and Mass Communication

(IIJNM) in Bangalore are its teenage children. The Asian College of Journalism was founded in

1994 and, for a short time, was "run under the auspices of the New Indian Express newspaper (S.

Kumar, personal communication, July 2013)." In 2000, an agreement was made for the program

to be taken over by the Media Development Foundation, a not-for-profit trust that was

established "to foster journalism as an independent, investigative, socially responsible, and

ethical profession" (About Us – Media Development Foundation). Sashi Kumar, a former

journalist and filmmaker, along with N. Ram, former Editor-in-Chief of the *The Hindu*, one of

the country's most influential newspapers*,* began the Media Development Foundation with three

objectives: education in journalism, monitoring of journalism, and research in journalism (About

50

Us). The creation of ACJ was meant to address the first objective - to increase the scope and quality of journalism education in India. Each year, ACJ admits approximately 180 students from over 500 applications (S. Kumar, personal communication, July 2013). The Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media (IIJNM), meanwhile, located approximately thirty kilometers southwest of Bangalore, was founded in 2001 by the BS&G Foundation, a not-for-profit organization dedicated to "promoting democratic values and institutions in India" (About IIJNM). Each year, about 70 to 80 Indian students from all over the country enroll in IIJNM's nine-month program (K. Kaur, personal communication, March 2014).

The evidence used in the following analysis is pulled from two site visits to IIJNM and one visit each to IIMC and ACJ. Data comes from nearly sixty hours of interviews with administrators, faculty members, students and alumni as well as participant observation, extensive document analysis (syllabi, curricula, related websites), and historical research. As explained in the initial methods sections of this dissertation, I employed an inherently flexible data-gathering approach. If, for example, one of my interviewees mentioned a particular resource or document during the course of the interview, I did my best to attain that document. The picture that emerged from this analysis was a group of journalism schools pulled in several directions but undoubtedly influenced – although to different levels – by the organizational field of American journalism education.

The Filtering of Personnel

In DiMaggio and Powell's seminal paper regarding organizational isomorphism, the authors argued that an important mechanism of homogeneity within an organizational field is the "filtering of personnel" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983, p. 152). In explaining how organizations

51

may come to resemble each other, the authors wrote: "To the extent managers and key staff are drawn from the same universities and filtered on a common set of attributes, they will tend to view problems in a similar fashion, see the same policies, procedures and structures as normatively sanctioned and legitimated, and approach decisions in much the same way" (p. 153). Scott (2014), meanwhile, would view the filtering of personnel as an institutional carrier – a method by which ideas, norms, values, and roles are transferred between organizations within the same field. For example, Scott argues that, "institutions may be embodied in – carried by – structured activities in the form of habitualized behavior and routines. Routines are carriers that rely on patterned actions that reflect the tacit knowledge of actors – deeply ingrained habits and procedures based on unarticulated knowledge and beliefs" (p. 101).

One of the most consistent themes that emerged from my interviews with faculty across all three Indian programs, in fact, was that Schramm's connection to the faculty and administrators of IIMC and Sreenivasan's connection to IIJNM were not anomalies but rather the norm – many people I spoke with at all three schools had spent time ample time collaborating with or studying under already established journalism programs around the world. Sunetra Sen Narayan, for example, an Associate Professor at IIMC and Head of the Department of Publications, received her Ph.D. in Mass Communications from Pennsylvania State University in 2000 (S. Sen, personal communication, March 2014). Bindu Bhaskar, a Professor at ACJ, was "selected by [the] Times Research Foundation for a fellowship in the United States" in 1989 (B. Bhaskar, personal communication, March 2014). As part of the fellowship, she took "media training sessions" at Annenberg School (USC), Columbia University, and New York University (Bindu Bhaskar). And Gita Bamezai, Professor and Head of the Communication Research Department at IIMC, utilized a similar opportunity – a British Council Fellowship – to spend a

semester studying at the University of Manchester (G. Bamezai, personal communication, March 2014).

Many of the faculty members I spoke with, in fact, even if they had not spent significant time overseas, had clear ties to multi-national journalism education organizations. Shashwati Goswami, an Associate Professor of Radio Journalism at IIMC, for example, mentioned that she would be presenting a paper at the upcoming International Communication Association conference in Seattle, Washington (S. Goswami, personal communication, March 2014). And K.M. Shrivastava, the senior-most Professor at IIMC, spoke to me about his nearly thirty years of experience visiting "media organizations and academic institutions in different parts of the world" (K.M. Shrivastava). Included among the accomplishments touted on his faculty page are a stint as the "plenary speaker at the International Association of Media and Communication Research (IAMCR) Conference in Glasgow" in 1998, time as an "IAMCR delegate to the UN World Summit on Information Society" in Geneva in 2003 and in Tunis in 2005, and selection as the chair of a session at the World Journalism Education Congress in Grahamstown, South Africa in 2010.

DiMaggio and Powell (1983) suggested that the "filtering of personnel" promotes *normative isomorphism* and, with a nod to Larson's idea of professionalization (1977), discussed this process as the collective struggle of members of an occupation to define the conditions and methods of their work. Through their experiences at established journalism schools or conferences, many of which were in the United States, these faculty members ostensibly undergo a process of professionalization whereby they learn the organizational norms, dispositions, attitudes, and values inherent within an already established American journalism organizational field. Institutionalized behaviors learned through these associations, for example, could emerge

in the textbooks chosen for or assignments given in certain classes. They could also emerge in the way these professors discuss relevant topics or events, or in the way they assess the work of their students. To that end, these isomorphic behaviors are often hidden from the researcher's view and instead manifest themselves covertly.

I'd argue, however, that the filtering of personnel is not limited to behind the scenes normative maneuvering – it instead also influences the very structure of the organizations involved. To account for those instances, this section now moves away from the idea of normative isomorphism and into the realm of mimetic isomorphism, a concept that suggests "organizations tend to model themselves after similar organizations in their field that they perceive to be more legitimate or successful" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: 152).

I have already explained how Schramm's visit motivated the faculty and administration of a fledgling IIMC. His influence, furthermore, continued to be touted by IIMC for decades after his visit. According to the school's website in early 2014, "the blueprint for the Institute was drawn up by a team of internationally renowned mass communication specialists, representatives of UNESCO and of the media in the country" (About Us).[15] And many faculty members are well aware of the influence Schramm had on the development of IIMC - several specifically mentioned Schramm when I asked about the origins of the school (IIMC Faculty, personal communication, March 2014).

Even more representative of mimetic isomorphism, however, was the influence of already established journalism programs such as the Columbia School of Journalism on the formation of India's newer journalism schools – ACJ and IIJNM. This influence was sought out,

---

[15] This statement was pulled from the IIMC "About Us" page in early 2014. During the course of my research, however, IIMC overhauled their entire website. Interestingly, this statement now reads: "Inaugurated on August 17, 1965, by the then Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Indian Institute of Mass Communication (IIMC) started with a small staff, including two consultants from UNESCO," thus de-emphasizing the role the "internationally renowned mass communication specialists" had in the creation of the Institute.

intentionally and with purpose. The founder of ACJ Sashi Kumar, for example, explained that

when he and his colleagues began creating the foundation of the school's curriculum, they went

on a tour of established journalism schools in the United Kingdom and the United States:

> We went on a short tour of the UK and the US to look at some of the good journalism colleges and
> we visited City College in London, Cardiff University and one other university, I don't know the
> name will come to me. And then in the US we of course went to the Columbia School of
> Journalism where Ram [N.Ram, another founder of the school] was a student of that school earlier
> and we went to the New York University's journalism department and those days there was
> another college that since closed down called the Baruch College of Journalism so we went there
> because we wanted to look at what business journalism was all about. And apart from that
> subsequently a colleague of ours on a scholarship, she went and did a study of various journalism
> institutes in the US and that was also very useful for us of what was happening there (S. Kumar,
> personal communication, July 2013).

Kumar discussed specific lessons and concepts he took away from that trip, including

how curriculum should be developed in a journalism program, and how those ideas shaped the

curriculum at ACJ. He noticed that . . .

> . . . while New York University gave greater emphasis to the philosophical aspects of journalism
> – the 'why" aspect of journalism as we call it – the Columbia school gave more emphasis to the
> hands-on delivery aspects, the tools of journalism . . . So Tom [from Columbia] would say 'if I
> were setting this up all over again, I would add more of the reflective aspect.' And Richard [from
> NYU] was saying the same thing, saying that 'we have to reinvent this program and have a little
> more of the hands-on aspect.' So we have the luxury of, since we are starting on a clean slate to
> combine this in a fairer mix when we started our program and therefore if you look at our
> statement and prospectus - and how we speak about the program – there is a judicious mix of the
> "Why" and the "How to" aspects of journalism (S. Kumar, personal communication, July 2013).
> .

The influence of these American schools, however, continued long after Kumar's visit to

the United States, particularly through the work of Lawrence Pinkham, a professor of N. Ram's

while the latter was at Columbia. Another long-tenured ACJ faculty member I spoke with

mentioned that Pinkham was invited to ACJ in the early 2000s and during his years with the

school gave the "program a new shape" while bringing "a lot of ideas of [an] American style of

training." She said that working with Pinkham was "wonderful" and recalled a few specific

changes the American made to the school's structure: "We made a lot of changes in the print

program. Till then it was just a tabloid - Lawrence said we should make it a broadsheet and we laid a lot of emphasis on reporting and news writing skills" (B. Bhaskar, personal communication, March 2014). She also mentioned that "Lawrence introduced some of the textbooks that were being used in Columbia" (B. Bhaskar, personal communication, March 2014).

An article in *The Hindu* noting Pinkham's death in 2010 remembers Pinkham as "playing a valuable role in shaping journalism education in India and China" and claims that the school's administration remembers the early 2000s as "the Pinkham years" (Ranganathan, 2010).[16] It goes on to quote Kumar as saying: "We continue to evoke Larry in our curricular review meetings and the 'Pinkham template' fixed in our minds is the touchstone to which we bring new doubts, problems, deficiencies and inconsistencies in the programme" (Ranganathan, 2010). Bhaskar agreed, saying that Pinkham "has always been seen as a mentor of the college" (B. Bhaskar, personal communication, March 2014). To honor Pinkham's memory, in fact, ACJ has named the school's annual convocation speech after him.

While Pinkham was at ACJ, another Columbia School of Journalism faculty member, Sree Sreenivasan, already discussed in this chapter's introduction, was two hundred miles away in Bangalore at IIJNM, helping Abraham George and colleagues develop the curriculum for their own post-graduate degree. While Sreenivasan's name wasn't invoked as much as Schramm's was during my interviews at IIMC faculty or even Pinkham's was during my interviews at ACJ, the influence of Sreenivasan and Columbia is still apparent on IIJNM's marketing materials with the school's website touting a "curriculum developed in association with Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism" (About IIJNM).

---

[16] N. Ram, one of the founders of ACJ, was editor-in-chief of the newspaper at this time.

But, as noted previously, several faculty members at IIJNM seemed to downplay Sreenivasan's influence, claiming that although the educator suggested ideas for the curriculum, the school's faculty disagreed as to whether those ideas should be implemented. One IIMC faculty member I spoke to, however, insisted that this is unusual and that many Indian journalism programs do indeed rely on curriculum and syllabi developed by established schools or entities. When I asked what the future held for her own institute, for example, this faculty member bypassed the question and instead critiqued the mimicry rampant among Indian journalism schools: "In India there is a huge vacuum in academics of media or communication. Nobody is working on that area. If you look at the course curriculum, in big institutes you will see we are usually modeling the UNESCO syllabus, adopting it, not working towards it" (Personal communication, March 2014).

Unfortunately, without access to the early conversations between IIJNM and Sreenivasan, it is difficult to determine whether the school implemented the American's ideas or not. But an empirical study of the influence of institutional carriers undoubtedly calls for a systematic analysis of isomorphism or homogeneity – for journalism programs, this homogeneity would be reflected in curriculum and structure. In order to pursue this analysis, then, I will compare sample curricula from a document discussed above - the *Model Curricula for Journalism Education* released during the 2007 WJEC – with curricula from the three Indian journalism programs in an effort to locate similarities and differences.[17]

---

[17] As mentioned previously, the *Model Curricula* grew out of the World Journalism Education Council which materialized in part from the influence of AEJMC, one of the organizing bodies of American journalism education; the information inside the *Model Curricula* document, then, can be traced specifically back to the American journalism education organizational field.

Analysis of Curriculum

All three Indian programs under analysis offer as their primary degree a "Post Graduate Diploma." In India, a Post-Graduate Diploma differs from a Master's degree. While both degrees can be pursued after the student's undergraduate studies,[18] an Institute must be affiliated with a University in order to offer a Master's degree, which in turns necessitates a long process with the country's University Grants Commission.[19] In many ways, in fact, the diplomas offered by these three schools are analogous (although admittedly not identical) to the fourth year of studies for an American journalism student. Many of the students attending IIMC, ACJ or IIJNM had come to the programs directly from their 3-year undergraduate studies,[20] meaning that the year working toward these diplomas could temporally be seen as equivalent to the fourth year of studies for an American student.

UNESCO's *Model Curricula* document, meanwhile, offers sample curricula for both Master's Programs and Diploma programs. To explore curricula similarities and differences between this document and the Indian journalism schools, I chose to use the two-year "Master's Program For Students With Little Or No Journalism Education or Experience" as opposed to the two Diploma programs as the latter were built specifically for students either right out of high school or for mid-career journalists, neither of which was applicable to the students and schools I visited.

The curriculum for the sample UNESCO Master's Program (Model Curricula) suggests four courses in each of the two terms of the first year. In the first term, the student should be exposed to:

---

[18] This is called a "graduate degree"

[19] These details came from a conversation I had with a Professor at IIMC.

[20] Many of these students, furthermore, had received a BA in a communications related discipline.

- Reporting and Writing (Tier 1): Basic news and feature stories
- Media and society, incorporating an introduction to the coverage of contemporary social issues of importance to journalists, such as gender, race, ethnicity, religion, social class, poverty, development issues, and public health, with training in applying analytical and critical techniques to news coverage of these issues.
- Journalism ethics
- Graduate level courses in a single academic discipline (or combined field of study) that provides the foundation for an area of specialized journalism.

In the second term, the students should be exposed to:

- Reporting and writing (Tier 2): In-depth journalism
- Media law (national and international)
- Media workshops: At least two of the following: (reporting and writing for radio, radio editing and production, reporting and writing for television, television editing and production, newspaper editing, design and production, photojournalism, magazine editing, design and production, online/multimedia writing, editing and production)
- Graduate level courses in a single academic discipline (or combined field of study)

These can be conceptualized as UNESCO's recommended "Core Courses," a loose framework of what is expected of a post-graduate journalism degree. So how well do the curricula of IIMC, ACJ and IIIJNM match up with this structure?

IIMC offers five different concentrations - English Journalism, Hindi Journalism, Odia Journalism, Radio & Television Journalism, and Advertising & Public Relations. The Course Outline for the Post-Graduate Diploma in English Journalism at IIMC, probably the most applicable of the five to the UNESCO syllabus, includes 10 courses (Journalism, English):

Figure 1

	Papers	Theory	Practical
1	Communication: Concepts and Processes	100	
2	History of Press, Laws and Ethics	100	
3	Reporting: Concepts and Processes	100	
4	Reporting: Practical	-	100
5	Editing: Concepts and Processes	100	
6	Editing: Practical	--	100
7	PR, Advertising and Media Business Management	100	
8	Radio and TV Journalism	50	50
9	Development Journalism	75	25
10	New Media Journalism	60	40
	Total	**685**	**315**

ACJ, meanwhile, offers concentrations in Print, Television, New Media, and Radio. During the first term, meanwhile, there are five required courses: Reporting, Writing and Editing; Tools of the Modern Journalist; Key Issues in Journalism; Media Perspectives; and The Media, Law and Society. In the second term, students begin their specialization: "They learn to select, report, edit, and produce pieces in the form required by the particular stream they have chosen. Under the guidance of professionals, they develop their skills in interviewing, researching and news gathering, and sharpen their ability to recognize and develop stories" (Program Overview).

IIJNM, finally, offers specializations in three concentrations: Print Journalism, Broadcast, and Online/Multimedia. Its core courses consist of: Reporting and Writing; Tools of Journalism; Ethical and Legal Issues; Areas of Specializations; Convergence; Critical Thinking in Journalism; Media Workshops; and Master's Projects.

From the four sets of programs (UNESCO and the three schools), clear overlaps and themes emerge, both linguistically and substantively (see **Figure 2**). In all four cases, there is an emphasis on the skills necessary to be a journalist (i.e. reporting and editing), an emphasis on learning how to navigate the cultural and legal environments (i.e. ethics and law), and an emphasis on critical thinking (i.e. key issues, concepts and practices). There is also a clear distinction between types of "media." The UNESCO syllabus, for example, encourages students to take at least two "Media Workshops" in their second year focusing on different distribution outlets (e.g. radio, television, online). The three Indian schools have similar designs albeit structured through slightly different approaches. IIMC separates its concentrations into language-

specific journalism tracks but also offers one specifically devoted to Radio and Television. ACJ, meanwhile, allows its students to specialize in Print, Television, New Media and Radio while IIJNM offers Print, Broadcast, and Online/Multimedia.

	UNESCO	IIMMC	ACJ	IIJNM
Skills	Reporting and Writing (2 Classes)	Reporting (2 Classes); Editing (2 Classes)	Reporting, Writing and Editing	Reporting and Writing
Cultural/Legal Environment	Journalism Ethics; Media Law	Historty of Press, Laws and Ethics	The Media, Law and Society	Ethical and Legal Issues
Key Issues/Concepts	Media and Society	Communication: Concept and Processes	Key Issues in Journalism; Media Perspectives	Critical Thinking in Journalism

Figure 2

Based on the analysis above, there does indeed seem to be a strong substantive foundation – a general pattern as to what constitutes a worthwhile journalism education. And while there are, admittedly, differences in the wording of the courses and the timing at which they are offered, the similarities across the four "programs" are too salient to ignore. From here, my primary research question re-arises, especially as it pertains to IIJNM, the school that touts a curriculum modeled after the Columbia School of Journalism in its marketing materials, downplays the actual influence Columbia had on the formation of its curriculum, and yet offers a curriculum that is on its face remarkably similar to the UNESCO model: To what extent can one say that these schools have been influenced by the American journalism education organizational field? To answer that question, this chapter turns to yet another seminal work in the new institutionalism literature.

Institutional Pull

In an oft-cited paper concerning organizational structure and institutionalization, Meyer and Rowan (1977), suggested that organizations that "incorporate the practices and procedures defined by prevailing rationalized concepts of organizational work and institutionalized in society" subsequently "increase their legitimacy and their survival prospects, independent of the immediate efficacy of the acquired practices and procedures" (p. 340). In other words, new organizations can quickly increase their legitimacy within a field by adopting practices and procedures of already established organizations. But because those practices and procedures can be at odds with the new organization's goals or objectives – the organization's "efficiency criteria" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) - these practices and procedures are sometimes adopted "ceremonially," (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) meaning that while the activities may be advertised outwardly as a fundamental component of the organizational structure, they are less significant in terms of day to day operations. As Meyer and Rowan suggested, these organizations build "gaps between their formal structures and actual work activities" in an effort to "reflect institutional rules" (p. 341).

Perhaps the most interesting data to emerge from the above analyses concerns IIJNM's connection with the Columbia School of Journalism. Although this relationship is advertised on the school's website and brochures, its faculty members discuss the connection as being relatively inconsequential in the development of the curriculum. This would not entail isomorphism, then, as DiMaggio and Powell (1983) have described it, but rather a *façade* of isomorphism, something Meyer and Rowan (1977) would call "ceremonial conformity."

During our conversation, the Vice-Dean of IIJNM described the school's curriculum as incredibly dynamic, often changing year-by-year based on conversations she would have with

individuals in the media industry. When Kaur first started, for example, she looked at the

curriculum and . . .

> . . . realized that we needed to keep changing it, modifying it as times went along. So one of the
> things that, so I think since then we have evolved a sort of tradition, if you want to call it, that
> every year, at the end of the year, the one thing that we do is, all faculty members meet at the end
> of the year and see how the year went by and see what changes we need to make in the
> curriculum. So we take a short break in May, and we come back in June, we start classes only in
> mid-July. So we come back in June and relook at the curriculum completely. Every year we do
> this. So, we add new courses, we change the way a few things have been taught, we introduce new
> elements into it as much as possible (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013).

Kaur mentioned that her goal was to position IIJNM's curriculum alongside current

trends in the media industry – that meant continually adding courses as the faculty and

administration saw fit. A good example of this was when the school began a course on radio

news:

> About five or six years ago, we heard from somebody in the BBC, in India, that radio was going to
> open up and BBC was hiring people. So that is when we started a course on radio news. Otherwise
> in India, radio news is confined only to the government channels. Private players were not allowed
> to broadcast news and current affairs. So we thought that that was opening up and we started that
> (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013).

Another example of a curriculum adjustment meant to meet the needs of India's media

environment involves the school's addition of a "Science and Technology" course:

> So we have this faculty member tell us - he heads the Bangalore edition of national business
> newspaper here in Bangalore. And he said, "Look, when I need somebody for covering technology
> and the IT industry, and whatever else is happening, say, in the pharmaceutical industry or
> science, I have nobody. I can't find anyone with the training". So that is when we started this
> course on covering science and technology (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013).

Still, despite these changes, the school's "formal structure" – the one advertised and

promoted on its website and through its brochures - still shares a strong resemblance to the

curricula of IIMC, ACJ, and the UNESCO Model. It is possible, however, that those elements

are yet another example of "ceremonial conformity." When I asked Kaur about the students' first

term on campus, for example, she explained a system far different than the week-by-week syllabi

suggested by UNESCO:[21]

> the way our week works in IIJNM is, we have classes on Monday's, Wednesday's and Friday's and
> perhaps Saturday mornings. Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturday afternoons are meant for, beat
> reporting and production. Even our classes are oriented towards what is happening in your beat.
> So if you are going reporting tomorrow, here are possible ethical issues you have to look at. If you
> are going reporting tomorrow, here is how you source. If you are producing tomorrow, here is
> what you need to learn (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013).

In fact, over the course of two plus weeks and thirty plus interviews on the campus of

IIJNM with faculty, administrators, and students, I never saw or heard of a syllabus for an

individual class. What I observed, instead, were groups of students commuting into Bangalore

proper to collect stories and returning to put those stories in a newspaper, magazine, broadcast,

or webpage.[22] Often, the school seemed to be run as (and the students seemed to discuss it as) a

regular news organization. Some of the faculty members noted this distinction in our interviews:

> So there are a lot of these institutions where they run an on-campus magazine. So they report
> what's happening on campus. We are not looking at those kinds of stories as even to teach
> reporting. We insist on getting real stories that could then get published anywhere. So the students
> go out and do real reporting. Some of the stories are then picked up by local media . . . .So they are
> doing really solid reporting work here. I think they learn, they don't get by easily. Yeah, it's a lot
> of work (S. Deepak, personal communication, July 2013).

Part of this commitment to running the school as a news organization can be traced to the

background and experience of IIJNM's faculty. Two of the newer faculty members, for example,

came to the school directly from the newspaper industry. One, an investigative journalist and

two-time Reporter of the Year for the *Sunday Mail* in Scotland, joined the faculty in 2012 to

assist with the print reporting track. Another joined IIJNM after doing reporting, editing, and

layout for the *The Daily Yomiuri*, an English offshoot of *The Yomiuri Shimbun*, Japan's biggest

---

[21] An example: **Week 5 Lecture:** Getting it right: A passion for accuracy. Discussion will follow an exercise on the
process of analysis, supported by a handout on this technique: Students will be given a news story and asked to
analyze the lead, summation graphs, transitions, and use of quotes.
[22] The actual experiences of these students will be discussed in-depth in Chapter 4.

newspaper. Both faculty members were significantly involved in the end-of-the-year curriculum meetings mentioned previously.

What I observed at IIJNM, then, is an organization oriented toward several fields and entities. On the one hand, IIJNM maintains ceremonial conformity with organizational associations (i.e. Columbia) and formal structure (i.e. curriculum) for legitimacy within the larger journalism education organizational field; on the other hand, the school actively orients itself toward the Indian media industry by offering classes that fit its needs and also to its own (and potential) students by teaching and promoting skills in which jobs will be available.

My conversation with faculty at IIJNM, furthermore, was remarkably different than conversations I had with faculty at IIMC. As one of the oldest and "most prestigious" (Gaunt, 1992) institutes in the country, many of the faculty recognized IIMC's place in the hierarchy of Indian education and, thus, the need for IIMC to set the proverbial pace:

> But yes, even at IIMC there is lot more need to be done because when you say that you are the best then you have to, you have the responsibility to tell people that, okay you are the best. And you know you have to keep modifying, even our syllabus. We keep modifying it; we keep changing that particular thing. And I think there is a need to run more courses (A. Yadav, personal communication, March 2014).

And when I asked this faculty member how IIMC compared to other schools, she was adamant that the school was leading the way:

> **David:** You said that there is need for more courses, digital marketing. Do you think other schools have been able to move quicker?
> **Anubhuti:** No no. See if we compare it with the other institutes, we are still ahead.
> **D:** You are still ahead?
> **A:** We are still ahead.
> **D:** Because they have someone like you.
> **A:** No, it is not someone like me, it is just that you know, whenever you know, new thing happens and you know we are able to accept it, we are able to integrate it very quickly. And the reason is, we work very closely with the industry. Maybe being at Delhi, central place, we deal with industry people a lot, we call them here for guest lectures a lot. So whatever new is happening in the industry you know, we are able to, "Okay fine, this is something which has happened and this is new and this has to be integrated in our curriculum". So we are the one who are actually leaders in doing that particular thing. But compared to other institutes we are far ahead. Btu still we need to do la lot (A. Yadav, personal communication, March 2014).

But other faculty members weren't so sure; they seemed skeptical at the pace by which

IIMC was adapting to new challenges. The coordinator of the Radio Journalism course, for

example, a young professor who had only been at IIMC for a few years, told me that "in India,

there is nothing called radio journalism," because the private FM networks that do exist are

forbidden to broadcast the news.

> **David:** What kind of students take radio journalism?
> **Shashwati:** Nobody, nobody is interested.
> **D:** So do you make them take it?
> **S:** Yeah, because it is a must.
> **D:** Oh it is required?
> **S:** Yeah it is built into their syllabus and so you have to take those papers, nobody takes it seriously.
> **D:** Nobody takes it seriously?
> **S:** Yeah. It is just a part of their course curriculum. Everybody comes to this class looking at television, because our course is called Radio and Television Journalism. So radio is not important, it is simply silent (S. Goswami, personal communication, March 2014).

In this case, the faculty member – a radio specialist – felt that the course was irrelevant

and that "nobody took it seriously." It remained because it was a part of the syllabus – what new

institutionalists would call a "taken-for-granted" routine. This exchange, furthermore, stood in

stark contrast to my conversation with the faculty at IIJNM, who created a course on Radio

Journalism because they sensed future employment opportunities for their students.

But IIMC's legitimacy, both within the organizational field of journalism education

(stemming, in part, from its early association with Schramm and its position as the first true

Indian journalism institute) and within Indian higher education in general, did not necessitate the

kind of active innovation I saw at IIJNM. There was *talk* of innovation, to be sure (such as the

discussion mentioned above concerning New Media) but implementation was slower than at the

newer programs such as IIJNM or ACJ. Those schools were actively oriented toward their

students because they had to be – they were competing against each other and many of the new

journalism programs popping up around the country. But IIMC's enrollment was strong, thanks in part to its history, its legitimacy, and its association with the government, which allowed it to charge lower tuition. In short, regardless of what they learned, students were already promised jobs as soon as they walked in the door of IIMC. As one faculty member said to me, "They join the institute because they know that the moment they join IIMC, get admission in IIMC, it is sure that they will get a job" (Anubhuti, personal communication, March 2014).

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this chapter was two-fold. First, it was to utilize the analytical lens of new institutionalism to conceptualize American journalism education as an organizational field. And second, it was to assess and explore the influence of that field's supranational carriers – such as the filtering of personnel and the UNESCO *Model Curricula* document - on three Indian journalism schools.

My empirical investigation found evidence of normative isomorphism – through the relationship of Indian faculty members to the American journalism education organization field – as well as evidence of mimetic isomorphism - through curricula structure. But I also found evidence that at least one of the programs under examination, the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media, often exhibited what new institutionalists would call "ceremonial conformity" (Meyer & Rowan, 1977) to the field. The school, for example, openly touts a curriculum developed in tandem with the Columbia School of Journalism and advertises a course structure similar to one proposed by the UNESCO *Model Curricula* document (a supranational extension of the American journalism organizational field) while dynamically adapting its course offerings

to more properly fit the needs of the Indian media industry and to better prepare the students for jobs after graduation.

What causes an organization to adopt "ceremonial conformity"? In their seminal work on the subject, Meyer and Rowan (1977) claimed that, "In institutionally elaborated environments organizations also become sensitive to, and employ, external criteria of worth. Such criteria include, for instance, such ceremonial awards as the Nobel Prize, endorsements by important people, the standard prices of professionals and consultants, or the prestige of programs or personnel in external social circles" (p. 350). The authors continued by suggesting that:

> Ceremonial criteria of worth and ceremonially derived production functions are useful to organizations: they legitimate organizations with internal participants, stockholders, the public, and the state . . . . They demonstrate socially the fitness of an organization. The incorporation of structures with high ceremonial value, such as those reflecting the latest expert thinking or those with the most prestige, makes the credit position of an organization more favorable (p. 351).

In other words, IIJNM recognized the value of attaching its name to the Columbia School of Journalism. And the new institutionalism framework would suggest that this value stemmed from the legitimacy gained within the "institutionally defined environment" – i.e. the organizational field. As explained above, one reason I believe there was more evidence of ceremonial conformity at IIJNM than the other two schools I visited had to do with the composition of the faculty - IIJNM's instructors had fewer connections to the American journalism education organizational field and more connections to organizations within the media industry. This minimal "filtering of personnel," as DiMaggio and Powell have described it (1983), means there was less chance of normative and mimetic isomorphism. But the "ceremonial conformity" I observed at IIJNM is, at the very least, evidence that the school is at least somewhat under the auspices of the larger organizational field. If IIJNM (or IIMC and ACJ,

68

for that matter) existed completely outside the influence of this organizational field, in fact, one can assume that ceremonial conformity would be unnecessary and/or irrelevant.

There were also moments during my interviews with IIJNM faculty when evidence of institutional isomorphism, rather than ceremonial conformity, emerged. When I asked Kaur about the future of the program, for example, she mentioned that the school was developing a reputation not unlike a trade school[23] – students were learning how to effectively cover a beat and how to put together a story but there was a lack of deliberation about what kind of stories to cover and, most importantly, why. To counter this trend, Kaur introduced the "Critical Thinking" component of the curriculum "four or five years ago." But, according to her, it's not enough:

> But I am now beginning to think, this is the last year or so, if we want to change the way journalism is being done then we need to produce good editors. And which is why this whole movement towards research, thinking, criticizing, looking at stuff. And that is where we are looking at (K.Kaur, personal communication, July 2014).

During another moment in our conversation, she said:

> And also the industry I think needs somebody who can step back and look at what it is doing. While you are in it you are not thinking of where you are going. So, I think we might have the ability to step back and say, "Look academically or critically this is what we see" (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2014).

But when I asked Kaur if the media industry *wants* students with that kind of skill set, she laughed and said, "Want it? We don't know." And so after spending nearly an hour talking about how IIJNM catered to the needs of the media industry and its students – how the school had created courses like "Radio Journalism" or "Science and Technology" off the behest of requests and tips from specific media companies to fill open positions - Kaur admitted that because of IIJNM's supposed "reputation," she was thinking of pursuing another direction with the school's curriculum. In many ways, Kaur's desire to expand the scope of the curriculum brings IIJNM full circle – back to the early days of Wilbur Schramm, who, in his speech to IIMC in the 1960s,

---

[23] I regrettably did not directly ask Kaur where this "reputation" was coming from – the industry, students, critics, etc. – but I perceived that it was from within the higher education community.

emphasized that communication schools should be a place not only to learn how to use mass media but when to use it and why.

Meyer and Rowan (1977) suggested that, "To maintain ceremonial conformity, organizations that reflect institutional rules tend to buffer their formal structures from the uncertainties of technical activities by becoming loosely coupled, building gaps between their formal structures and actual work activities" (p. 341). This is what IIJNM did initially by outwardly advertising its association with Columbia but inwardly adjusting its curriculum to fit industry needs. But my discussion with Kaur suggests that this buffer can perhaps erode over time, and what was once ceremonial conformity to an expanding organizational field, can instead transform into institutional isomorphism.

Which leads to the final question of this chapter – what are the consequences of a supranationally expanding organizational field? In a discussion of Indian journalism education, Eapen (1991) has suggested that due to the persistent influence of American scholars on the development of Indian journalism programs, "The need for [text]books to reflect [Indian] national realities has not been met." Many Indian faculty members I spoke to supported this notion – one professor at ACJ, for example, mentioned her reliance on American journalism textbooks in the early days of the school. And while Eapen was specifically referring to the situation in his home country, previous research suggests the same may be true around the world. Duffy (2010), in a discussion regarding journalism education in Singapore, wrote that "Textbooks are primarily from the United States and the United Kingdom," despite acknowledging that Asian-focused textbooks are slowly becoming more prevalent (p. 40). Clarke (2010), meanwhile, writing about journalism education in Cambodia, has described a history not unlike India's: "Soon after the Peace Accords, two Australian journalists, Sue Downie and Susan

Aitkin, were hired by the government to run training programs. UNESCO started its own programs soon after, and in 1995, it set up the Cambodian Communication Institute under the Ministry of Information with funding from the Danish and French governments" (p. 59). She concludes her history with an observation very similar to Eapen's: "The point that jumps out from this overview is the predominance of non-Cambodian sponsors who provide journalism education and training, and the consequent strong influence of Western ideas" (p. 62). And Guo[24] (2010), in a biting critique of journalism education in China, has written that many early Chinese programs "were modeled after the Missouri School of Journalism in the United States" (p. 19) and that "beliefs about journalism being both an art and a craft succumb to a newfound worship of the ivory tower and the call for 'international linkage,' a euphemism for copying the Western education model" (p. 27).

In all three papers noted above, we see evidence of institutional carriers (e.g. personnel, textbooks). Some of the observations of these authors are simply that – Clarke and Duffy eschew critiques and seem only to be pointing out the myriad influences. Guo, on the other hand, relays a frustration with the system as its currently constructed, going so far as to title one of the sections of his paper "Institutional-Level Constraints" (p. 26). Of the Chinese journalism schools that emphasize research for the sake of training, for example, Guo wrote: "Because they are aware of the material resource gains and the symbolic implications associated with the label of 'research institute,' journalism schools religiously stress the priority of academic research in the career advancement of journalism faculty members, a presupposition widely criticized as emphasizing research at the expense of reality" (p. 27).

---

[24] Interestingly enough, Professor Guo Zhongshi is himself an institutional carrier, having received his Master's and Ph.D. degree in political communication from the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

The main concern of this study, however, is not whether journalism schools should be stressing training or research[25] or even some other component but rather *how* and *why* those priorities are rising to the top. And as the first study to analyze journalism education from an organizational framework, I believe the primary contribution of this chapter is as a reevaluation of how American journalism education has evolved and how its influence has permeated outward. As scholars continue to call for innovation in the way journalism education is constructed and discussed (Deuze, 2006; MacDonald, 2006; Mensing, 2010; Pavlik, 2013; Reese & Cohen, 2000), then, I believe more self-reflective empirical studies like this are crucial for understanding why these organizations function the way they do. And with that, this dissertation now turns to the individuals affected the most by the structure of journalism education – the students.

---

[25] This discussion, I believe, would take this chapter in an entirely different direction and so is best saved for another project.

CHAPTER 3: THE STUDENTS

Nibedita is from Orissa, an eastern Indian state with nearly five hundred kilometers of coastline on the Bay of Bengal. She was from what she called a "conservative" Oriya family; her father is a head pharmacist at the one of the largest steel companies in India while her mom is a primary school teacher. Throughout her life, Nibedita's family had pushed her to become a doctor and when I first spoke with her in August of 2013, she had just completed her Bachelor's of Science with concentrations in Zoology, Botany, and Chemistry through a university in Jamshedpur, Jharkand. But Nibedita had no desire to pursue medicine; she enjoyed reading and writing and thought those interests would translate well to a career in journalism. Unfortunately, her family disagreed - they had a poor opinion of the profession and were intent on encouraging her to change her mind:

> **Nibedita:** So when I asked my grandfather that I want to continue journalism he has the mentality that journalists, they usually sit on the desk and deliver the news, they have the mentality just to the limit of that . . . actually I have an aunty, I had an aunty, she was into journalism, she was a news reporter and for that she got boycotted from our whole family, my grandfather he boycotted her.
> **David:** Why?
> **N:** Just because she was in the media and everybody in the locality as well they have the mentality that if anybody is going into the media it means they don't have scope, they don't have anything of their own, they just put on the makeup and sit on the desks, deliver the news and all and behind the scenes they do all those negative stuff, their mindset is like that. Unless and until you come out of your well you won't know what the world is actually, so I just want them to get out of their well and think beyond the well.
> (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013)

Nibedita told me that she knew many people who felt journalism was a poor occupational choice. But she hoped to change their minds, to elevate the role of the news reporter, and to alter what she believed to be a "very backward, very conservative" approach to the profession:

> After graduation [from her Bachelor's degree], every day I used to console my mom, mom I am very well here, having my food, I am not doing any kind of stuff and my whole career and my focus is on my career only. I want to work purely for journalism not for money or fame or something like that, just for myself, just for my satisfaction (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013).

But Nibedita mentioned that her motivation to pursue journalism against her family wishes went beyond a desire to read and write and to elevate the perception of the journalist - she also hoped, in may ways, to become a role model to other young girls in her community, many of whom were limited by traditional societal or cultural norms:

> Just because in our society the parents have made the limitations to hold their customs so tightly, that's why the girl couldn't breathe, even if she wants to do something else, she cannot dare to because the society has made them that so if I am attempting my first test towards journalism and I am standing firm on it the girls of my locality they'll see me and they will get the inspiration from me and they will think of stepping forward beyond their limitations and gradually the society will change, that's what I think (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013).

In the end, Nibedita made a deal with her grandfather, agreeing to pursue another profession if she is unable to secure a job as a journalist once her degree program comes to an end:

> He was a bit opposed to that [the decision to enter journalism school], but I told him it was an eleven-month course and so they have allowed me for one year. I told him 'teek hai' [OK] I will do this eleven-month course, if I cannot succeed in my career, if I cannot see anything in my career after doing eleven months in my course then whatever you say I will do that. Like that if I cannot stick to my word, and he agreed to that. Even my father was not convinced but after I talked to my grandfather he convinced my father and my father willingly sent me for my course (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013).

The purpose of this chapter is to explore the motivations of journalism students in the United States and India. The inquiry is focused around two broad research questions. First, why do students pursue journalism as a profession? And, building off that inquiry, why do students enter journalism school?

These questions have been explored before on a cross-national level, most often through a rigid, generalizable, survey-based approach (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007; Hanna & Sanders, 2007; Sanders, Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008; Splichal & Sparks, 1994). As

evidenced by the above example, however, a student's motivation to pursue journalism is often layered, multi-faceted, and often quite complex. During the beginning of our first interview, Nibedita explained that she pursued journalism because she loved reading and writing and thought the profession was a natural extension of those affinities. But after further conversation, the decision to pursue journalism and enter journalism school was revealed not only as an application of a relevant skillset but also as a symbolic gesture toward her local community and as a bargain negotiated between Nibedita and her family. Some of these motivational aspects would be easy to capture using a standardized survey questionnaire; others, though, would be quite difficult.

Methodologically, then, this chapter contributes to previous cross-national literature by utilizing in-depth interviews and the "life history" approach (Watson & Watson-Franke, 1985; Meyers & Davidson, 2014) to examine the motivations of journalism students in the United States and India. Similar to previous studies, I did indeed find multinational patterns as to why the students thought they should become journalists (e.g. they were good at writing) and why they wanted to be journalists (e.g. to serve the public). But unlike past studies, my unique methodological approach allowed for me to probe this inquiry further, and subsequent conversation revealed the true complexity of these students' decisions, a complexity that made it difficult to segment the holistic motivations of the students into large, generalizable categories. In the end, the study became one of heterogeneity as much homogeneity, a sharp divergence from previous cross-national studies that used surveys to find statistically significant similarities and differences.

Furthermore, unlike these previous studies, my empirical objective was not only to understand the motivations of these students but also to explore (and understand) precisely where

those motivations came from. To properly contextualize the multi-layered complexity inherent within these motivations, then, I deployed the concept of habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). Habitus is an oft-used concept defined and utilized differently by different scholars and in different settings. The key for my own approach is that habitus allows the researcher to look not only at the individual (and his or her choices, actions, etc.) but also at the structures that surround, and the dispositions which inhabit, that individual. Following the arguments of scholars like Reay (2004), I utilized habitus primarily as a methodological tool, rather than as an empirical catchall, to ensure "that the research [was] always broader than the specific focus under study" (p. 439). And so while I found that both American and Indian journalism students were pursuing journalism to "serve the public," a conclusion not unlike those of previous surveys, I was also able to relate the differences in how American and Indian students specifically defined this journalistic "role" to larger country-related economic opportunities and constraints. The analysis, then, moved beyond the individual into a larger discussion of the students' respective media environments.

This chapter is structured as follows. First, I critically review Splichal and Sparks' (1994) seminal cross-national survey of journalism students in order to methodologically situate my own contributions to the literature. Next, I make a case for habitus as an appropriate methodological tool to study journalism student motivations, reviewing its previous application to the exploration of journalism and news. Then, I lay out the data collected through forty-seven interviews with journalism students in both the United States and India. I highlight both the homogeneity that emerges from the data as well as the heterogeneity, emphasizing the latter as a key contribution to the existing literature. I conclude the chapter by discussing the implications

of my methodological and analytical approach, and by linking the findings of this chapter with the findings of the previous chapter.

USING HABITUS AS A METHOD

The Survey Approach

Cross-national media research invites a host of issues. Different languages and cultures complicate surveys and interviews while temporal and spatial differences increase cost and personnel. Most of the cross-national research that has been conducted on journalism students (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007; Hanna & Sanders, 2007; Hovden et al., 2009; Sanders, Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008), meanwhile, has followed the survey-centric methodological path set down by Splichal and Sparks' (1994) twenty years ago, when the two authors conducted the most in-depth and comprehensive cross-national exploration of journalism students ever conducted. Bjørnsen, Hovden, and Ottosen (2007), for example, in their examination of Norwegian journalism students said, "Our study is clearly inspired by Splichal and Sparks' comparative study of journalism students in 22 countries" (p. 383). It is therefore worthwhile to explore the methodological decisions made by these two scholars in an effort to situate my own study within the appropriate literature.

In terms of purpose, despite their geographical ambition (involving academic collaboration in each of the nearly two-dozen countries), the authors' explicit aim was to effectively eliminate the significance of nation-state boundaries within the cross-national comparison. Splichal and Sparks pursued this objective by arguing that journalism had been internationally "professionalized" and that this global ideological consensus on what it meant to

be a journalist had marginalized any differences of journalistic beliefs and attitudes emerging specifically from national contexts. As the authors suggested in the introduction: "If . . . we can point to strong elements of a professional ideology of journalism which are common to different countries with widely different social structures, then it is reasonable to argue that journalism is a distinctive occupation which is constructed internationally" (p. 6).

Although the authors at one point claimed that the primary dependent variable of the study was media autonomy, "decomposed into a) evaluative and b) prescriptive attitudes of journalism students towards c) the influence of different social structures and organizations upon media policies, and d) dangers and e) pre-requisites for freedom of the press" (p. 59), they advanced no specific overarching theory-based hypotheses utilizing these variables, perhaps due to what they called a "general lack of a theoretical base for research" (p. 59). They instead pursued what may be thought of as a large-scale "fishing expedition," consisting of a wide-ranging survey that sought an "empirical generalization" (p. 58) consisting of similarities, rather than differences, between journalists from the different countries. The resulting similarities subsequently allowed the researchers to broaden the research inquiry beyond simple country-to-country comparisons, and instead to group the participants into different demographic or psychographic categories. In Chapter 6, for example, the authors categorized the students by political beliefs and found that "the political opinions of students emerged as one of the most important factors influencing students assessment of the degree of influence of different social actors upon the press" (p. 92).[26] And in Chapter 7, using all 1,820 participants, the authors discussed the different "career aspirations of male and female" journalism students (p. 118).

---

[26] Aware that this sort of categorization across 22 countries could be interpreted as incredibly problematic (i.e. is a conservative in Ghana the same as a conservative in the United States?), the authors go to great pains to explain the potential limitations of such a method.

In terms of gathering data, the authors' primary instrument was a questionnaire designed to "reveal how values, attitudes, and motivations of journalism students are related to contextual and personal characteristics of students" (p. 59). It consisted of fifty closed-ending questions concerning a wide range of topics including political beliefs, news habits, motivations for entering a journalism program, educational experience before entering college, and perceptions of the "most important" qualities for a good journalist. Most questions were constructed using Likert-type scales. For example, the question "How often do you listen to radio news programs?" was accompanied by four choices – every day; many times, though not every day; rarely; and never. The question, "In your opinion, what is the influence of different social structures or organizations upon media policies?," meanwhile, was accompanied by a seven-point scale for each entity, ranging from 1 (weak) to 7 (strong). The questionnaires were mostly administered in three languages – English, France, or Spanish. In the countries where these languages were not spoken, the survey was translated into the "mother tongue" (p. 62).

Translation and misinterpretation of questions, furthermore, was not only noted by the authors as a common hindrance within comparative studies but also mitigated as much as possible in the pre-survey design; after circulating a copy of the survey in English, "several questions were reconceptualized or discarded" and the authors "tried to frame the questions widely enough to take account of differences of economy, society, and culture among participating countries" (p. 62). This generalizability, however, subsequently limited the scope of the study. Country-specific questions, for example, were impossible, as were questions regarding concepts or topics foreign to even one of the participating countries. As the authors noted, "In order to gather comparable and reliable survey data, only categories and terms were used on

which there was general agreement" (p. 63). The survey, then, can be seen as appealing to the least common denominator – a necessarily simplified questionnaire able to generate consistent answers within radically different political and cultural environments. And as Law argued in his discussion of the performativity of research tools, the survey is indeed creating an understanding of journalism student attitudes and values, "*but only in the context of its own interviews*" (2009, p. 245).

In terms of findings, finally, the authors were explicit in what they believed to be their study's primary takeaway, that attitudes of first-year journalism students around the world suggest that journalism has indeed become an international "profession" largely immune to differences in social or economic structure:

> The major finding of this study is undoubtedly that the attitudes of first-year journalism students are not determined by the nature of the national social or economic structure of the state within which they have been socialized. Despite the wide range of ages and situations, and despite the very different substances of the courses upon which they were enrolled, a number of striking similarities emerged. To the extent that they do exhibit uniform traits, these tend to stress a desire for the independence and autonomy of journalism (p. 179).

Furthermore, while the authors defined a typical supranational "pattern of attitudes towards the social role and goals of journalists," they also cautioned the readers by suggesting that "what appears to be internationally the dominant perception of journalists' goals and roles is not always the dominant opinion or ethical standard within single countries" (p. 171). In sum, the authors a) set out to find "strong elements of a professional ideology of journalism which are common to different countries with widely different social structures" (p. 6) despite a weak "theoretical base" from which to begin, b) utilized a methodological approach with "categories and terms . . . on which there was general agreement" (p. 63), and c) found, along with some differences, "a number of striking similarities that stress a desire for the independence and autonomy of journalism" (p. 171) across different countries.

Three aspects of this seminal work, then, are relevant to this study. First, it would seem that the authors' main conclusion concerning similarities and a professional ideology was, in a way, preordained by their theoretical (or lack thereof) foundation as well as their uniform methodological approach. Second, all findings - even the differences - were limited by the constraints of their survey design; that is, they were unable to investigate any motivations, attitudes, values, or expectations that could exist beyond their generalized categories or terms. And third, there was little empirical discussion of *why* and *how* those similarities and differences emerged.

My analysis of journalism student motivations in this chapter, then, can be seen both as a methodological alternative to the popular survey approach begun by Splichal and Sparks as well as a way to explore not only similarities and differences between journalism students in two countries but the underlying set of influences resulting in those similarities and differences. To pursue this contribution, I employed the methodological tool of habitus.

Habitus

Habitus has recently emerged as a popular conceptual vehicle for media scholars to explore journalists and journalism (Benson, 2004; Compton & Benedetti, 2010; Schultz, 2007; Willig, 2013). The concept of habitus, however, is not new – it originated with Bourdieu (1977) nearly forty years ago and was initially explained as follows:

> The strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations . . . a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks (1977: p. 72, 95)

The book in which Bourdieu introduced the concept has been critiqued as conceptually meandering and an "effort to read"; one early reviewer warned readers they would be waddling "through oceans of intellectual mud" (Hanson, 1980). Perhaps because of the context within which the concept emerged, habitus as a conceptual tool has often taken on a life of its own. Reay (2004), for one, has been critical of the manner in which many scholars have utilized the idea, suggesting that "Habitus is assumed or appropriated rather than 'put into practice' in research accounts, and it appears that it is 'the gravitas of habitus' that is desired rather than its operationalization" (p. 440). These "appropriations" could also explain Bourdieu's apparent frustration when explaining what he meant by the concept. In one interview, Bourdieu said, "I have explained the meaning and function of the concept of habitus so often that I hesitate to return to it once more, lest I only repeat myself and simplify without necessarily clarifying things" (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992).

Among journalism scholars, the tool is often employed to explain a "journalistic habitus" or a "news habitus" (Compton & Benedetti, 2010; Schultz, 2007; Willig, 2013). According to Schultz (2007), habitus is the manner by which journalists are able to process hundreds of possible daily news stories in a timely and efficient manner. The author explained habitus as "a practical mastering of the news game involving a strong, bodily sense of newsworthiness" (p. 193) and labels that mastering the "journalistic gut feeling." Like many authors who employ habitus as a conceptual tool, Schultz referred to Bourdieu's analogy of habitus being similar to having a feel for the game: "Having a feel for the game is having the game under the skin; it is to master in a practical way the future of the game; it is to have a sense of the history of the game" (Bourdieu 1998: p. 81). This "feel," meanwhile, and according to Schultz, was ingrained in Danish journalistic culture:

In Danish news journalism five *new criteria* [timeliness, relevance, identification, sensation, conflict] are highly institutionalized in the self-understanding of the journalistic field. The five news criteria are reproduced in different journalism readers, taught at journalism schools and discussed in the professional magazines. Wake up any Danish journalist in the middle of the night, and they would repeat these criteria of newsworthiness at the drop of a hat (p. 197).

This is what Reay would call an institutional habitus – "the impact of a cultural group or social class on an individual's behavior as it is mediated through an organization" (p. 521). Schultz, in fact, calls it a "professional habitus" (p. 193). Her empirical contributions, meanwhile, explored how these institutionalized traits were "observable in talk and in informal conversations" (p. 198). In short, the author suggests (anecdotally) the existence of an institutional habitus and then proceeds to empirically document how that habitus is enacted through interviews with and observations of Danish journalists.

In many ways, this particular study can be seen as an extension of the work of early news ethnographers - those scholars who documented the routinized work of newspaper and television journalists in an effort to navigate through a plethora of daily information. Tuchman (1973), for example, argued that journalists, because of finite time and resources, "typified" news stories. In an exploration of a local TV network and a daily newspaper, she wrote that, "news organizations routinize the processing of seemingly unexpected events by typifying them along dimensions that reflect practical tasks associated with their work" (p. 117). Bantz, McCorkle and Baade (1980), meanwhile, referred to a television newsroom as a "news factory" and suggested that individual journalists, in a way, were eminently replaceable: "newswork is accomplished within steps of organizing that are designed to use nearly identical reporters and photographers to produce a uniform product within a limited period of time" (p. 64). In both cases, there was a discussion of the attitudes and values deployed by journalists in certain situations or moments – the "institutional" or "professional" habitus as defined by Reay or Schultz.

Other scholars utilized the concept of habitus not to explore the journalists but rather to explore the structures and institutions surrounding those journalists. Compton and Benedetti (2010), for example, used habitus to accommodate, "both the micro-level practices of individual reporters (professional and amateur) and the macro-level institutional structures in which they invariably find themselves" and "as a method of situating the practices of individual bloggers and paid newsroom employees within the broader culture and political economy of journalism" (p. 488). Without explicitly mentioning it by name, the authors aligned with previous scholars in suggesting the existence of a journalistic habitus – "we observe forms of storytelling, and information gathering that structure the rules of the journalistic game" (p. 489). Their objective with the study, however, was not to explore how this habitus is enacted (such as in Schultz's work) but rather to explore the shifting social, cultural and economic contexts in which paid and unpaid journalists work. They did not, for example, interview a single journalist or blogger. And so once again, a kind of professional habitus is assumed rather than explored, out of which a separate analysis emerges.

Similar to these scholars, I adapted the concept of habitus for my own purposes – to explore the motivations of American and Indian journalism students to pursue journalism and enter journalism school. But this chapter is not concerned with what has been referred to as the "journalistic" or "news" habitus nor does it assume one exists among journalism students. Instead, my objective was to take a much broader view of the concept by focusing on the singular unifying characteristic among the twenty-six students used in the analysis: they chose to enter a journalism school. If, as Reay has suggested, "choice is at the heart of habitus," (2004), and that the habitus "makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks" (Bourdieu, 1977), then an exploration of how twenty six individuals of different genders, races, and

nationalities came to a similar decision to enter journalism school should cast light on the dispositions of these students as well as the experiences which influenced those decisions. I conceptually approached the students, therefore, as a single multi-national educational cohort so that their similarities and differences could emerge not through arbitrary pre-determined categorizations (e.g. American/Indian), but rather through an in-depth empirical investigation.

The notion of habitus is thus reflected in my interview structure, based loosely on the "life history" approach which is defined as "any retrospective account by the individual of his life in whole or part, in written or oral form, that has been elicited or prompted by another person" (Watson & Watson-Franke, 1985: p. 2). As Reay (2004) has explained, "Individual histories . . . are vital to understanding the concept of habitus. Habituses are permeable and responsive to what is going on around them" (p. 434). While I asked the students about their specific motivations to enter their respective journalism schools (to which I received somewhat similar answers), I also asked about their parents' occupations, their high school experiences, their hometowns, and their interests outside journalism (to which I received wildly divergent answers). The goal was to understand the dispositions, motivations, and expectations of these students and to explore what Reay (2004) has called the "deep, interior, epicenter containing many matrices . . . [that] demarcate the extent of choices available to any one individual" (p. 435). That information was then contextualized against a singular choice – the decision to enter journalism school. In sum, this approach would help me achieve my primary objectives discussed in the previous section: to provide a methodological alternative to the study of journalism student motivation as well as to explore not only similarities and differences between journalism students but the underlying set of experiences and influences resulting in those similarities and differences.

Data used for this chapter was collected primarily through two sets of interviews conducted six months apart with journalism students in both the United States and India. In all, I conducted forty-seven interviews with twenty-six total students, fifteen from India and eleven from the United States. During the second round of interviewing, I was unable to connect with two Indian students and two American students.[27] There were twenty-two females and four males and all were between the ages of twenty and twenty-two. Each interview lasted between twenty minutes and two hours. Some were eager to talk to me about any and all subjects, and the talks often diverged from their original intent about journalistic motivations and educational experiences. Others simply answered my questions directly, reluctant to venture too far from my initial, albeit purposely loose structure. Most of my interviews with the Indian students were conducted on the campus of the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media, either in an office at IIJNM's main facility, in the school's cafeteria, or in the apartment I was allowed to use when visiting. Two were conducted via phone once I returned to the United States. The interviews with the American students, on the other hand, were all conducted in my office on the campus of the University of North Carolina.

MOTIVATIONS

My findings are broken down into four sections. The first section explores the students' perceptions of themselves and the skills they believed were appropriate to pursue a career in journalism. The second section explores what the students believed the role of the journalist to be. The third section explores the expected lifestyle that students believed came with being a

---

[27] One of these American students had unfortunately dropped out of school. The other three students didn't respond or responded too late to my interview requests. Overall, this was a small drop out rate and there is no reason to think these students were any different from the other students in the cohort.

journalist. And the fourth section, finally, diverges from wider categorizations and instead explores the students' heterogeneity – in essence, the myriad reasons why each student actually ended up in a journalism school.

Being a Journalist

Regardless of nationality, gender, or familial background, two overarching skills emerged as the predominant traits deemed appropriate to pursue a journalism career: 1) writing and 2) socializing.[28]

Several of the Indian students I interviewed, for example, mentioned their ability to write well as a specific motivation for entering a post-graduate journalism program. Sneha, for example, completed her bachelor's in English literature. As she said to me, "English has been my favorite subject like forever so I always wanted to do English literature and fortunately I got a course in one of the best colleges in the city. So I enrolled for that and I did a good job, in my three years of literature, it was great. I am very fond of writing and reading so that is how literature happened" (Sneha, personal communication, July 2013). Nibedita told a similar story. Her motivation to write, she said, stemmed from the encouragement she had received from a former teacher: "He was our English teacher. I was pulled out for English in my class – I got the highest marks in my 10th standard board and throughout the course I was good at it and I wrote many poems and opinions" (Nibedita, personal communication, July 2013).

---

[28] Socializing, in this paper, is defined as the ability and desire to meet, talk with, listen to and interact with others on a daily basis.

Other students echoed Nibedita's story of writing-related accolades. Prutha, a twenty-one-year-old from Mumbai, explained that she had always been good at writing but that she had never known where it would take her:

> Writing was always my thing. I had won a lot of competitions like debates, elocution, writing competitions, etc. So it was always there but I never thought that I could make a career out of it because I come from a science background so biology, to become a doctor, was more my thing (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013).

Prutha's turning point came in a class with a visiting professor who worked as an editor for the *Times of India*. He had given the class an "on-the-spot" project and Prutha's submission had garnered significant praise: "When he read my article, he said that he has never come across such an article in such a limited amount of time, so he really praised me a lot and he said that you know what, you should be there and not here and you should definitely go into journalism" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). Other students mentioned teachers who had had a similar vocational influence. Suchitra, for example, knew from her ninth standard that she always wanted to do something with writing and high praise from a teacher only solidified that stance:

> My English professor she used to keep admiring my writing, like when we had these essays . . . and I used to be one of the toppers so then she used to keep praising me. She used to read out my essays in class. So that was very inspiring for me at that time and I thought, OK, maybe I can do something in that line (Suchitra, personal communication, July 2013).

A similar attention to writing was evident in my discussions with American students. Leslie Ann, for example, became interested in journalism after she began receiving accolades for her work on a monthly column within the local newspaper. The resulting praise resulted in a subsequent shift in her career aspirations towards a journalism degree:

> people just took to them and really liked them and I never had, like, adults responding to me like that or just the idea that I could make somebody think something was really exciting (Leslie Ann, personal communication, September 2013).

Emily, meanwhile, developed a love for writing earlier in her life but was initially unsure of how she could utilize that skill for her career: "I always loved writing since, like, the first

grade – I loved writing stories but I didn't really know what form that would take" (Emily, personal communication, September 2013). Although she was exposed to journalism by working on her high school newspaper, her affinity for creative writing always lingered in the background. Only when she took a class in creative nonfiction taught by a former journalist did she recognize the opportunity to translate this affinity and proficiency in creative writing into a journalism career:

> I think in my mind strangely I always consider myself a writer and I like writing creative writing and writing journalism were two separate things and I never saw an article as a story, I saw it as an article and she made me see articles as stories and it completely revolutionized how I went about writing for my journalism classes (Emily, personal communication, September 2013).

Claire, another student, mentioned journalism as the natural outlet for what had been a lifelong love of writing: "I always wrote – I don't know why; I always had" (Claire, personal communication, September 2013). At some point in high school, she decided that the best application of her writing ability would be as a journalist:

> Journalism seemed to be the easiest translation of what I wanted. You know, I'm naturally curious and I do like deadlines and I really like to write and talk to people so it seemed like a natural pathway and when everyone around was deciding about journalism, the idea just clicked in my head and that was kind of what I did (Claire, personal communication, September 2013).

From the previous quote, furthermore, emerges the second trait characterized by the students as appropriately applicable to a career as a journalist – that of socializing. Many students repeatedly stressed that their abilities to get along with people, to converse, and to listen had somehow pushed them toward a journalism career.

Emily, for example, noted her interest in journalism stemmed from a natural social disposition: "I like to talk but then I also really like to listen and see what's going on in other people's lives and that really intrigues me" (Emily, personal communication, September 2013). Another American student, Allison, admitted that her interest in journalism stemmed from a high

school assignment for which she was asked to interview local musicians: "I can talk to people I really love and really admire and ask them all these things and maybe one day get paid for it. That would be really, really cool. Maybe I won't get a ton of money but I would love to keep doing this" (Allison, personal communication, September 2013). And Leslie Ann mentioned the joy that came with hearing other people's stories:

> But there was some day when I sat down and listened to someone telling an interesting story and I was like, 'I should listen to people more often.' Something just kind of clicked and I was, like, maybe I should start listening to people. So I just started listening and letting people talk as long as they wanted and it just kind of changed the way – it made it a lot easier to kind of write because suddenly I had something to write about besides what I was thinking about" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, September 2013).

Many of the Indian students expressed a similar desire to interact with and listen to people. Mayukh, for example, explained that many people, including one very influential professor, had frequently mentioned to him that he should pursue journalism because "In general I am an extrovert, I get along with people very easily in general, and another of my major advantage is that I generally avoid having a big, inflated ego, I keep my ego aside when I am talking to somebody irrespective of who that person is" (Mayukh, personal communication, July 2013).

Rashmi, another Indian student, mentioned that she "took a lot of time" to decide what she wanted "to do in life." She cited her ability to socialize and her desire to meet and talk to people as a key determinant in her decision to pursue a postgraduate degree in journalism: "Actually they say what you want to do in life should be something that you are good at and I have been good at socializing and all, I get along with people very fast and I make friends very easily" (Rashmi, personal communication, July 2013). After some research, she decided that perhaps journalism was the career that best suited her particular skill set: "I had to talk to a lot of people and they suggested to me that 'I think you are good at socializing with people, you are

good at talking, you are good at making simple things interesting so you should basically go for [journalism]'" (Rashmi, personal communication, July 2013).

Riya, a twenty-one-year-old from Kolkata, had come to a similar conclusion. She mentioned her obsession with meeting new people and establishing a portfolio of contacts:

> So chatting with people and making contacts was one of my favorite games. I used to talk to my friends like this, 'OK let's count who has how many contacts.' Like, we used to play games in our school, so that was one of my favorite games I used to do in my school time (Riya, personal communication, July 2013).

This kind of attitude had led her first into an undergraduate program in advertising and public relations, and eventually into a postgraduate program for journalism. Shweta, meanwhile, described a similar desire to simply meet new people and to tell their stories: "For me it's very basic. I am not looking for fame, No. 1, and No. 2 is I would like to meet different kinds of people, be it any kind of people" (Shweta, personal communication, July 2013).

The conclusion that journalism students were motivated to pursue the profession because of their talent/love of writing and their ability to socialize or desire to meet new people is not new. Other studies, in fact, have already come to similar conclusions. Splichal and Sparks (1994), for example, found that a desire to meet interesting people and a talent for writing emerged as two prominent themes across their broad geographical analysis of journalism student motivations. Sanders et al. (2008), meanwhile, found that around one half of British journalism students pursued the profession because of either their "love of writing" or because of the "non-routine, sociable" aspect of the profession (p. 138). And in a survey of journalism students from Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden, Hovden et al. (2009) found "the pleasure of writing" and the ability to "meet interesting people" as important motivations for more than two-thirds of students.

91

What these studies failed to do, however, was to investigate the manner by which these seemingly innate character traits were linked to a specific vocational path - i.e. the path to pursue journalism. Utilizing habitus as a methodological tool, then allowed me to explore not only the "lasting and transposable dispositions" (e.g. "I am good at writing") but also the "past experiences" of these students which had led to said dispositions (Bourdieu, 1977). What I found through further examination of these students' life histories, then, were explicit connections between skillset and profession, a moment in time (or moments in time) when the student's ability to or love of writing/socializing was linked with the idea of pursuing journalism.

Often, this connection developed through relationships with other people and/or within other organizations. Prutha, for example, was encouraged to enter a journalism school off the accolades she received on her writing by the editor at one of India's most popular English-language newspapers. He did not, for example, simply tell her she was good at writing, but instead told her she was good at writing and that she "should definitely go into journalism" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). Emily, meanwhile, was persuaded to pursue journalism by a former teacher of hers during a creative nonfiction course (Emily, personal communication, September 2013). Rashmi, on the other hand, spent a considerable amount of time thinking about what she wanted to do in life. She was eventually encouraged to pursue journalism by her "friends and her family" because, as she told me, they told her that she was good at talking and meeting different kinds of people (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). And Mayukh, finally, was encouraged to pursue the profession by a professor who noted that his extroversion would serve him well in a journalist role.

These tangential motivational details are important. They imply that a student's decision to enter journalism school is, in some ways, a collective and socially-defined one, influenced by

a multitude of forces and influences. DiMaggio and Powell's (1991) idea of habitus is useful here: "a system of 'regulated improvisation' or generative rules that represents the (cognitive, affective, and evaluative) internalization of actors of past experience on the basis of shared typifications of social categories, experienced phenomenally as 'people like us'" (p. 26). In many ways, this is exactly what students like Emily, Prutha, and Rashmi were doing – they were improvising (i.e. trying to find an appropriate profession or major) but in a regulated manner, in that they received, and in some cases sought out, the advice of family, friends, and teachers. That advice, meanwhile, was built off of "shared typifications of social categories," a collective understanding of what being a journalist entailed. The advice contributed to an understanding of what "people like them" - people who wrote well and socialized - *did* for a living.

Which leads to another question – where do these "shared typifications of social categories" come from? In other words, how does a shared supranational belief that journalists are adept at both writing and socializing, as suggested by the data in my interviews, emerge? Vos (2012), for one, leaning on Meyer and Rowan's (1991) discussion of the influence of higher education, has suggested that higher education plays an important role in this process. Specifically, the author argued that journalism educators "have a unique authority to construct and maintain morally potent occupational norms" (p. 446). One manner by which this process occurs is through the creation and dissemination of textbooks: "Texts in general, and textbooks in particular, represent a fixed body of knowledge; that is, a sense that a definitive treatment of a subject has been rendered" (Vos, 2012, p. 437). If true, the prominent character traits of "being" a journalist discussed above should be reflected as key components within popular journalism textbooks. And previous research suggests this is indeed the case. Brennen (2000), for example, who conducted a review of journalism textbooks from the 1980s and 1990s, explained that

contemporary journalism texts have continued to place significant emphasis on both "news writing basics" (i.e. writing) and "the use of sources" (i.e. socializing).

This line of reasoning, then, would suggest that journalism education has, at the very least, contributed to shaping the idea of what a journalist "is," which, subsequently, regulates the manner by which journalism is socially discussed by categorizing what traits are deemed important for the profession which, in turn, influences the vocational choice of potential journalism students. Or, viewed in the opposite way, students do not simply pursue journalism because they are good at writing or socializing, but rather because the idea of being good at writing and being good at socializing has become an institutionally defined component (e.g. a taken for granted element) of what being a journalist entails, in part because of the emphasis placed on it by the field of journalism education. The implications of this arrangement, especially in light of the findings concerning the American journalism organizational field from the previous chapter, will be discussed at the end of this chapter.

The Role of a Journalist

Beyond possessing skills deemed appropriate for a career in journalism, many students explained that they pursued the profession because of what they believed the role of the journalist to be. Several of the Indian students, for example, referenced the overwhelming power journalism could have in their country. One Indian student insisted that "the role of a journalist is more important than the role of the CBI [India's Central Bureau of Investigation – the country's foremost police body]" (Meeta, personal communication, July 2013). Another referenced a lecture she had heard several years before from a journalist at a popular Indian newspaper who

had said, "If there is one profession that police are afraid of, then that's a journalist" (Shweta, personal communication, July 2013).

Several students agreed that this kind of power should be used as an antidote for the ills of India – government corruption, income distribution, gender inequalities. Bhavika, for example, rationalized the difficulty of the program, and thus her to decision to enter it and pursue a journalism career, with the potential outcome she hoped would emerge from her future work:

> See, it is difficult but I like what I do. If I would have been in engineering I would not have liked that, right? So it is supposed to be difficult. I have chosen this for me and it is OK . . . I believe in journalism for change so I am constantly thinking about how does my reporting of stories bring about change in any way (Bhavika, personal communication, July 2013).

Riya echoed this sentiment, explaining to me that she wanted to use journalism as a tool – as a way to get people to stand up for their rights and to fight for what they believed in:

> So for me I want people to fight for themselves, I want people so that they should fight for their rights, fight for the way they are presenting themselves, you know people they say, no, I am not going to do this, like they wash off their hands, but they shouldn't. They should go there and say, "Why are you doing this, you shouldn't do this" (Riya, personal communication, July 2013).

Several others suggested that their motivations to pursue the profession stemmed not only from the role the journalist should play in society but precisely because that role was currently underutilized. Mayukh, for example, explained that one of the reasons he chose to pursue journalism was because India "needs good journalists, not just biased people. We don't need another Arnab Goswami [a popular Indian television news anchor] jumping about like a jackrabbit on the 9 o'clock show. We need somebody who talks sense. I'd like to be that person" (Mayukh, personal communication, July 2013). Rashmi, another student, agreed, explaining that while India's economy was doing well, the country lacked the means to tackle certain issues such as corruption:

We do need a lot of journalists in India right now. The people who work in corporates they just work in corporates, they are doing their job. But what journalists do is that they have the power to change, they have the power to expose people (Rashmi, personal communication, July 2013).

As with the Indian students, many of the American students referenced the public service nature of journalism. But unlike the Indian students, who often cited a journalist's ability to tackle large-scale societal issues such as poverty and corruption, the American students articulated the public service role of the journalist as more concentrated on singular events or communities rather than widespread national topics. For many of them, the public service role of the journalist was envisioned as being more about "revealing" rather than "changing."

Brian, for example, noted that the role of the journalist is twofold: "It's to provide enough information to the public so that the public can make their own rational decisions about topics . . . and to just kind of show the humanity of the community, show the world cool people that make the community tick" (Brian, personal communication, September 2013). Emily, a double major in journalism and global studies, also referenced journalism's ability to illuminate previously unknown people or places: "I picked journalism because I really liked telling other people stories . . . I want to throw light on other cultures and situations – the less-known or the misunderstood" (Emily, personal communication, September 2013).

Another student, Leslie Ann, mentioned the influence she could have on a community by simply writing stories. In high school, although she considered herself more of a fiction writer, she agreed to start writing a monthly column in her local newspaper. Soon, "there were all these people coming up to me and they were, like, 'I just love what you wrote, it made me think differently about a person.'" This idea – "the idea that I could make somebody think something" – intrigued her. Her decision to eventually pursue a degree in journalism stemmed from her transition as a writer: "For some reason I had actually stopped wanting to write artistically . . .

and started enjoying writing so that people could learn and to express myself. It seemed like a less-selfish thing to do – seemed like I am doing this for someone else, I am doing it so that someone can learn something." She noted that journalism is "a very noble path to go down" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, September 2013).

These findings, again, are not necessarily groundbreaking. Similar to the previous section in regard to writing and socializing, many of the motivations mentioned above concerning the role of journalism as "public service" matched up well with previous studies. Sanders et al. (2008), for example, found that 29% of Spanish journalism students cited "Public Service" as their main reason for wanting to pursue the profession. And Hovden et al. (2009) found that over two thirds of Nordic journalists choose "Fight Injustice" and "Participate in Public Debates" as "Very Important" or "Somewhat Important" motivations in their decision to become a journalist. And again, it is possible to trace elements of this journalistic "occupational norm" to extensions of the journalism education organizational field. One of the World Journalism Education Council's Code of Principles, for example, states that: "Journalism program graduates should be prepared to work as highly informed, strongly committed practitioners who have high ethical principles and are able to fulfill the public interest obligations that are central to their work" (Principles).

But although the overarching role of public service materialized during my conversations with both groups of students, key country-specific differences also emerged; students in India were more likely to describe journalism as an agent for critical societal and cultural change while American students were more likely to describe journalism as a tool to tell previously untold stories. Further investigation, meanwhile, revealed a possible source of this disparity – employability upon graduation.

Several Indian students mentioned that they were pursuing journalism at IIJNM because the school offered an easy path toward an entry-level position at a major Indian news organization.[29] Sneha, for example, mentioned that "I am very fond of writing and reading so that is how literature happened and journalism offers you employability" (Sneha, personal communication, July 2013). Another student I interviewed told me about a conversation she had with an alumnus who spoke glowingly of the salary prospects after graduation from IIJNM:

> Like in freshers [new workers] whatever we get is just 10,000 bucks but when IIJNM placement was there the children got 20,000 bucks and that was really a turnover point for the freshers. 20,000 bucks was like "Oh wow," after a graduate or post graduate because a fresher doesn't get so much money at the entry point so it was like "Wow" so getting 20,000 bucks was like "Wow," so after hearing all that stuff, it really strikes, ok the placement cell is good (Riya, personal communication, July 2013).

And a third told me about an alumnus who had said, "there was a good placement program [at IIJNM], a very good placement program. Not everyone would get a start package of 40 or 20 but the companies are really good, the companies that come here are really good, really good, besides that you could choose which company you want to go to" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013).

This was in stark contrast to the American students, many of who told me they were pursuing a job as a journalist *despite* the job prospects. Brian, for example, began his college career as a Computer Science major; he mentioned that his Dad had been an engineer and there was a strong likelihood of getting a job with that kind of degree:

> It was definitely the influence of my mom and dad, both my parents were pretty poor growing up so I think a large part of the reason they majored in the things that they did was because they thought they could get a job. I mean it wasn't like, they were not saying that they wouldn't pay for college if I didn't go into a field like that, it wasn't that kind of pressure, but I have always kind of grown up with that kind of practicality and I enjoyed messing with computers so you know if it's a choice between two things I enjoy but one will pay substantially better and provide more job security, then I was going to choose the one that provided me with more job security (Brian, personal communication, September 2013).

---

[29] This process is discussed extensively in the next chapter.

After a few classes in Computer Science, though Brian decided that he was "way out of [his] league" and, having spent time both with his high school newspaper and then with the college newspaper at the University of North Carolina, decided to switch to journalism: "Ultimately if I dislike something that I am doing for 8 hours a day then it's not worth it to me" (Brian, personal communication, September 2013).

Allison had made a similar decision. She had grown up in a suburb thirty minutes from the Chapel Hill campus and had developed an interest in broadcast journalism from her grandfather, who worked in video production. This interest was piqued through a joint program between her high school and a local television network, one in which students were allowed to put together their own broadcasts. When it came time to pick a school, she was torn between journalism and a textile program at N.C. State, a degree that offered an easy path toward eventual job placement:

> I was really interested in the textiles program at N.C. state, specifically in the College of Textiles it was Polymer and Color Chemistry. So I was also kind of being groomed for that. I went to a bunch of summer camps and was involved over there and that department is amazing, just like the stuff they are doing is mind-blowing. And they were like "Job placement rates, 6 months after graduation is 99% consistently. And the starting salary is like $60,000 a year," and so my parents were like "You should do that". And I was like, I like chemistry but I don't really like the math of it that much. I know I'm going to take all of this math and I am going to struggle with. Not that I was particularly bad at it but I liked writing and doing the creative stuff a lot better (Allison, personal communication, April 2014).

There was, then, much more job uncertainty with the American students than there was with the Indian students. Leslie Ann, for instance, repeatedly told me that she wanted to pursue community journalism but that she was not sure she would get that opportunity right out of school:

> The thing about community journalism is especially with newspapers is that you can dive into a subject that you never knew about and show that you care about it very deeply and then the next day you move on and care very deeply about something else. You know you can write about it in depth. So I would like to do that in some context, I don't know if it will be in the newspaper in the short term but I really like light hearted things and human interest type stories or even I interned at our state magazine this summer also and I really enjoyed that so that's kind of my main calling

right now that it's a very noble path to go down and I want to write for a community newspaper for the rest of my life but it's also not the most realistic path to say that I am going to dive into a free newspaper and be there the rest of my life because in terms of being able to support myself and being supportive to my family, I don't know if that is always going to be a possibility with newspapers. (Leslie Ann, personal communication, August 2013).

This difference in attitudes concerning employability upon graduation was, of course, a product of the two media environments, one in which the pool of traditional journalism jobs – such as newspaper reporters – were declining (the United States) and one in which the pool for these jobs was still growing (India). One source, for example, cites a loss of 16,200 full-time newspaper newsroom jobs in the United States from 2003 to 2012 (Jurkowitz). The IIJNM website, meanwhile, claims to have "achieved practically 100% job placement for [their] graduates at attractive salaries" (About IIJNM).

After speaking with both groups of students, it became apparent that their motivations concerning journalism as a public service were perhaps moderated by their job prospects after graduation. In other words, while both sets of students had developed a similar understanding of what the role of the journalist entails ("serving the public"), that understanding may have been modified by the economic realities of their respective professional situations. Promised a job at a major news organization upon graduation, such as the television network Times Now or the newspaper *The New Indian Express,* the Indian students were intent on using their journalistic training to enter these organizations and cover large-scale national issues like poverty and gender inequality. The American students, meanwhile, were unsure of where they would end up. They were not promised a job at a major news organization by their school; some of them were not even sure if they would be able to work as a journalist immediately upon graduation. And so their "public service" expectations were tempered, focused more on "telling people's stories" or showing the "humanity of the community," in essence, the more attainable and achievable side

of public service. In this case, the difference between the students emerged not simply because some were American and some were Indian but instead because there were differences in the media environments and hiring landscapes across each country.

A Fulfilling Lifestyle

While the motivation to pursue journalism to either enact change or to tell previously untold stories was apparent, many of the students I interviewed cited the personal satisfaction or fulfillment that came attached to these functions. Nibedita, one of the Indian students, explained that her family had been upset with her decision to pursue. But regardless of how her family felt, she was undeterred: "I want to work purely for journalism not for money or fame or something like that, just for myself, just for my satisfaction" (Nibedita, personal communication, July 2013). Similar to Nibedita, Mayukh's family was initially unsupportive with his choice of profession, recognizing that students often make more money pursuing business or engineering: "So my family was a bit reluctant but I have a very supportive father who just told me you do whatever you want and I will take care of the rest of it" (Mayukh, personal communication, July 2013). Leslie Ann, meanwhile, one of the American students, explained that even though she was pursuing journalism "so that can someone can learn something," she also found writing stories to be a "very fulfilling activity" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, September 2013). Claire mentioned a similar motivation, explaining that she didn't care what newspaper she would be working at as long as they "pay me to write the stories that I find important and fulfilling" (Claire, personal communication, September 2013). Brian referenced a "strong sense of purpose" that came with working in a newspaper environment (Brian, personal communication, September 2013). And Eric, an American student with an interest in political reporting,

referenced a particular story he had been covering to relate the satisfaction that came with getting the public to pay attention to something: "But it was really cool because when that stuff started blowing up I was like, 'I have been covering this stuff for four to five months.' So you know, it was kind of fun to say that" (Eric, personal communication, September 2013).

But beyond the personal satisfaction and fulfillment were additional, more tangible incentives for many of the students. A few students, for example, because of past experiences working at news organizations or simply watching/reading the news, equated the journalistic lifestyle with a certain level of access and recognition. One student, enthralled with a certain Indian cricket player, bluntly said that she was pursuing the profession so that she could "meet prominent people" (Nirupa, personal communication, July 2013). An American student similarly admitted that her interest in journalism was piqued during an assignment where she got to interview her "favorite guitarist of all time" (Allison, personal communication, July 2013). Others simply expressed a desire to become well-known. One student mentioned that "the limelight . . . was the thing that inspired me to go in for journalism," (Shristi, personal communication, July 2013) another expressed a desire that people would "admire" her for her work (Riya, personal communication, July 2013), while a third said that she simply enjoyed "seeing her name in the paper" (Sierra, personal communication, September 2013). Here, one can quite clearly see the methodological advantage to pursuing an in-depth interview design when investigating motivations; it was doubtful, for example, that any journalism student would claim "access" or "recognition" as their "main reason," as a previous study had queried (Sanders et al., 2008), for wanting to be a journalist.

Sometimes, furthermore, the motivations of these students involved not what journalism *was* but rather what journalism *was not.* Several Indian students, in fact, referenced the

preference of being a journalist rather than working in a normal office environment. One Indian student told me that "cubicle work is very tedious and tiring and everything, and there is nothing interesting about that" (Amrita, personal communication, July 2013). Another said that she "never wanted to be in a 9-to-5 job, staying in a kind of office job" (Shristi, personal communication, July 2013). A third said she was "sure I didn't want to do accounts and I didn't want to become a doctor" (Meeta, personal communications, July 2013). And a fourth said she didn't want "to settle down in one place, or to just be with a boring profession where you don't get to travel" (Rashmi, personal communication, July 2013). The American students were often similarly adamant. One American student said that working within her particular niche (arts and entertainment) "was hard work sometimes, but I really enjoy it. So it doesn't feel like work" (Allison, personal communication, September 2013). And another, as mentioned above, switched out of a major because "ultimately if I dislike something that I am doing for eight hours a day then it's not worth it to me" (Brian, personal communication, September 2013).

The expectations of what these "boring" jobs entailed, meanwhile, often developed from an exposure to the lifestyle of family and friends. One said of her family: "My family has been a family of engineers and doctors, apart from me all my cousins have been into engineering and pharmacy and all of that and I was the only one in my family who was into journalism" (Nikita, personal communication, July 2013). Another told me that both her brother and her sister had received MBAs, and that she "was the only one in the field of journalism" (Shivani, personal communication, July 2013). And a third said: "Actually my father wanted me to be a doctor but I am very much scared of blood" (Nibedita, personal communication, July 2013). For these students, then, the decision to pursue journalism was in part a response to learning what they did *not* want to do through watching the professional lives of relatives and acquaintances.

The Actual Decision

If the analysis were to stop at this point, I would conclude that individuals who pursue journalism and who enter journalism school believe themselves to be competent writers with quality social skills who hope to serve society and to lead a noble, fulfilling, and perhaps somewhat glamorous or respected life. Each student I spoke to did not, of course, possess all of those qualities but I could conclude that it is possible to use those categorical guideposts as a frame to help us understand the attributes of the "journalism student."

But utilizing habitus as a methodological tool allows the researcher to, and in some ways demands him or her to, probe further. Bourdieu (1993) has written "Just as no two individual histories are identical so no two individual habituses are identical" (p. 46). This is where my adaptation of the life history approach proved invaluable; it allowed me to penetrate deeper into the lives of these students, to delve into their individual decisions to enter journalism school beyond the easily identifiable categories of "I enjoyed writing" or "Journalism is a noble profession." The decision to enter journalism school, then, is rarely as simple as "I enjoyed writing and so I came to the University of North Carolina to major in journalism," but rather is often a complex decision influenced by myriad factors. And when I began to interrogate the data further, I found many aspects of the decisions that could not be placed into the neat categorical buckets used in previous studies of journalism student motivations.

Scholars who focus primarily on college and vocational choice have reached similar conclusions.[30] Chapman (1981), for example, has suggested that the choice of a college/university "is influenced by a set of student characteristics in combination with a series of external influences" (p. 492). Lent et al. (1994), meanwhile, developed a career development

---

[30] This, in fact, is an entire body of work and will only be covered briefly in this section to highlight my own substantive contributions to the work on journalism students specifically.

model that incorporates both personal agency as well as "extra-personal factors that enhance or constrain agency" (p. 79). The objective of these authors was to aggregate the behavior of high school students into predictive models of college and vocational decisions. But habitus is best utilized as a tool rather than a model and was conceived to highlight the complexity of individuality rather than distill choice toward generalizability. Slotting the motivations of the students I interviewed into a model, then, would, in many ways, be counterintuitive to the habitus approach.

There were many instances during my conversations, for example, where the vocational/degree choice came down to a seemingly minor (although ultimately important) logistical detail. Maddy, for example, had entered college interested in majoring in Education. Her hope was to become a Teaching Fellow, a position where you receive free tuition to college but need to commit to teaching in North Carolina for four years after graduation. But she was initially waitlisted and when she was finally offered the fellowship during her first year, she declined and decided to stick with her journalism major. When I asked her if it was because she liked journalism or because she didn't want to stay in North Carolina, she said that the structure of the fellowship had dissuaded her from pursuing the education option: "Yeah I didn't want to teach. I didn't want to stay in North Carolina four years and I didn't want to teach for four years" (Maddy, personal communication, September 2013).

Allison's decision, as mentioned previously, came down to a choice between a textile program and a journalism school. But the roots of this decision were not simply about which major she preferred, although that did play a role, but also about moving away from home: My dad's office is five minutes from NC State so that would have been a little too close to home. So I

105

am really happy with where I am and what I am doing (Allison, personal communication, April 2014).

Claire, on the other hand, was dead set on majoring in journalism when she was in high school. It was, according to her, "the easiest translation of what I wanted" (Claire, personal communication, September 2013). Her decision to enter North Carolina's journalism school, however, wasn't as straightforward as her choice of major. Some of it, in fact, can be attributed to the weather: "So I was looking at all these colleges and it was a winter in New Jersey that it snowed 99 inches and all the headlines were like 'Snowpacolypse' and 'Snowmageddon' . . . and my mom and I were like let's get out of here. So we flew to Raleigh rented a car and did South Carolina, Wake Forest, Elon and a bunch of random schools and North Carolina, which had fit me on paper" (Claire, personal communication, September 2013).

Riya, meanwhile, a student at IIIJNM, had initially wanted to attend Xavier Institute of Communications in Mumbai and had passed the initial entrance exam. But she was unable to proceed because of a "Christian quota," a process by which schools set apart a certain number of admissions for under-represented groups in the country. If she had been granted admission to Xavier's, she would have pursued Advertising and Public Relations because, as she told me, "money is like everything nowadays so I wanted to go for advertising because it is the best way to earn resource and revenue. . . . But unfortunately I couldn't go for Xavier's so I had to come here" (Riya, personal communication, July 2013). Her dream, however, is not dead; Riya later told me that she wanted to work for a year or two as a television announcer but eventually go back to Advertising or Public Relations, a job she felt was much more conducive to her overall lifestyle.

For Nirupa, journalism school seemed like a convenient second option. She had

mentioned to me that she had pursued journalism to meet "prominent people," cricketers

specifically. But if it had not been for a small visa-related delay, she probably would not have

even enrolled in the program in the first place. Before coming to IIJNM, Nirupa had completed

her Bachelor's of Technology from the Indian Institute of Technology. After graduation she had

applied for admission to the Master's of Information Science program at the University of

Melbourne. But she told me the application process "got delayed for some reason" and "in the

meantime" she had applied for a seat at IIJNM. A few days after starting the program, however,

she was accepted into the program in Australia. When I asked her if she would have pursued that

option if the timing had been different, she said yes:

> **David:** Do you think if you would have found out about the Melbourne seat beforehand, you
> would have gone there?
> **Nirupa:** Yeah I would have.
> **D:** So you would have gone into information technology?
> **N:** Yeah, I would have.
> (Nirupa, personal communication, July 2013)

And, finally, there was Nibedita, mentioned in the beginning of this chapter. During our

first interview, Nibedita mentioned that she was pursuing journalism and entering journalism

school (against the wishes of her grandfather) in part as a way to inspire other girls in her

community, many of whom were limited by traditional societal or cultural norms:

> Just because in our society the parents have made the limitations to hold their customs so tightly,
> that's why the girl couldn't breathe, even if she wants to do something else, she cannot dare to
> because the society has made them that so if I am attempting my first test towards journalism and I
> am standing firm on it the girls of my locality they'll see me and they will get the inspiration from
> me and they will think of stepping forward beyond their limitations and gradually the society will
> change, that's what I think (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013).

It was often difficult, then, to group the students I interviewed into neat or logical

categories. While many of them mentioned pursuing journalism school because they were good

at writing or good at socializing or because they craved the journalistic lifestyle, many also

mentioned their choice of profession/school being influenced by various other factors including

the strict commitments of other academic programs (Maddy), a desire to move away from home

(Allison), weather patterns of the American east cost (Claire), an organization's government-

mandated religious quota (Riya), the Australian visa process (Nirupa), and the gender inequality

inherent within Indian society (Nibedita). These final six vignettes, in many ways, are a clear

indication of the complicated nature of the habitus – a complex matrix of influences in which

individual agency is both enabled and constrained by past experiences and social structures.

Unlike other studies of journalism student motivations, then, my findings are meant to

highlight both homogeneity *and* heterogeneity - to build upon previous research contemplating

the similarities and differences between journalism students around the world while

simultaneously calling attention to the difficulties in appropriately segmenting these students into

easily definable and rigid categories. The final section of this chapter explains the takeaways

from this analysis.

DISCUSSION

If the purpose of the previous chapter was to introduce journalism education, then the

purpose of this chapter was to introduce journalism students. My specific objectives, meanwhile,

were to a) provide a methodological alternative to previous work on journalism student

motivations and b) explore not only what those motivations were, but also where they came from

and how they developed.

In terms of the first objective, I found evidence to suggest that there are at least some

commonalities in the conception what it means *to be* a journalist across the United States and

India. These patterns, meanwhile, including perceived skills (writing and socializing) and expectations (public service and lifestyle), match up well with previous studies concerning journalism student motivations (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007; Hanna & Sanders, 2007; Sanders, Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008; Splichal & Sparks, 1994).

But, more importantly, my analysis also showed that putting students in large generalizable categories such as "they enjoyed writing" or "they wanted to live a fulfilling life" marginalizes the intricacies of life and, to use more theoretically derived terminology, marginalizes the intricacies of habitus. Consider, for example, the survey used by Sanders et al. (2008) in order to measure motivations of journalism students in Spain and Britain. The questionnaire used by the researchers included an open-ended question that asked: "What is the *main reason* you want to be a journalist?" The answers given by the students were then coded into eight mutually exclusive categories such as "Most Desirable/Suitable Occupation For Me" and "Good Prospects/Good Income" (p. 139). During my own interviews, I often found it difficult to extricate the *main reasons* for pursuing journalism for any of these students and believe that rigid categories such as the ones above reduce what is an incredibly complex matrix of perceptions, attitudes, values, and dispositions. Weaver et al. seemed to come to a similar conclusion after interviewing working journalists about their reasons for entering the profession: "Though it's useful to categorize responses to better understand the main themes that emerge as journalists explain what brought them into the business, it's important to recognize that categorizing tends to simplify what, for many, were complicated reasons for choosing this profession" (p. 61), an odd yet welcome proclamation in a book that spends much of its time trying to systematically quantify the "American Journalist in the 21st Century."

All of which leads to the second objective of this chapter - an analysis of why those motivations existed and where they came from. Many of the students above, for example, claimed to have pursued journalism because they were good at writing or good at socializing. But my data suggests that these motivations, in fact, stemmed from a socially accepted connection between a relevant skill (writing, for example) and a possible vocational path. In other words, understanding what a journalist *is* or *does* manifests itself through the advice of family, friends, teachers, and mentors as potential journalism students negotiate the school application and admission process. Students do not simply pursue journalism school because they are good at writing. Rather, students pursue journalism school because they develop an understanding of who a journalist *is* or what a journalist *does* by their surrounding social structures.

My interviews further suggest that components of this understanding can perhaps be moderated by one's respective media environment. At IIJNM, where jobs at large-scale media organizations were essentially guaranteed upon graduation, students discussed pursuing journalism in order to enact large-scale societal or cultural change. At UNC, however, where the path upon graduation was less clear, students talked about telling untold stories and showing the humanity of a community. Both of these motivations could be classified under the larger category of "public service" but their precise definitions were modified and adapted by the limitations or opportunities of the economic structures into which the students would be graduating. But motivations to pursue journalism and/or enter journalism school also emerged from a multitude of other forces. Some students saw it as a way to move away from their family or as a way to set a good example for their community. Several pursued journalism precisely because of what it was *not* (i.e. a boring office job)*,* rather than what is *was.* And still others

ended up at journalism school simply because of how each particular program was structured –

no commitments upon graduation, no religious quotas, and no visa process to negotiate.

Most importantly for the purposes of this dissertation, however, is the relationship

between the motivations of these students and the larger field of journalism education, discussed

in the previous chapter. As mentioned above, I found through my interviews enough evidence to

suggest that there are at least some commonalities in the conception what it means *to be* a

journalist across the United States and India. And because higher education can help shape the

social understanding of occupational norms (see Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Vos, 2012), this

homogeneity in occupational perceptions could in fact be connected to the growing homogeneity

across journalism schools in the United States and India (i.e. the organizational field). This is

where the lowest common denominator – the writing, the socializing, the desire to serve the

public - of these students is most evident. This process also results in an interesting cycle where

elements of journalism education are disseminated into society through institutional carriers (e.g.

personnel or textbooks), upon which these carriers then contribute to a shared understanding of

what a journalist is or does, which subsequently determines the type of student most likely to

enter journalism school. This means that most journalism students are influenced by journalism

education before they even set foot on campus.

But the analysis in this chapter also provides evidence that journalism schools are often a

landing spot for students with widely divergent motivations - those who want to meet famous

people or travel or open non-profit organizations or, in many cases, just *do not* want to pursue

other paths and use journalism as tangible alternative. While the elements discussed above are

undoubtedly inherent within the decision of many students, they are far from the only influences

and can therefore be conceptualized as a single component within the student's larger matrix of values, attitudes, and expectations – i.e. the student's habitus.

And because the purpose of the next chapter is to explore the experience of journalism students within journalism education, I believe the heterogeneity of the students is just as important as the homogeneity; in other words, how a journalism student experiences journalism education is eternally contingent on other experiences, attitudes, values, and expectations. Bourdieu has expanded on this concept in his discussions of habitus - that influences from aspects of one's life are constantly structuring and re-structuring other aspects and that in order to understand certain experiences, it is essential to understand the entirety of one's habitus, rather than simply understanding the outcomes of those experiences:

> Thus, for example, the habitus acquired in the family underlies the structuring of school experiences (in particular the reception and assimilation of the specifically pedagogic message), and the habitus transformed by school, itself diversified, in turn underlies the structuring of all subsequent experience (e.g. the reception and assimilation of the messages of the culture industry or work experiences), and so on, from restructuring to restructuring (p. 87).

As Benson and Neveu (2005) have written, "Habitus is not unchangeable. In fact, it is constantly being modified" (p. 3). The final chapter of this dissertation, then, combines a discussion of journalism education with a discussion of journalism students. It is, in a way, a study both of homogeneity (journalism education) and heterogeneity (journalism students) and the relationship between the two. It explores the experience of journalism school not in a large generalizable macro context but rather on an individual level – how students experience journalism school and how that experience is shaped by previous (and current) motivations, expectations, and values. The goal, ultimately, is to shed new light on the structure and efficacy of journalism education.

CHAPTER 4: GRADUATION

Chelsey, a 21-year-old journalism student at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, worked with the *Daily Tar Heel,* an independent student run newspaper, for her first three years on campus. When she lost an election for Editor-in-Chief at the end of her junior year, Chelsey left the paper to develop the concept for an iPad-only subscription magazine focused on enterprise reporting around campus. When I spoke with her in the fall semester of her senior year, she was excited about the possibilities of this new initiative; that excitement was still there when we spoke in the spring, but it was tinged with a sense of reality – readership was down and revenue was declining. When I asked her if she thought working on the magazine had been a valuable experience, she was certain it had been:

> I never thought about the business of news before. Never thought about it, never crossed my mind. I was like "Yeah the money is just there, like it just keeps going". So it never even crossed my mind to think about that. But now it's just … like how it seems ridiculous that there is such a huge divide between editorial advertising and the business side of news that you can work in a newspaper and never even think about it and that seems ridiculous now after doing this just because you miss so many opportunities to do things if you never even talk (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014).

When pressed to think about if any of her other classes had discussed the "business of news," she admitted that one had – a graduate-type class on Leadership that focused on reviving a community newspaper in southern North Carolina – but that "it didn't feel urgent to me because my job didn't depend on it." And in February, when forced to choose between taking an internship at the *Wall Street Journal* or Reuters, she chose the former, mostly because she felt the newspaper had a solid business model on which it could continue to flourish and grow.

While previous scholars in the United States have explored the employment rates of journalism students after graduation (Job Market) as well as the percentage of journalists who attend journalism school (Weaver et al., 2007), we know little about the actual *process* by which these students make (or do not make) the transition to the working world. Similarly, while prior research has explored the gap between journalism education and practice in terms of skillsets (Dickson & Brandon, 2000; Du & Thornburg, 2011; Lepre & Bleske, 2005) and attitudes (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen, 2007), we know little about how journalism education explicitly and immediately influences the behavior and actions of graduating journalism students. The fact that Chelsey, for example, had taken an internship at the *Wall Street Journal*, one of the most prestigious and well-known newspapers in the world, is indeed interesting. But even more interesting, I suggest, is the process by which Chelsey made the decision to work at the paper – by using the knowledge she had gained of business models during the development of an iPad-only campus magazine.

The purpose of this chapter, then, is two-fold. One, it details the process of American and Indian journalism students as they approach graduation. And two, it utilizes the concept of habitus to tease out the influence of journalism education, or what Reay (1998) has previously called the "institutional habitus," on the actions and behavior of journalism students during this process.

The chapter unfolds as follows. First, I briefly discuss the literature exploring the influence of journalism education on journalism practice. Next, I return to the concept of habitus, discussed extensively in the previous chapter, and explain its usefulness in investigating the efficacy of journalism education. Then, I reveal my findings concerning an exploration of the influence of journalism education on the actions and behaviors of Indian and American

114

journalism students as they prepare to graduate. Finally, I conclude the chapter by discussing the implications of my findings.

THE INFLUENCE OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION

The relationship between journalism (and, to a larger extent, mass communication) education and the larger media industry has often been a focal point of media scholars. Thanks to the University of Georgia's "Annual Survey of Journalism & Mass Communication Graduates," we know, for example, that "Bachelor's degree recipients from journalism and mass communication programs around the country in 2013 reported the same level of job offers as a year earlier, the same level of employment as did 2012 graduates, and the same level of success in finding work in the field of professional communication" (Job Market). We also know that by 2002, "it was more the case than ever before in American journalism that a bachelor's degree in journalism-mass communication was becoming the necessary qualification for being hired as a journalist by the mainstream news media, especially television, radio and daily newspapers" (Weaver et al., 2007, p. 50). For example, "In 2002, 89% of all U.S. journalists had a college degree, and 36% had majored in journalism" compared to 58% and 34%, respectively, in 1971 (p. 31).

Beyond hiring rates, however, the influence and efficacy of journalism school on the industry is, and has been, much debated. Dickson and Brandon (2000), for example, have suggested, "Journalism education has been subjected to criticism from professional journalists and journalism educators for years for not doing enough to prepare students for media jobs" (p. 50). Several studies have been conducted to measure the perceived "gap" between journalism educators and practitioners – in essence, the importance of certain characteristics and skills as

115

perceived by both entities. The results of these studies, however, are often mixed. Dickson and Brandon (2000) used a survey to find that "a gap does exist between the professional journalists and journalism educators surveyed concerning several aspects of journalism education, but that the gap is not particularly wide" (p. 65). Lepre and Bleske (2005), meanwhile, focused specifically on magazine journalism, and used a survey to find that "Educators rated eighteen of the twenty-three skills, courses, and educational experiences significantly more important than did the editors" (p. 196). Du and Thornburg (2011) added to this stream of research by shifting the focus to online journalism. They found "some evidence of the 'gap'- significant differences in the perceptions of online journalists and online journalism educators regarding some key skills, duties, and concepts of online journalism" (p. 228). imilar to the other scholars, however, they found that this gap "is not necessarily wide, as the two groups agree on many other aspects of online journalism" (p. 228).

Bjørnsen, Hovden, and Ottosen, meanwhile, took the analysis a step further by asking the question, "To what extent do the J-schools actually make a difference in the shaping of the next generation of journalists?" (2007, p. 383). Using a series of questionnaires administered to three cohorts of Norwegian journalism students at different phases of their career – the start of their studies, the end of their studies, and three years after graduation – the authors explored the changing values and expectations of journalism students as they advanced through their degree program and into the working world and, concurrently, the value, worth, and utilization of journalism education. In one section, the authors . . .

> . . . asked students to rank a listed number of subjects and topics taught during the journalism programme. They were asked how important they found the different topics as ingredients in a journalism programme, and after three years they were asked how useful they had found the teaching in the different topics in relation to their work tasks (p. 395).

The authors found that students often rated a topic's importance higher than its usefulness. For example, when asked at the end of their studies how important "Interview Techniques" were for journalism students, 80% of the survey participants responded that this skill was "very important." When asked to evaluate the usefulness of this same topic three years later, only 14% rated it as "very important." According to the authors, this disparity "could signal both that the students perceive a vast difference between how important a topic is compared to how useful the teaching has actually been for them in their job as a journalist and/or that it is not likely that students would highly appreciate the teaching of specific subjects retrospectively" (p. 395). Former students were also surveyed about the perceived overall usefulness of their journalism education: "When asked whether they found their journalistic education useful for their performance in their present jobs, 67 percent indicated 'yes' and 14 percent 'no'" (p. 398).

While the above study should be applauded for attempting to measure the efficacy of journalism education as it relates to journalistic career development and progress, its methodological limitations must be noted. Much of the data for the study, for example, were based on "Likert-type attitude questions," despite prior research indicating "that the relationship between attitudes and action is often weak" (Bjørnsen, Hovden, and Ottosen, 2007, p. 397).[31] And as many scholars have suggested, there is often significant "discordance between what people say and what they do," (Thomson, 2007, p. 572). Participant responses, furthermore, were limited specifically to the survey instruments, meaning it was possible that the most useful component of a student's journalism education experience (an influential adviser, perhaps) was omitted. The findings, finally, were also what Flyvbjerg would call "context-independent" (2006); that is, they ignored the multitude of other influences in the students' lives.

---

[31] These limitations were noted by the authors in the study's conclusion.

This chapter, then, is designed to build off the substantive direction of Bjørnsen, Hovden and Ottosen (2007). It diverges from previous studies of the influence and efficacy of journalism school by foregoing a survey design and by instead utilizing the methodological tool of habitus to situate the influence of journalism pedagogy. According to Bourdieu (1977), habitus is a "strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations . . . a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions and makes possible the achievement of infinitely diversified tasks among the students" (p. 72). In this dissertation's previous chapter, I utilized a similar methodological and conceptual lens to explore the motivations of students to pursue and enter journalism school and found that these students' decisions were often multi-layered and complex, made up of an intricate matrix of societal, cultural, familial, and economic considerations.

Bourdieu, meanwhile, has highlighted schooling as an important component of an individual's habitus (Bourdieu, 1967, cited in Reay, 2004, p. 434). If the students' decisions to enter journalism school emerged from a complex matrix of influences, as the concept of habitus suggests, then the students' behavior as they exited journalism school emerged from the same complex matrix of influences *plus* new "appreciations, experiences, and actions" imparted through journalism school. This chapter, therefore, incorporates Reay's (1998) idea of an "institutional habitus" - "the impact of a cultural group or social class on an individual's behavior as it is mediated through an organization" (p. 521). In this case, the "cultural group" is journalism school or journalism education. But how does a researcher measure the impact of a cultural group on an individual's habitus? In other words, how is it possible to isolate and subsequently examine what a student takes away from his or her journalism school experience?

Recognizing the methodological limitations of previous research, my approach in this chapter was to pivot away from the survey and attitudinal-based foundation of previous journalism education efficacy studies by instead leaning on the concept of habitus to examine actions and behavior. If habitus is a "strategy-generating principle" that functions "at every moment," then what the researcher needs to explore the complexity of the habitus is a specific "moment" during which "strategy" was generated (Bourdieu, 1977). In many ways, this method can be categorized within the larger case-based approach of qualitative research, a method in which scholars utilize "concrete, context-dependent knowledge" in the investigation of "human affairs" (Flyvbjerg, 2006, p. 224).

The moment I chose, then, was a student's graduation from journalism school. My overall objective, in this case, was to isolate the specific influences of journalism education on the students' behavior and decision-making by untangling the complex matrix of dispositions that generated a specific strategy at this moment in time. It was possible, of course, that the institutional habitus would be untraceable or unrecognizable in the student's behavior at that moment. A student, for instance, could chose to move straight home after graduation to be close to a sick relative or friend. But even this behavior is informative in the context of the habitus – that certain familial or financial commitments or dispositions can take precedent over supposed "professional" commitments or dispositions upon graduation. I am not hypothesizing, then, that the institutional habitus is necessarily dictating the student's behavior upon graduation. I am instead examining *if* and *how* the institutional habitus shapes behavior at that moment. And the hope is that this granular exploration of a single moment could potentially help us understand how the "institutional habitus" – i.e. the lessons imparted in journalism education – can be

embedded onto a student's larger habitus and ultimately utilized in the course of the student's professional development (or lack thereof).

I pursued this inquiry through a flexible interview design. First, I asked about the students' experiences at journalism school – favorite classes, memorable topics, influential faculty. Many gave long, revealing answers about stories they had covered with student-led media or insights they had gained during specific newsworthy moments. After gaining a sense of the student's experience in journalism school, I then asked about their current plans – what were they planning to do upon graduation? In India, students go through what is called the placement process, a procedure that is described in detail for the first time below. In the United States, the process is more unstructured and open – some students apply for fellowships or graduate school, others continue networking with previous contacts, and still others canvass the Internet for entry-level positions. I then tried to link the data from these two categorical lines of questioning. In other words, in what way were the lessons of journalism school – the "institutional habitus" - grafted onto an individual's larger system of lasting, transposable dispositions? And from this, how can the influences of journalism school be contextualized within other social or cultural influences?

Data used for this chapter were collected primarily through interviews conducted with my panels of journalism students in the United States (UNC - 9 participants) and India (IIJNM - 13 participants) as well through interviews with Indian faculty and administrators at IIJNM, IIMC, and ACJ. All of my interviews with the Indian students and faculty were conducted on the respective school's campus. The interviews with the American students, on the other hand, were all conducted in my office on the campus of the University of North Carolina. Each interview lasted between twenty minutes and two hours.

THE GRADUATION PROCESS

Because the processes prior to graduation for students at the Indian Institute of

Journalism and New Media and the University of North Carolina are so different, I have

separated the findings for this chapter into country-specific sections. The first section, then,

details the process for Indian students at IIJNM while concurrently examining the ways the

institutional habitus is incorporated into the students' behaviors and actions. The second section

does the same, but for American students at UNC.

The Indian Placement Process

As relatively new entrants to the Indian journalism education environment, the Indian

Institute of Journalism and New Media actively tries to recruit students by promoting (and

sometimes promising) quality job placement in the media industry upon graduation. The "About

IIJNM" page of IIJNM's website, for example, says: "IIJNM offers its students extensive

placement assistance, and to date, has achieved practically 100% job placement for our graduates

at attractive salaries;" the school, furthermore, "**guarantees** placement to all its students who

graduate in first class" [emphasis has been retained] (About IIJNM).

This commitment to finding students employment is, according to the Vice Dean of

IIJNM, an important component of the institute's appeal. Because of this, although many of the

students do get positions before graduation in May, the staff of IIJNM persists until the student is

properly placed within a media company:

> We have a very formal placement process where we have industry coming in and recruiting from
> our students, recruiting here. And about 70 to 80% of them get placed in this placement process.
> But this happens in April, before we close in May. We usually close at the end of April. Now
> between April, between May and July, the placement officer Girish, keeps working. And they
> keep putting out feelers and there are a few students who are left behind. And, by usually by the

time the new batch comes in, all are old batches would have been completely placed (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013).

During my interviews with faculty, staff, and students at three Indian journalism schools, the "formal placement process" mentioned above was revealed as a highly systematic and organized procedure. This process, in short, served as a direct bridge between the school and the industry, a way for media organizations to assess dozens of students and to systematically select those most appropriate for their organization. Because this procedure has, to date, received little scholarly attention, it will be described in detail alongside this chapter's specific intent - to isolate the influence of journalism education on the students' actions and behaviors.

The placement process was the culmination of what many students believed to be a very intense academic year; the goal was to transition the students from school to their first media-related job. The process involves faculty and administrators inviting recruiters from media organizations (e.g. newspapers, websites, television networks) from all across India onto campus to assess their students. Not all journalism programs participate in this process – one faculty member at ACJ, for example, mentioned that organizations come to their school because "it's the best journalism school in the country" (Madhavi, personal communication, July 2013).[32]

After the visits are scheduled with faculty and administrators, students are informed as to when the organizations are coming and can decide whether or not to participate in the companies' processes. Once on campus, the organizations administer a variety of tests, interviews, and exercises to those students who choose to sit for their exam. Often, the process involves several rounds – a test first, for example, followed by select interviews with students who performed well on the test, followed by a second round of even more in-depth interviews. According to faculty I spoke with at ACJ, the placement process is a ten-week program at the

---

[32] All three schools I visited – IIMC, ACJ, and IIJNM – participated in this "placement process."

end of April (S. Rampath and M. Ravikumar, personal communication, July 2013). But at IIJNM, I discovered the process to be far more fluid and lengthy. One student mentioned that it had started during the second week of February, when Reuters had come to campus (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014). And by the time I visited in the middle of March, seven students had already been placed, and companies were expected to be coming to campus intermittently until late April (Prutha, personal communication, March 2014).

One of the clearest examples of the influence of the institutional habitus concerned the manner by which the Indian journalism students prepared for and took these placement exams. The tests were designed to assess a variety of skills and competencies – grammar, editing, news values, current affairs – that, according to faculty and students, were reinforced through lessons given during the academic year. When I asked one faculty member at ACJ if the school specifically prepared the students for the exams, for example, she said, "We just tell that these organizations are coming and if you want to sit for a particular organization, you can. The ten-month education here actually helps them get placed. So there is no need for special preparation for placements" (M. Ravikumar, personal communication, July 2013). Ravikumar's response indicates that the school's curriculum is often designed specifically with these placement tests in mind, thus, there is no need for additional training or preparation. Another faculty member – this one at IIJNM – even told me that some of the school's alumni are the ones who write the placement exams for some companies (K. Kaur, personal communication, July 2013) indicating a cyclical process in which knowledge is reprocessed through the placement procedure. In that case, the influence of the institutional habitus emerges not only from the test takers, but also, interestingly enough, from the test *makers*.

Although the actual placement exams for each individual company varied, the

components of the tests fell into three categories – group discussions, written tests, and

interviews. The group discussion was the most rare of the three; from what I could tell, only one

media organization, International Data Group, employed this technique. The process involved

twenty-two total students from two schools - IIJNM and ACJ. These students were then broken

up into two groups of eleven and asked to debate a topic of the organization's choosing.

According to one participant:

> So within a group of eleven people you had a topic - Edward Snowden, against the system or for
> the system, you know, what he did, do you think it is right or wrong? And then our discussion
> starts. So whoever is for him or against him, people kind of have to make their point and whoever
> kind of gets to make their point, and it is not about whoever speaks the longest or the loudest or
> whatever. I think GD's [group discussions] are all about whoever concentrates on the content, you
> know, you do not speak crap and have to kind of let other people make their point and then you
> have to make your own point and the recruiters observe us - like they go around the room and I
> think they focus on what you say, not how much you say (Bhavika, personal communication,
> March 2014).

The group discussion, according to one student, was a way of both testing the student's

knowledge on current affairs as well as a way to determine how well that student substantiates

his or her opinion. When I asked this student why he felt he advanced past the group discussion

stage, he said: "I guess I just substantiated what I said. I always keep myself updated with the

newspaper and what is going on because as a journalist that is one of the basic things that we are

supposed to be doing. So I do that. Whatever I said made sense" (Mayukh, personal

communication, March 2014). The other student who advanced past the group discussion stage

said something similar:

> **David:** So why do you think you were chosen as opposed to everyone else?
> **Bhavika:** Because I think I was speaking sense.
> **D:** And other people weren't?
> **B:** They were making a lot of noise. You cannot ask another person to shut up. You have to
> communicate your point (Bhavika, personal communication, March 2014).

At least two other companies tested the students on their current affairs, but instead of

using a group discussion to gauge knowledge, they administered written tests. One company

gave the students a list of topics from which they had to "write in 100 words" why that person, place, or thing was newsworthy (Shristi, personal communication, March 2014). The other company took more of a "rapid fire" quiz approach, with twenty current event related questions. One student told me that it wasn't too difficult as long as you "read the newspapers on a regular basis" (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014) – she mentioned that one individual from IIJNM got nineteen out of twenty question correct, which was the highest score for the exam (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014).

Other written tests involved basic skills like grammar or editing. One exam, described to me as "easy," was apparently designed to test the student's grasp of the English language. A student described a sample question as follows: "'Mark the answer which is the nearest – A hill will always have trees, animals, water and height.' So you will definitely know the answer is height" (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014).

Another test had a section where students had to rank a set of headlines based on the stories' "news value." As one student explained it to me: "They give you a set of headlines from the news or something like that and they are like 'If you were the editor, which story would you pick and which would you throw out?' So it basically was for checking how good you are in paging stories" (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014). When I asked if she thought there was a correct answer, she said no, and that the answers simply gave the interviewers an idea of the student's news "sense": "It depends on the person, from person to person. If I am a politics fan, I would definitely choose a story about Narendra Modi and some latest speech he gave as a main story. But if I am more of a person who is interested in something else, maybe some story in the city which is as important as the Narendra Modi story I would put that. So it depends on the person" (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014).

Yet another test required the students to edit stories as if they were working on a desk. They had two hours and were told to complete six stories. As one student told me:

> We had around six stories, which were badly written, badly written. We had to write that from scratch, you know, good language, good decent language. So six long stories, they were like six hundred word stories, each of which is huge. And it was a hard copy given. If it was a soft copy we could have easily copy pasted and we could have ordered it. That was an easy procedure. But they gave us in a hard copy, kind of write everything and also the names, South Indians usually have very difficult and long names, extremely long names. So we had to type in everything correctly. So that was a challenge. Six stories, two hours' time, I think is a huge job (Prutha, personal communication, March 2014).

And finally, one website asked the students to write brand slogans, ostensibly to gauge their ability to come up with catchy headlines:

> **Nirupa:** They asked us to give jingles, couple of jingles.
> **David:** Jingles? What does that mean?
> **N:** Like, for KFC we have that thing right, "Fingers licking good" caption.
> **D:** You have to come up with that?
> **N:** Yeah we have to come up with that.
> **D:** So did they give you a brand?
> **N:** Yeah they said Starbucks and Whatsapp . . . for our political leaders too, Narendra Modi, Rahul Gandhi.
> **D:** So what did you say?
> **N:** For Starbucks, I had written, "A coffee can change your mood" or something. For Whatsapp I had written it as, "Know what's up with your friends."
> (Nirupa, personal communication, March 2014)

Most companies used these exams to reduce the applicant field; the process for many companies was to administer exams (or, in the case of one website, run a group discussion) and then shortlist a group of students for personal interviews. This was not a prolonged process – some students told me that they took an exam, gave an interview, and received an offer all on the same day (Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014). The interviews, meanwhile, were often attended by some of the highest-ranking employees at the companies. One student explained that his interview was with "the CEO and India President, Mr D'Mello [Louis D'Mello of the International Data Group] and the Editor-in-Chief" (Mayukh, personal

communication, March 2014). Another mentioned that her second interview with the popular

English language television news network, *Times Now*, was with Arnab Goswami, the network's

Editor-in-Chief (Meeta, personal communication, March 2014). And a third student told me that

her upcoming face-to-face interview with a team from the *Hindustan Times* would include the

newspaper's Editor-in-Chief:

> **David:** Who is asking these questions? Do they have a specific person who does it?
> **Sneha:** It is always the Editor-in-Chief.
> **D:** The editor-in-chief?
> **S:** Yeah. Even though you might not work with them in the next few years directly, because you have hierarchy that is followed. So you might never really contact the Editor-in-Chief let's say for the next year, but the new blood that is taken by the organization is always selected by the Editor-in-Chief.
> **D:** And the Editor-in-Chief was talking to you on the phone?
> **S:** Yeah, it is always a panel and one of them would be the editor-in-chief.
> (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014)

Some of the questions asked during the interview process were similar to the ones on the

exams. Arnab Goswami, for example, had asked the student mentioned above to do two things:

first, to describe the job she was applying for (it was for the output desk) and second, to give him

a rundown of the day's top news (Meeta, personal communication, March 2014). Other

questions, however, were sometimes very personal. One female student who advanced passed

IDG's group discussion, for example, was asked both about her marriage plans as well as about

her family:

> It was a very personal kind of a thing because they asked, till when would I be in this profession, what about my marriage plans and about my family back in Delhi. I was like, 'Everything is in place and all that [marriage] is still like at least 5 years from now.' So, then they were like 'okay.' So very simple stuff (Bhavika, personal communication, March 2014).

Her answers proved sufficient; the student passed and was hired by the company.

Another student who went through this company's procedure (and also passed) described a

similar line of questioning:

> **Mayukh:** In the interview, it was a very personal thing. They asked me about my family, what type of family I come from, what kind of relationship I share with my parents, what kind of, since

127

my father is the primary bread-winner in my family, what kind of a relationship I share with my father, what kind of relationship do I intend to share with my kid, my kids when I have them.
Dave: Is that normal for an interview?
M: Not always.
D: Because it is pretty personal.
M: It is very personal. But then again what they said is that, this is a field where once you are in the field and working, and if you are really working properly, you will have a lot of enemies who will be trying to get these things. So it is just checking how easily a person gets faced or nervous in these questions. It is just, they try to pile up some pressure on you just to see how you react to that pressure.
(Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014)

The students at IIJNM often explained to me how specific lessons from the school's curriculum appropriately and effectively prepared them for these placement exams. This indicates a direct influence of the institutional habitus, an explicit utilization of lessons learned in school on actions, behavior and, thus, future employment or professional development. An excellent example of how the structure of these schools directly influenced the students' performance on the placement exams is the IIJNM news quiz. Two students described it to me as follows:

Riya: Every morning at 9:20 we have a news quiz and it is like for four minutes, we are given seven questions and one is of fifty words. Multiple-choice questions are like six.
Prutha: And it is related to the previous day, like today I will get a news quiz on the previous day's news. Like whatever important things they will ask, they will give multiple choices for the question. The final one is an opinionated question; they will ask your opinion on the Egypt elections, or the Pakistan elections, and we have to describe, you need give your opinion in fifty words that is the news quiz. Each day the time limit reduces, like today if you do not complete in four minutes, you are done, the marks are cut. You will not be graded, tomorrow, like Kanchan said it's going to be two minutes, like every day you need to increase your speed. You cannot be thinking all the time, like "Oh my God what's happening here."
(Prutha/Riya, personal communication, July 2013).

To prepare for these exams, these students explained a process by which they would study as a group: "Every morning we are supposed to read three newspapers, minimum three newspapers so we read one each and we discuss. Like one hour from 7-8 is the time to read, so all of us just sit and read, so we are six girls in one room, we mark the important stuff and at 8 o'clock sharp we discuss" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). When I spoke with a different student six months later, she described a similar system of collaboration. But this time

the students were preparing for the upcoming placement exams rather than the IIJNM news quiz: "Since a few months we have started that habit of having, just me and my friends, we are five of them, we have this habit of reading one hour every day, five of us take five different newspapers and we discuss how it is reported here, in this paper, how is it there, where is it placed in the paper, what preference was it given" (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014).

The IIJNM news quiz, therefore, forced the students to study the newspaper and to articulate what they saw. This exercise, in turn, directly prepared the students for the portion of the placement exam that measured knowledge of current affairs as well as the portion that asked the participants to state their opinions on various news topics, such as the group discussion administered by IDG. If we once again return to Bourdieu's (1977) conceptualization of the habitus – "the strategy-generating principle enabling agents to cope with unforeseen and ever-changing situations . . . a system of lasting and transposable dispositions which, integrating past experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix of perceptions, appreciations and actions" (p. 72, p. 95) – while delineating the particular "moment" as the student's experience with the placement exam, we can see the "strategy" deployed being primarily motivated by the lessons and experiences of the institution. In other words, the institutional habitus, for at least this moment, specifically dictates action and behavior.

The students were not required by the school to sit in on the placement exams as part of their degree requirements. And yet every student I spoke to had taken at least three exams, sometimes for companies they seemingly had no interest in working for. As one student said to me: "You don't have a choice do you? I mean, you cannot be picky about which exam you take because it's just the start of the process" (Bhavika, personal communication, March 2014)."

Bhavika was one of the few who had already been placed; several more were in the final stages of interviews; still others were nervously anticipating the results of a recent test. The main decisions of the students, then, often concerned not whether they would sit for these placement exams but instead *specifically* which exams they would sit for.

In that regard, the expectation to pursue the highest possible salary upon graduation, in fact, while usually not mentioned explicitly, was a frequent topic of conversation. One student mentioned the economic difficulties faced by prospective journalism students – an odd proclamation at a school where the students were essentially guaranteed jobs (and, therefore, guaranteed salaries) upon graduation. After accepting a job at a place called International Data Group, he told me:

> Honestly speaking there was no specific reason that I wanted to get to this place. The thing is the current industry position is not a very sound one with job cuts and everything going on. So, honestly I was one person, it sounds bad, it sounds ugly, but I am a person who had just one thing, "Beggars cannot be choosers". At the moment I have zero to go on. So I have to take anything and everything that comes my way. So I was appearing for every interview and every test that was being conducted. And this clicked (Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014).

Later in the conversation, Mayukh mentioned that the pay was actually quite good at the job he was accepting, "the best that our batch is getting," (Mayukh, personal communication, March 2014). Another student who accepted a position at the same company had similar things to say about the offer: "The work is good, the pay is good, the work hours are good. I think it is a very good start for a fresher like me" (Bhavika, personal communication, March 2014).

As to why so many students were excited for the Reuters exam, for example, one student said: "I remember everybody, people who have never read a financial newspaper, economic newspaper, they were all mugging things up because Reuters pays well and it is an international agency and it is very reputed and all of that and nothing better. What better start can you get, things like that . . . " (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014). Sneha didn't want to sit for

the exam - "There is nothing in the world that can get me to read an economic piece" – but did anyway (the interview went "horribly") because everybody else was doing it. Another student, who was not selected for a position at IDG said that while she found the subject material quite boring, had she been selected for the position, she would have nevertheless taken it: "I mean there is nothing that I found interesting in that. [But] yeah I will do the job because they are paying me 40K, that sounds good" (Nirupa, personal communication, March 2014). Among the students who were yet to be placed, in fact, there was a small element of bitterness toward those who they felt had stumbled into well-paying positions, "Also, no offense to anybody, but people who have got some good companies with good salary package and everything, they never even attended lectures. They have never attended lectures. I don't say that they are not knowledgeable. They are knowledgeable. Everyone over here is knowledgeable. But you also need to consider the fact that this person has not worked hard at all the entire year" (Prutha, personal communication, March 2014).

The desire (or expectation) of these students to pursue the highest possible salary upon graduation most likely emerged from a societal attitude referenced in the previous chapter. Several of the Indian students I interviewed, in fact, mentioned that pursuing journalism was often the alternative vocational route - a more acceptable career path, meanwhile, would have been one that invariably led to a higher salary, such as a job in engineering or medicine. One told me, for example, that "after my junior college when I had to choose whether to become an engineer or a doctor, I told my parents no, I want to do journalism, I want to write, I want to specialize in it" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). Another recalled an incident during her primary school when, "Everybody stood up and said I want to be a doctor, engineer or teacher and then she suddenly came to me and, I don't know how it came to my mind, I said I

want to be a journalist" (Nikita, personal communication, July 2013). And then there was

Nibedita (Nibedita, personal communication, August 2013), who had been encouraged by her

family to pursue a medical career and whose aunt had been boycotted from the family because

she became a journalist, as well as Bhavika, who mentioned that "everybody wanted" (Bhavika,

personal communication, August 2013) her to go into something related to science, but that she

had an inclination toward art and literature. This expectation for a young, educated Indian to

pursue a higher paying career like engineering or medicine, then, is perhaps manifested not

within the overall vocational choice of the students but rather within these students' specific

search for employment within the actual media industry. In this case, the institutional habitus

might emerge as a dominant "strategy-generating" influence through the manner by which the

student takes the exam (as mentioned previously), but a larger, more omnipresent societal

expectation (i.e. the desire to earn as much money as possible) can be seen dictating the method

by which the student sorts through his or her options.

But while the topic of salary came up frequently during my conversations, the reality was

that most of the media companies that administered placement exams were on sound financial

footing and could pay decent wages. That meant that many of the students had to sort their way

through their options based on what they wanted to do and where they wanted to work. One

student, for example, had entered IIJNM wanting to work on travel and lifestyle pieces. But then

she took a class called "Investigative Reporting," a class in which she often stayed out in the city

until two or three in the morning talking to police officers, and her focus changed: "Before I

joined this college I had claimed to my friend that I will never do crime reporting. I will never do

hard news. After coming here I can't do anything other than hard news" (Shweta, personal

communication, March 2014). The turning point was a particular story she covered about a

fraudulent doctor. He told me she traced his credentials, or lack thereof, back to his college days

and realized that the man's entire CV had been fabricated:

> And then finally at the end of everything I got his phone number and I called him up and traced his phone number. Sorry, I don't remember how I really got it but I called him up and I confronted him, I told him "I found this this about you, what do you have to say about this?" and he started yelling on the top of his voice, "How dare you call me this and that" and I said "I have proofs. You tell me whether I am right or wrong", he just didn't bother (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014).

This story motivated the student to pursue more crime stories. When I pressed her to

explain specifically why she thought her interests had changed, she repeatedly said how much

"fun it was" and how it was an "adventure":

> So it lets you, I don't know, it gives you, you meet a lot of people in the process and they have all sorts of stories to tell you. It's fun, it's fun, it's like watching CSI or something like that. It's fun. It doesn't really work that way but it's fun (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014).

And when it came time to sit for placement exams, her choice of organizations was

directly based on her interest in crime reporting:

> In the beginning I didn't know I would be so into crime reporting but now I am sure that is what I want to, because during placements also, I go speak to Girish, and tell him that I want a paper that lets me do crime. And in a country like India they don't let women do crime reporting. It's very difficult . . . but in my mind I always wanted Indian Express. I still do. So those results have not yet come and I have kept my fingers crossed. Because over here I got to know that that is the only paper that really gives you the freedom to do your crime work and they really hire women for crime reporting (Shweta, personal communication, March 2014).

It is clear that an experience (or multiple) experiences during her journalism program

explicitly dictated Shweta's actions and behaviors when deciding what placement exams to sit

for – she was adamant that she wanted to be a crime reporter and was hoping to land a job at *The*

New Indian Express, the only "paper that really give you the freedom to do your crime work." It

is also notable, however, that she was pursuing crime reporting for very personal reasons –

because it was "fun" and an "adventure." Shweta, then, was incorporating the "institutional

habitus" into her decision-making but in a personalized manner; she was not pursuing crime

reporting to expose criminals, to better society, or even "to search for contradictions and misrepresentations" but rather because she simply enjoyed the experience.[33]

Similar to Shweta, Sneha came into IIJNM hoping to get into soft news, feature writing especially. But in the first semester, she was forced to investigate crime stories and found it shockingly straightforward:

> But I, it was very late in the first semester that we were compulsorily supposed to do a crime story and that was the first time I went to a police station. Until then there was not compulsion right. So I found my stories from all the other places but the police station. So that was the first time I went and I found four stories in one visit. And I realized its no big deal you know. And now I know that the crime stories are the easier to find because you go to a police station, establish a contact with the police inspector concerned and he will give you all the details required. All you have to do is get the details, talk to the victim or the oppressor on phone and you are done. You get the photos; you get all the details from the police inspector himself. And nothing is easier you know (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014).

After a while, she decided that she would pursue a "hard news" position after graduation because "it would be very exciting to see me work something that I never thought I would be able to" (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014). And while she retained her love for feature writing – she mentioned that the stories she produced for the magazine were her favorite experiences of the semester – she thought the time was right to pursue a line of work she never intended to enter:

> If I enter into magazine that will be my safe place and that is a little laid back. Yeah, so I can do that maybe when I grow older or something. For now I think I can break my back. I am in that position. I can work with a newspaper and sometime in future when I have other engagements or other priorities something, then magazine yeah would come in handy anyway . . . Yeah because I have been accused here like you know, Charles [a faculty member at IIJNM] has "You write the best features". I thought that was a compliment, but he was like "Grow beyond that". So yeah, I get him. I had done crime stories but my features kind of overshadow everything else. So I want to keep that, okay it is nice that people approve of your writing and all of that, but I don't want to get, what do you say, typecasted (Sneha, personal communication, March 2014)

---

[33] IIJNM describes its Investigative Reporting class as follows: "Students learn to write investigative articles about government policy and other areas by cross reading different published articles and documents, and by interviewing key players - in search of contradictions and misrepresentations."

When I left IIJNM, Sneha was headed for Delhi for an interview with the *Hindustan*

Times, one of the most respected newspapers in the country. With Sneha, I again found the

institutional habitus personalized into actionable behavior; that is, Sneha's exposure to crime

reporting and Charles' insistence on her branching out from feature writing was manifested in

the student's choice of which exams to sit for and which organizations to pursue.

Nikita's choice of which exams to sit for was yet another example of this pattern. She

mentioned that she was on the newspaper track and, similar to Sneha, claimed that "learning

from Charles [the faculty member in charge of print] was amazing:"

> Yeah six months ago, I didn't know what a story idea was. So every Sunday you are asked to
> submit three story ideas, like "What do I submit on this?" . . . Slowly we figured it out. Initially we
> used to read newspapers only to get news. Now you read the newspaper, you analyze the news and
> you will find out whatever is missing, like these are the missing key facts, so find those. You just
> go out, you just observe around (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014).

Eventually, Nikita was able to use those skills to find compelling stories. She followed

one story, for example, about a string of ATM attacks in Bangalore proper. After uncovering a

lead, Nikita and a few friends had tracked the victim down to the hospital and received an

exclusive quote from the husband about how he wished the attacker should be "hanged." This

quote led to external exposure in the regional version of a national newspaper. In the very

beginning of our second interview, in fact, Nikita told me how she had gotten three articles (or,

at least, pieces of articles) published in the *The New Indian Express*. This, to her, was very

exciting:

> It was amazing because for a person like me who has never had a by-line published outside, I
> haven't interned at many places and I was an intern in a broadcast channel where we were never
> given a chance to do something. And the moment we saw the by-line we were very happy, very
> happy. And more than us, the faculty was happy. We went to Charles and he emailed everybody
> that they have been published (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014).

When I spoke to her in March, two months before graduation, Nikita had already sat for

three exams. The only one in which she had been somewhat successful (she had passed the

written test and made it into the interview portion) was for a website she had no interest in working for. At that job, she said, "you are doing nothing, just changing the headlines and putting a photo and making it fit for the web." Instead, she wanted to work at a job that produced original reporting, a position where she could ostensibly put her ability to find stories to good use. When I asked if she would have taken the job with the website, she said:

> **Nikita:** I would have said "No, thank you".
> **David:** What would you have said? Just that it's not right for you?
> **N:** Yeah, because I don't see the placement process pressurizing me.
> **D:** You don't?
> **N:** No. I don't know if I am normal or what it is but I am just not, everybody is like "Oh this company has come, this test was not good, that test was not good. I didn't go through this interview" and I am like I would just look at the names. I sit for all because all of them sit for all but there are a very few interviews where I am like "Okay, I should get selected in this" and right now, till now it has been only Hindustan Times.
> (Nikita, personal communication, March 2014).

It would be easy to group these three students together and to categorize their experiences in a similar fashion. They all attended IIJNM and they all approached graduation wanting to pursue a job in original reporting at a national Indian newspaper. But my analysis shows that the application of their experiences during the program - specifically, the impact of the institutional habitus - were quite distinct. To Shweta, "hard news" (as all three described their interest) was an adventure, to Sneha, "hard news" was a challenge, and to Nikita, "hard news" was fulfilling and a way to get exposure. Each student, then, incorporated the institutional habitus in a very personalized manner, a method by which the lessons and experiences of journalism school were grafted onto preexisting attitudes, values, or expectations. If Shweta did not have an expectation for adventure, for example, would she still have pursued crime reporting? And if crime reporting proves to be boring, or if she is assigned to a desk job, will she give up and pursue another occupation that allows for more adventure? Only further investigation, then, will reveal the continued influence of the institutional habitus – a topic I will return to in the discussion.

The path of the Indian journalism students I spoke to upon graduation was clear and direct; the path of the American students upon graduation was less so. There are no placement exams in the United States and so those students looking to pursue a journalism career, which included every student I spoke to, had to find his or her own way.

Several American students, for example, told me that they could no longer afford to do an unpaid internship. One told me, "At this point I cannot accept any unpaid gigs anywhere. I need money to survive. I have student loans to pay off, I am moving away from home, food, you know" (Claire, personal communication, April 2014). Another student summarized her decision-making process as follows: "You know basically my criteria [for possible jobs] was like 'Can I pay rent with this job?' 'Can I pay rent, feed myself, can I get to wherever I am going?'" (Allison, personal communication, April 2014). When I asked a third student what his priorities were during his search (i.e. location, topic, organization) he said he took one particular reporting job simply because "it was a job" (Brian, personal communication, April 2014). And another mentioned a priority to be, "Salary. Salary would be important just because I would like to have enough to live" (Eric, personal communication, April 2014).

In these four examples, we see the student's behavior driven mostly by the expected vocational path of the college graduate – find a job, move away from home, start to pay rent. This disposition, furthermore, was being driven by societal expectations of college graduates, by extant financial structures such as, in Claire's case, the student loan system, and by overall trends such as increased unemployment for young college graduates. One paper, for example, released by the Economic Policy Institute (The Class of 2014), reports that, "For young college graduates, the unemployment rate is currently 8.5 percent (compared with 5.5 percent in 2007), and the

underemployment rate is 16.8 percent (compared with 9.6 percent in 2007)."[34] And so unlike the Indian students, who often mentioned salary expectations as a motivating factor when looking for work, the American students were more focused on simply making *a* salary, be it the bare minimum necessary to pay rent and buy groceries.

Habitus is often discussed within the context of having a "feel for the game" (Bourdieu 1998: p. 81) – in this case, all the American students I interviewed had a general idea of what was expected of them upon graduation - leave school, find work, pay bills. These expectations and motivations, furthermore, were far more recognizable in the interviews than any expectations regarding professional development. But that does not necessarily mean that the institutional habitus – the influence of journalism education - was entirely subsumed. What I found, instead, was that these students used different aspects of the lessons imparted and experiences gained through their journalism education in different ways. And, similar to the Indian students, these lessons were often personalized to individual needs or expectations.

The first step for the students was deciding what route to pursue – a full-time job, a part-time job, an internship, or graduate school. Many students, for example, were looking for paid internships. One student told me, "Most people I know have internships which is also unusual - like other people I know in other fields would never get an internship right after college but in journalism it is kind of expected" (Maddy, personal communication, April 2014). Another student said that it was "really rare" (Claire, personal communication, April 2014) to get a full-time reporting job right out of school. A third student mentioned that "I just feel like with the way the job market is like, there are so many people who have more experience than I am, who want the same job as I do. So it is not ideal to have an internship after you graduate, but you are

---

[34] This discussion is a dissertation unto itself. Because of that, I do not spend much time discussing *why* this is the case and instead focus on my specific inquiry – the influence of journalism education.

not going to get hired anyway. So that is really the only way to get your foot in at one of these bigger papers" (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014). An internship, therefore, was seen by many of the students as the most logical transition from an undergraduate journalism degree or, as one student said, "as an in-road to getting a job" (Eric, personal communication, April 2014). This expectation, meanwhile, was driven by knowledge gained through talking with recently graduated students or current advisers and professors and was, therefore, an expectation that can said to have been a component of the institutional habitus.

Finding internships, furthermore, involved networking with contacts from previous internships and scouring the Internet for openings. Eric, for example, had traveled to Washington D.C. over spring break to meet individuals at several companies and inquire about potential positions. When I asked how he got in touch with these companies, he described a variety of processes: "Some of them I just cold emailed, others by virtue of working at the *American Prospect*. I had a lot of contacts with people out of Vox, because Matt Yglesias started the American Prospect. So I knew people and things like that. Huffington Post I sent in some stuff too. In fact they seemed pretty interested. Then recently I have been talking to people from the New Republic" (Eric, personal communication, April 2014). Other students had submitted applications for positions posted on various websites. After explaining that she would be working at an education-focused trade publication in D.C., Maddy told me that she "just applied and it worked out" (Maddy, personal communication, April 2014). Chelsey told a similar story of applying to work at the *Wall Street Journal*: "it was a traditional application like resume, cover letter and then a few questions on the website" (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014).

If institutional habitus is the "impact of a cultural group" (Reay, 1998) on an individual's behavior, then the impact of the University of North Carolina could be seen in the manner by which these students marketed themselves or made themselves available to outside entities. When I asked one student why she was selected for an internship, for example, told me that "UNC should have something to do with it. People do like our journalism school" (Claire, personal communication, April 2014). Another used a visit to the school by a recruiter from the Wall Street Journal to hand in her application (Claire, personal communication, April 2014). And a third landed a part-time paid job with a local broadcast network after being introduced to a company employee by her UNC adviser (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014). With these three examples, we can see the institutional habitus directly reflected in the way these students seek out or find internships and jobs. In other words, the legitimacy and reputation of the university is incorporated into both the way the students brand themselves and the manner by which they seek out job opportunities.

Still, for many of the American students, the future was filled with question marks. The one student I spoke with who already had a full-time reporting job, in fact, doing business reporting for a medium-sized paper in Arkansas, mentioned that he might consider moving back to the east coast at some point in the near future due to personal reasons (Brian, personal communication, April 2014). Another student, who had gotten an internship at the *Wall Street Journal,* mentioned that she was open to pursuing a Fulbright fellowship with National Geographic in the next couple years. And yet another, when asked about her future, emphasized her youth and vocational flexibility: "I guess if everything falls out from underneath me, I move home for a while with my family and get a part time job, you know, become a waitress for a while. I am not above or against these things. I do feel still really young and I feel like I have a

lot of time to make it work despite how fast everything is moving" (Claire, personal

communication, April 2014).

So while the initial path upon graduation for the Indian students was clear, the path for

the American students was much more fluid; since they did not take placement exams the

process they went through upon graduation was much less structured than that of the Indian

students. What I found, then, was that the immediate influence of journalism education on the

behavior of these students was often more nuanced than it was more the Indian students. Some of

this influence is described above, as the students learn about previous student experiences in the

industry or seek out potential job opportunities using school-related contacts. But one of the most

interesting themes that emerged from the American side was that the students often applied the

knowledge they had gathered regarding organizational viability, digital distribution, and financial

health to the analysis of where they would be applying for jobs.

For example, when I asked Chelsey, the student mentioned in this chapter's introduction,

what she was prioritizing in terms of future employment opportunities, she told me:

> Uh, I guess this is kind of like a weird way to look at it but I guess one of the things that was
> important to me and I guess looking at it after doing the magazine and everything was like sort of
> the business model for it. Like I thought, I think *The Wall Street Journal* had a really solid future
> and they have been hiring a lot and like they are, they have been doing really well. They pay well
> and like they are adding a lot of value added services for their subscribers and they have a huge
> subscription like they have the highest that any newspaper in United States. So that is obviously
> like a reason why, like why, one the reasons as to why I was attracted to it. And Reuters was
> having a lot of problems, like they can't figure out how to monetize their business, like they are
> getting killed by Bloomberg and they just don't, like they haven't figured that out and they have
> been doing a ton of lay-offs like they laid off like a thousand people last year (Chelsey, personal
> communication, April 2014).

The magazine Chelsey mentions in the above quote is the iPad-only subscription

magazine that she and a few other students had started during the first semester of her senior

year. While the magazine originally started as a for-credit class, it evolved into a regular non-

credit student run organization. She explained that she had never really thought of "the business

of news before" until she was forced to monetize the long form content the students hoped to develop with this magazine, a task she called "definitely a lot harder than I thought it was going to be" (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014).

As Editor-in-Chief of the new venture, she learned not only that monetizing media is a difficult task, especially in an environment where advertising revenue remains down, but also that media organizations tend to remain stagnant when they should really be focused on innovation, technology, and remaining relevant to their readers. Her account of working at the magazine, in fact, reads similar to Ryfe (2012) and Abernathy's (2014) description of organizational inertia at community or regional newspapers:

> I think it's just hard to keep people like, forward-focused. I think when people get into like one niche they want to like stay there forever. So if people say "We want to be an iPad magazine" maybe that is not maybe the best place to be now and you know maybe we should move online or maybe not do all that. So that hasn't been a huge issue but that's what I want for future years, for the people to stay really on the cusp of new media. I think it would be really easy for people next year to just say "Well we are an iPad magazine and that's what we have to do" and we do three long form stories and not want to change anything but there are all these cool things that we could do and nobody is experimenting yet, especially at the college level. So, I guess that is the one thing that I hope doesn't change and people aren't afraid to experiment with things (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014).

Claire, another one of the American students who had worked on the iPad-only magazine, described a similar evaluation process. She had applied for and received callbacks for internships at three newspapers – *The Boston Globe, The Austin-American Statesman*, and *The Oregonian*. She quickly decided that the *Statesman* was not for her: "The website just seemed very rudimentary, it was poorly designed and really clunky and just, you could tell they hadn't worked on their web presence at all in years. Their social media accounts weren't even up to any kind of standards. It was all over the place and had very few readers and then the reporting articles were pretty straight-forward" (Claire, personal communication, April 2014). In this description, it is possible to see the application of Claire's work on the magazine, where much of

the time was spent on developing a "non-clunky" digital interface able to support long-form enterprise reporting. When I asked what her criteria was for evaluating a potential internship, in fact, the first thing she mentioned was "Is this paper viable long-term?" And when she told me that she had also applied to some small newspapers in Vermont and New Hampshire, she said that "that kind of alt-weekly, small enterprise paper is much more attractive to me than a clunky, broken model paper in the middle of Texas" (Claire, personal communication, April 2014).

Leslie Ann was another student who looked at organizational viability and financial structure in order to assess what she wanted to do after graduation. She had come into the journalism school hoping to work for a community newspaper, a vocational path she always thought she would pursue. But when I spoke with her toward the end of her senior year, she admitted that "a lot has changed" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014). She had started working at UNC's Reese News Lab, "an experimental media and research project" staffed by a group of undergraduate and graduate students that "focuses on developing and testing new ideas for the media industry" (About – Reese) off the recommendation of a friend: "I heard a lot of great things about it and I knew someone who had got in and said, 'It is like one of those life changing things that you use what you learn for the rest of your life' and I was like, 'Well I am not going to have that kind of opportunity once I leave [school]'" (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014).

After starting at Reese, Leslie Ann's focus began to change:

I kind of got hooked on the first day. We had like this crazy orientation where we had to create some product like you know in like half an hour with like random stuff, like we created some like ketchup and mustard equalizing dispenser. And it was just so bizarre and just something that I never really like my creativity was unstifled, you know, in ways and I feel like having unstifled creativity is a very important thing now going forward for me. Just because it definitely makes the work life a lot less you know, you feel like a lot less like work, you know (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014).

It was only after working at Reese that Leslie recognized her attraction to the innovative

aspects of content creation and that, if she wanted to continue to work in those spaces, her

immediate future was perhaps not in the community newspaper environment but rather in

television. During her time at Reese, in fact, Leslie Ann was given an opportunity to work at a

local broadcast company in a digital position on a part-time basis. This was something she never

expected – "it was kind of weird for me to apply for a job in broadcast" – but she hoped to stay

with the company after graduation. As she was explaining this decision to me, Leslie Ann

sounded apologetic, almost as if she was abandoning print – her first love - for the foreseeable

future:

> So I think that everybody is kind of merging into the same mentality and that newspapers
> unfortunately have kind of a disadvantage because they don't have the same kinds of revenue that
> television has to kind of invest in digital and in whatever. So I was kind of encouraged by the fact
> that these opportunities were there and like, I don't know of a newspaper nearby that has anything
> similar what they are doing and you know while I do love newspapers and I think that they are
> very important and you know, I am invested in the long run in kind of finding something to help
> newspapers out, I think at the same time, like right now, the types of innovation that I want to
> work with, the opportunities are going to be maybe not all in broadcast but at least in companies
> that are either digital native or have some kind of resources to invest in becoming more digital
> friendly (Leslie Ann, personal communication, April 2014).

In each of these three vignettes, we see aspects of pedagogical lessons designed to have

the students try new things, to experiment, and to test ideas – activities, in short, designed to

foster an entrepreneurial spirit. Chelsey and Claire started a digital magazine with little

knowledge of what they were doing and little idea if the model would ever work. Leslie Ann,

meanwhile, shifted away from print to pursue work at Reese (and eventually at a broadcast

network) because she was "not going to have that kind of opportunity" once she graduated.

These entrepreneurial lessons, however, these *aspects of the institutional habitus*, were then

personalized by the students to fit individual needs. Each of the students took something they

learned concerning the viability of news organizations and the importance of innovation – be it

through student-run media or at the Reese News Lab – and made it relevant not within the context of society or the larger media industry but rather within the context of their *own* future. In other words, the students were not so much concerned with the business models of these companies for the sake of the businesses themselves but rather because their viability directly impacted their ability to get hired and continue doing what they hoped to do. The institutional habitus of trying new things and innovating, then, was grafted onto the students' larger individual habitus that was focused on, as explained above, finding a stable job and earning a salary.

In the end, therefore, I found varied influences of journalism education on the behavior of journalism students on the cusp of graduation in both the United States and India. On the Indian side, some of these influences were direct, such as preparing students for the media organizations' placement exams. These direct influences were less apparent on the American side, as the process by which these students sought jobs was significantly less structured.

Across both countries, however, these influences were most evident (and most interesting) as components of job selection behavior stemming from the personalization of pedagogical lessons. On the Indian side, there was evidence of a push to work for outlets that produced true "hard news" such as crime reporting, rather than companies that simply recycled older stories - but that desire stemmed not from a societal or political point-of-view but rather from the students' need for adventure, a desire for challenge, and enjoyment in pursuing stories and seeing a published byline. On the American side, students were cognizant of the failing business models of traditional news sources (such as newspapers), but their concern was less for the overall health and survival of these specific entities than it was for their own future job prospects.

Perhaps the most representative quote that emerged from all my interviews, then, was the one briefly touched upon in the introduction to this chapter. It involved the American student who had been offered an internship at the *Wall Street Journal* and had accepted the position over another option because of the long-term viability of the paper. She told me that she had wondered about media business models before and had even learned about it in one graduate-style seminar class but that it "it didn't feel urgent to me because my job didn't depend on it" (Chelsey, personal communication, April 2014). Only when her job *did* depend on it, though, while working as Editor-in-Chief on an iPad-only digital magazine and when looking for long-term employment upon graduation, did that aspect of the institutional habitus become personal and, thus, exceedingly relevant.

DISCUSSION

I had two objectives with this chapter. The first was to detail the process of American and Indian journalism students as they approached graduation by using data gathered through interviews with students, faculty, and administrators. For Indian students at select journalism schools (including the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media), I found this process to be a very structured affair, involving a series of exams designed to test, among other things, news values, grammar, and editing. For the American students, however, I found this process to be much more fluid, with many students having to pursue part-time work and paid internships upon graduation.

The second objective of this chapter, meanwhile, was to use a specific moment in a journalism student's life when decisions would have to be made – the time before graduation – as a way to isolate the influence of journalism education on actions and behaviors. Unlike

previous works detailed in this chapter, this study was not intended to measure what journalism schools are *trying* to teach, what students *said* they learned, or what journalism schools *should* be teaching. Instead, I wanted to maximize the value of my collected data by pursuing a context-heavy, case study type investigation – to find out how lessons imparted through journalism education were enacted through specific decisions or choices.

While I found examples of direct and indirect influences of the institutional habitus on the actions and behaviors of these students as they sorted through and applied for various jobs and internships, two broader conclusions regarding the efficacy and influence of journalism education emerged from the analysis. First, there was a clear value in the *opportunities* provided by journalism school, opportunities that often existed either outside the realm of the normal curriculum or outside the realm of what the student expected to do in the program. These opportunities were very influential in determining the path taken by students upon graduation. As one American told me regarding her experience at UNC and, specifically, her experience working for the music section of the campus newspaper:

> I just kind of had an outlet to be engaged, you know. I know a lot of people do like social activism or like social justice stuff or do like a 5K for cancer or something and you know that is great. Sometimes I feel bad for not doing something more productive. But you know, I have gotten to find something that has really helped me become actively involved or engaged in a community which I feel like a lot of people don't find that outside of school (Allison, personal communication, April 2014).

This opportunity to become engaged, in fact, had resulted in a network of music-related contacts that, subsequently, had resulted in the student being offered a part-time position at a local newspaper. If the institutional habitus is the "impact of a cultural group" on an individual's behavior, then Allison's experience is a clear example of how the opportunities afforded by journalism education directly led to the job offer. And the institutional habitus, in

this case, can be said to have been grafted onto Allison's larger system of dispositions and expectations which involved, generally, getting a job and working in the music industry.

This experience, in fact, also accurately represents my second conclusion regarding the influence of journalism education – the personalization of those opportunities. Many of the students I spoke with embraced the lessons delivered through their journalism program; the lessons that were most salient, however, were the ones that directly affected their livelihoods. With Chelsey, for example, the idea of a media entity being financially stable only hit home when she was forced, as Editor-in-Chief, to sustain an iPad-only long-form magazine. She subsequently applied the lessons learned from this experience to an assessment of her own job prospects upon graduation. The same goes with Shweta, an Indian student who told me that she understood the societal importance of crime reporting, but, in actuality, hoped to pursue this line of work simply because she enjoyed the work. These findings, then, suggest the most memorable and influential lessons of journalism education (at least at this one moment in time) are those lessons that are most personal.

The full impact and influence of journalism education on students, of course, is an inherently difficult variable to measure. This study, then, should be regarded as a small empirical ripple in an otherwise large substantive pond. But I believe the method pursued in my inquiry stands as a necessary complement to the broad survey-based examinations of previous scholars. At some point during my interview, in fact, I asked each student I spoke with about the role of the journalist and the qualities every journalist should have – questions similar to those used by previous scholars who have pursued cross-national research (Hanitzsch et al., 2011; Splichal & Sparks, 1994). One student told me: "A perfect journalist is one who can report an event properly in an unbiased, impartial manner and not worry about consequences if he has his facts right or is

148

sure of it" (Mayukh, personal communication, July 2013). Another said a perfect journalist is one who "writes well, who checks his facts correctly, who is not biased, who is not at all opinionated, they are not supposed to give opinions" (Prutha, personal communication, July 2013). A third told me that being a journalist is about "courage, the willingness to write about things that are going to upset the upper class" (Eric, personal communications, September 2013). And a fourth said the role of the journalist is to "shed light on stories that people wouldn't hear about and to make sure that you give a voice to the people who don't have it" (Emily, personal communication, September 2013). But what do these values, attitudes, and expectations mean within the context of journalism education? Do the students actually believe what they are saying? From where did these ideas come from? Will they embody these characteristics if they get the chance to work as a journalist? And what do they tell us about the value of a journalism program? My point with this chapter, then, is to suggest that these answers tell us very little without the added context of the student's experience in journalism school and the empirical data from specific decisions and choices they make throughout their lives. As mentioned above, there is significant "discordance between what people say and what they do" (Thomson, 2007, p. 572), discordance that can be measured through the analysis of tangible action and behavior.

And so I argue that analyses such as the one pursued in this chapter – ones that examine specific actions and behavior - are useful to measure the efficacy and value of journalism education. Interviewing students on the eve of graduation, of course, is hardly a comprehensive assessment of an education's worth. I suggest, however, that, it can certainly be a piece of the puzzle, and is as valuable as an attitudinal survey administered three years after graduation. And while my data for this study was limited to actions and behavior immediately preceding graduation, it is possible this study will continue - incorporating additional behavior as these

students develop professionally while concurrently using the data gathered during journalism school to isolate the specific elements of the institutional habitus. Taken holistically with the compendium of previous research on journalism students and education, it is my goal that this kind of context-based analysis will eventually contribute to the larger discussion concerning the overall structure and efficacy of journalism education around the world.

CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

In 2006, a paper was published in *Journalism Studies* entitled "Teaching Journalists to Save the Profession" (MacDonald, 2006). The paper comprehensively described (and criticized) what the author believed to be the standard "professional model" of journalism education - a structure historically molded to help mitigate the profit-oriented pressures of a commercial media environment. MacDonald, however, questioned the efficacy of this model and suggested it inculcated an aura of complacency within the students: "In light of the shortcomings of the professional reform approach, an important question then remains for journalism educators; what kind of journalism education would better serve the public?" (p. 746). As an alternative, the author offered and advocated for a "critical" approach to journalism education, a model that would require students to actively and openly question the constraints of a commercial media and the "barriers" it places upon democratic performance. With this proposed pedagogical model, journalism programs would ostensibly teach student how to "save" the profession.

More important than MacDonald's overall argument for the sake of this dissertation, however, is the evidence (or lack thereof) and data she used to construct it. The work, for example, did not include a single quote from or statistic about journalism students. This is not abnormal; as Deuze (2006) has written "Journalism is a more or less autonomous field of study across the globe, yet the education and training of journalists is a subject much debated – but only rarely researched" (p. 19). Two relatively recent works outlining additional models for journalism education in the 21st century (Mensing, 2010; Pavlik, 2013), for example, are

similarly devoid of rigorous empirical data to back up their larger conceptual arguments. Pavlik (2013), for example, suggested "a model of innovation and entrepreneurship in media, guided by ethics, freedom of speech, and rigorous, independent and critical inquiry" (p. 211). Mensing, meanwhile, advocated for "conceiving of journalism as an act of community, a process as much as a product" that will "help educators and students respond to the deep changes catalyzed by the development of digital technologies" (p. 520). But there is little data in either of these works to explain why journalism programs look they way they do, why students enter a journalism program, or even what students ultimately take away conceptually over the course of their degree program.

The three papers noted above were conceived as opinion pieces; they should, therefore, be treated as such. But over the two years I spent researching this dissertation, I could not help but feel a perceptible disconnect between many of the papers I read concerning the "future" of journalism education and the empirical realties I uncovered during my own work. MacDonald, for example, does not mention the implications of an influential American journalism education organizational field on her proposed change. Nor does she discuss the repercussions of a revamped journalism curriculum on the "motivations" (and, thus, enrollment) for students entering a journalism program. And finally, there is little attention paid to how this new curriculum would specifically benefit students as they proceed down their vocational path. The graduating journalism students I spoke with in the United States and India, for example, did not seem particularly concerned about "saving" the profession of journalism. Few, in fact, had much to say about the matter at all. Our conversations, instead, revolved primarily around very personal and specific matters - getting a job, making a decent salary, paying off student loans.

And so without empirical justifications for proposed changes, or rationale for the manner by which the proposed change would or could be implemented, the multitude of opinion pieces concerning the structure of journalism pedagogy are just that – opinion pieces.

My dissertation, then, can best be viewed as an attempt to fill in some of these substantive gaps and to account for what Deuze has called "a lack of rigorous scholarship in the field of (international) journalism education and training" (p. 29). As stated in the introduction, my overall dissertation contributes to the literature on journalism students, journalism education, and journalistic professionalism in two ways. First, it serves as the first concurrent cross-national examination of journalism students *and* journalism education. And second, it shines a much-needed light on journalism education and students in India, the world's largest democracy and one of the few places on the planet where traditional news sources such as newspapers are still hiring at a consistent pace.

Keeping these overall contributions in mind, I return, then, to the specific takeaways from each of my empirical chapters as well as the broad inquiry advanced in the first chapter of this dissertation: What can a) the development and structure of journalism education on a supranational level, b) the motivations and attitudes of journalism students in the United States and India, and c) the students' experiences in journalism school and immediate vocational decisions tell us about the current state and future of journalism education and, thus, journalism students?

First, in terms of the development and structure of journalism education on a supranational level, I attempted, in Chapter 2, to recast the history of journalism education in the United States as the structuration of a persistent and influential organizational field. Organizational fields, meanwhile, are embedded with regulative, normative, and cultural-

cognitive elements that, according to Scott (2014), contribute "in interdependent and mutually reinforcing ways, to a powerful social framework – one that encapsulates and exhibits the celebrated strength and resilience of these structures" (p. 59). Organizations within a field are often characterized by institutional isomorphism – "a constraining process that forces one unit in a population to resemble other units that face the same set of environmental conditions" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983: p. 149) – and a gravitation toward those elements. Because they are so resiliently embedded in the field structure, *changing* the elements that comprise an organizational field (and thus the elements to which organizations within the field migrate), then, is a difficult and complicated process. It is one thing for scholars to propose changes to the overall structure of journalism education; it is quite another to implement those changes within a structure where institutional isomorphism toward the socially accepted elements upon which the organizational field has developed leads to legitimacy.

I also suggested that supranational extensions of the American journalism education organizational field have resulted in both institutional isomorphism as well as ceremonial conformity among journalism schools outside the United States – specifically, Indian journalism schools. While my work provides further evidence for a supranationally influential journalism education organization field, it also suggests that the influence of this field is dependent on a variety of other factors, such as an organization's orientation to its students or the media industry. Regardless, an influential organizational field has consequences for the manner by which journalism educators pursue (or do not pursue) changes. Consider MacDonald's question above, for example, in which she asked: "In light of the shortcomings of the professional reform approach, an important question then remains for journalism educators; what kind of journalism education would better serve the public?" (p. 146). This inquiry, however, suggests that

journalism educators are (or should be) primarily oriented toward the public. At the Indian Institute of Journalism and New Media in Bangalore, for example, school administrators often changed curriculum on an annual basis in an effort to adapt to the needs of the media industry. The school also maintained ceremonial conformity to the larger American journalism education organizational field by, among other things, referencing the Columbia School of Journalism on its website. To pursue substantial curriculum change in order to better serve the "public," then, would involve a prolonged negotiation of factors and a potential loss of legitimacy within other fields to which the school was oriented.

Second, in terms of the motivations and attitudes of journalism students, I diverged from previous cross-national survey-based studies in Chapter 3 by instead deploying the methodological tool of habitus in an effort to understand the inherent complexity of a student's decision to enter journalism school. Through in-depth "life history" interviews with students in the United States and India, I detailed not only the components comprising this decision but also the underlying influences resulting in similarities and differences between students. And unlike previous cross-national studies, the focus was as much about the heterogeneity of these students as it was the homogeneity.

Understanding these motivations, it would seem, is essential for scholars who wish to map out the future of journalism education. If, for example, and as previous scholars have suggested, higher education helps define the boundaries of occupational norms (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Vos, 2012) and if journalism students choose to enter journalism school based on their perceptions of those occupational norms (as I discuss in Chapter 3) then it would follow that if journalism programs were to undergo widespread or significant changes, those changes would lead to a change in perceived occupational norms which would subsequently lead to

journalism students with altered motivations and characteristics. And even though journalism schools, as I found in Chapter 2, are oriented toward many different fields (i.e. the media industry, students, each other), it is quite fair to suggest that journalism students are an essential component to every system of journalism education. Discussing proposed changes to journalism school curriculum without a concurrent discussion detailing what those changes would do to student motivations (and enrollment), then, seems unnecessarily removed from the realities of the situation at hand.

And third, in terms of the students' experiences in journalism school and immediate vocational decisions discussed, I again deployed the methodological tool of habitus in Chapter 4 to specifically explore the influence of the "institutional habitus" (Reay, 1998, p. 521) of journalism education on journalism students. While I found examples of direct and indirect influences of the institutional habitus on the actions and behaviors of these students as they sorted through and applied for various jobs and internships, I focused primarily on the personalization of the opportunities provided by journalism school. That is, the lessons of journalism school that were most utilized as they graduated were the ones that directly affected their livelihoods. And while there should, of course, be significant caution when discussing the efficacy of journalism education based on the examination of one specific decision or moment, there is, I suggest, also significant worth in empirically connecting a journalism student's behavior or action to lessons imparted during a journalism degree. This direct examination, therefore, can and should serve as a complement to previous survey-based approaches measuring the value or worth of a journalism degree.

This dissertation concludes with a final point. In many ways, this project was meant as a series of empirical, methodological, and analytical contributions to the developing literature on

cross-national journalism students and journalism education. But it is perhaps possible to distill the findings from all three empirical chapters into a discussion regarding the potential friction between homogeneity (i.e. the schools) and heterogeneity (i.e. the students). In Chapter 4, I found that the most immediate application of journalism education by these students was through a personalization of opportunities provided by the curriculum. This suggests the benefit of an adaptable journalistic curriculum, one tailored to allow each student to develop independently through opportunities offered by their respective programs. This adaptability, however, seems to be most threatened by an increasingly influential supranationally extended organizational field, one in which journalism programs forsake regional sensibilities in order to seek legitimacy from (or ceremonially conform to) the larger organizational field. In this case, the power of the institutional pull would subsume the distinct pedagogical needs of the diverse student body. Recognition of the field's influence, then, is perhaps the biggest takeaway from this work.

REFERENCES

Abbott, A. D. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

About, *AEJMC.org,* Retrieved from http://www.aejmc.org/home/about/

About IIJNM, *IIJNM.org*. Retrieved from http://www.iijnm.org/over-about.html

About the school, *jomc.unc.edu*, Retrieved from http://www.jomc.unc.edu/about

About the World Journalism Education Council, *wjec.ou.edu,* Retrieved from http://wjec.ou.edu/about.php

About Us, *IIMC.nic.in*. Retrieved from http://www.iimc.nic.in/profile.html

About Us – Location, *asianmedia.org*. Retrieved from http://www.asianmedia.org/aboutus/location.asp

About Us – Media Development Foundation, *asianmedia.org*. Retrieved from http://www.asianmedia.org/aboutus/mdf.asp

"ACEJMC Accreditation Status 2012-13," *AEJMC.com*. Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/STUDENT/PROGLIST.SHTML.

Alonso, M. À. P. (2010). Quiero ser periodista: tras las motivaciones de la profesión periodística. (Spanish). *I Want to Be a Journalist: Looking for Motivation in Journalism. (English)*, *18*(34), 191–199.

Anderson, C.W. (2013). *Rebuilding the news: metropolitan journalism in the digital age*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Anderson, C.W. (2014). Book review: Silvio Waisbord Reinventing professionalism: Journalism and news in a global perspective (part of the series Key Concepts in Journalism). *Journalism*, *15*(1), 131–133.

Bagnoli, A. (2003). Imagining the Lost Other: The Experience of Loss and the Process of Identity Construction in Young People. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *6*(2), 203.

Bantz, C. R., McCorkle, S., & Baade, R. C. (1980). The News Factory. *Communication Research*, *7*(1), 45–68.

Beam, R. A., Weaver, D. H., & Brownlee, B. J. (2009). Changes in Professionalism of U.S. Journalists in the Turbulent Twenty-First Century. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 86(2), 277–298.

Becker, H., & Ragin, C. C. (1992). *What is a case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry*. New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Becker, L. B., Vlad, T., & Kalpen, K. (2012). 2011 Annual Survey of Journalism and Mass Communication Enrollments: Enrollments Decline, Reversing the Increase of a Year Earlier, and Suggesting Slow Growth for Future. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *67*(4), 333–361.

Benson, R. (2004). Bringing the Sociology of Media Back In. *Political Communication*, *21*(3), 275–292.

Benson, R. (2005). Mapping field variation: Journalism in France and the United States. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 85–112). Cambridge, England: Polity.

Benson, R., & Neveu, E. (2005). Introduction: Field theory as a work in progress. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 1–25). Cambridge, England: Polity.

Bindu Bhaskar, *asianmedia.org*. Retrieved from http://www.asianmedia.org/faculty/CV/bindu.asp

Bjørnsen, G., Hovden, J. F., & Ottosen, R. (2007). Journalists in the Making. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 383–403. doi:10.1080/17512780701505085

Boczkowski, P. (2004). *Digitizing the news: innovation in online newspapers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Boczkowski, P. (2010). *News at work: imitation in an age of information abundance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Outline of a theory of practice. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la Crise!: For Heterodoxy in Social Science. *Theory and Society*, 17(5), 773–787.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). *Sociology in question*. London: Sage.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *On television*. New York: New Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason : on the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D., (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Brief CV, *guyberger.ru.ac.za,* Retrieved from http://guyberger.ru.ac.za/CV/index.htm

Burawoy, M. (1998). The Extended Case Method. *Sociological Theory*, *16*(1), 4–33.

Cabrera, A. F., & La Nasa, S. M. (2000). Understanding the College-Choice Process. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2000*(107), 5–22.

Cassidy, W. P. (2005). Variations on a Theme: The Professional Role Conceptions of Print and Online Newspaper Journalists. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(2), 264–280.

Chapman, D. W. (1981). A Model of Student College Choice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, *52*(5), 490–505.

Clarke, Judith. (2010). Cambodia: Educating Journalists in a World of Poverty, Corruption, and Power Abuse. In B. Josephi (Ed.), *Journalism Education in Countries with Limited Media Freedom* (pp. 53-72). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Compton, J. R., & Benedetti, P. (2010). Labour, New Media and the Institutional Restructuring of Journalism. *Journalism Studies*, *11*(4), 487–499.

Cook, T. (1998). *Governing with the news : the news media as a political institution*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Crawford, E. C., Fudge, J., Hubbard, G. T., & Filak, V. F. (2013). The Mass Comm Type Student Personality Traits, Motivations, and the Choice between News and Strategic Communication Majors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *68*(2), 104–118.

Declaration of Principles, *wjec.ou.edu*. Retrieved from http://wjec.ou.edu/principles.php

"Development Journalism" brochure, Indian Institute of Mass Communication

Deuze, M. (2006). Global Journalism Education. *Journalism Studies*, *7*(1), 19–34.

Dickson, T., & Brandon, W. (2000). The Gap between Educators and Professional Journalists. *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, *55*(3), 50–67.

DiMaggio, P.J. (1991). Constructing an Organizational Field. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 267-292). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1991). Introduction. In W. W. Powell & P. J. DiMaggio (Eds.), *The new institutionalism in organizational analysis* (pp. 1–38). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Du, Y. R., & Thornburg, R. (2011). The Gap between Online Journalism Education and Practice: The Twin Surveys. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *66*(3), 217–230.

Du Bois-Reymond, M. (1998). "I Don"t Want to Commit Myself Yet': Young People's Life Concepts. *Journal of Youth Studies*, *1*(1), 63.

Duffy, Andrew. (2010). Shooting Rubber Bands at the Stars: Preparing to Work Within the Singapore System. In B. Josephi (Ed.), *Journalism Education in Countries with Limited Media Freedom* (pp. 33–52). New York: Peter Lang.

Eapen, K.E. (1991), "Journalism Education and Textbooks in SAARC Countries,"Retrieved from http://www.uta.fi/cmt/textbooks/india_saarc.html

Edmonds, R., Guskin, E., Rosenstiel, T., & Mitchell, A. (2013). Newspapers: Stabilizing, but Still Threatened. *The Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism.* Retrieved from http://stateofthemedia.org/2013/newspapers-stabilizing-but-still-threatened/

Faculty, *ipj.lau.edu.lb,* Retrieved from http://ipj.lau.edu.lb/faculty/

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006). Five Misunderstandings About Case-Study Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(2), 219–245.

Folkerts, J. (2014). History of Journalism Education. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, *16*(4), 227–299. doi:10.1177/1522637914541379

Folkerts, J., Hamilton, J.M., & Lemann, N. (2013) "Educating Journalists: A New Plea for the University Tradition." *Columbia Journalism School*, Retrieved from: http://www.journalism.columbia.edu/news/878

Fröhlich, R., & Holtz-Bacha, C. |. (2003). *Journalism education in Europe and North America : an international comparison*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.

Gaunt, P. (1992). *Making the newsmakers : international handbook on journalism training.* Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press.

Gordon, T., & Lahelma, E. (2003). From ethnography to life history: tracing transitions of school students. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *6*(3), 245.

Guo, Zhongshi (2010). Through Barbed Wires: Context, Content, and Constraints for Journalism Education in China. In B. Josephi (Ed.), *Journalism Education in Countries with Limited Media Freedom* (pp. 15-32). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Indian Entertainment and Media Outlook 2013, PwC, http://www.pwc.in/india-entertainment-media-outlook/index.jhtml

Indian Institute of Mass Communication. *Development Journalism* [Brochure].

Hallin, D. (2005). Field Theory, Differentiation Theory, and Comparative Media Research. In R. Benson & E. Neveu (Eds.), *Bourdieu and the journalistic field* (pp. 224-241). Cambridge, England: Polity.

Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: three models of media and politics.* Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hallin, D., & Mancini, P. (2012). *Comparing media systems beyond the Western world*.   New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hanitzsch, T., Hanusch, F., Mellado, C., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., … Kee Wang Yuen, E. (2011). Mapping Journalism Cultures Across Nations. *Journalism Studies*, *12*(3), 273–293.

Hanna, M., & Sanders, K. (2007). Journalism Education in Britain. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 404–420.

Hemmingway, E. (2008). *Into the newsroom : exploring the digital production of regional television news*. London: Routledge.

Hey, V. (2003) Identification & mortification in late modernity: New Labour; alpha femininities & their discontents. Keynote Address at the *2003 International Conference of Gender & Education*, University of Sheffield.

Holland, J., Thomson, R., & Henderson, S. (2006). Qualitative longitudinal research: A discussion paper. *London: Families and Social Capital ESRC Research Group, London South Bank University*. Retrieved from http://www.lsbu.ac.uk/ahs/downloads/families/familieswp21.pdf

Homepage, *AECJMC,* Retrieved from http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/

Hovden, J. F., Bjørnsen, G., Ottosen, R., Willig, I., & Zilliacus-Tikkanen, H. (2009). The Nordic Journalists of Tomorrow. *NORDICOM Review*, *30*(1), 149–165.

International Advisory Board, *IIJNM.org*. Retrieved from http://www.iijnm.org/over-board.html

"Job Market Recovery Has Stalled, Results Of Annual Surveys of Journalism & Mass Communication Indicate," *www.grady.uga.edu*, http://www.grady.uga.edu/annualsurveys/

Josephi, B. (2010). *Journalism education in countries with limited media freedom*. New York: Peter Lang.

Journalism: English, *iimc.nic.in.* Retrieved from http://www.iimc.nic.in/content/44_1_JournalismEnglish.aspx

Journalism Studies, *icahdq.org,* Retrieved from http://community.icahdq.org/ohana/groups/details.cfm?id=32

Jurkowitz, M. (n.d.). The Growth in Digital Reporting. Retrieved from http://www.journalism.org/2014/03/26/the-growth-in-digital-reporting/

K.M. Shrivastava, *IIMC.nic.in*. Retrieved from http://www.iimc.nic.in/content/ProfileDetail.aspx?FacultyId=23

Kreiss, D. (2012). *Taking our country back : the crafting of networked politics from Howard Dean to Barack Obama*. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Krucken, G. & Meier, F. (2006). Turning the University into an Organizational Actor. In Drori, G., Hwang, H., & Meyer, J. W. (Eds,), *Globalization and organization: world society and organizational change* (121-136). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Law, J. (2009). Seeing Like a Survey. *Cultural Sociology*, *3*(2), 239–256.

Lent, R. W., Brown, S. D., & Hackett, G. (1994). Toward a Unifying Social Cognitive Theory of Career and Academic Interest, Choice, and Performance. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *45*(1), 79–122.

Lepre, C., & Bleske, G. L. (2005). Little Common Ground for Magazine Editors and Professors Surveyed on Journalism Curriculum. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 60(2), 190–200.

Library, *IIMC.nic.in*. Retrieved from http://www.iimc.nic.in/content/40_1_Library.aspx

Lowrey, W. (2011). Institutionalism, News Organizations and Innovation. *Journalism Studies*, *12*(1), 64–79.

Lowrey, W. (2012). Journalism Innovation and the Ecology of News Production Institutional Tendencies. *Journalism & Communication Monographs*, *14*(4), 214–287.

Luker, K. (2008). *Salsa dancing into the social sciences : research in an age of info-glut.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Lyons, A. P. (1980). Review of Outline of a Theory of Practice by Pierre Bourdieu; Richard Nice. *ASA Review of Books*, *6*, 232–235.

MacDonald, I. (2006). Teaching Journalists to Save the Profession. *Journalism Studies*, *7*(5), 745–764.

MacDonald, R., Shildrick, T., Webster, C., & Simpson, D. (2005). Growing Up in Poor Neighbourhoods The Significance of Class and Place in the Extended Transitions of "Socially Excluded" Young Adults. *Sociology*, *39*(5), 873–891.

Mensing, D. (2010). Rethinking [again] the Future of Journalism Education. *Journalism Studies*, *11*(4), 511–523.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized Organizations: Formal Structure as Myth and Ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363.

Meyers, O., & Davidson, R. (2014). The journalistic structure of feeling: An exploration of career life histories of Israeli journalists. *Journalism*, *15*(8), 987–1005.

Mission, *IIJNM.org,* Retrieved from http://www.iijnm.org/over-mission.html

Model Curricula for Journalism Education," (2007), *UNESCO Series on Journalism Education,* Retrieved from http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001512/151209E.pdf

Moon, H. & Wotipka, C.M. (2006). The Worldwide Diffusion of Business Education, 1881-1999: Historical Trajectory and Mechanisms of Expansion. In Drori, G., Hwang, H., & Meyer, J. W. (Eds,), *Globalization and organization: world society and organizational change* (121-136). Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.

Murthy, C. S. H. N. (2010). Education in Mass Communication -- Challenges and Strategies: A Case Study of Indian Scenario. (French). *Romanian Journal of Journalism & Communication / Revista Romana de Jurnalism Si Comunicare- RRJC*, *5*(1), 5–16.

Newton, E. (2013) *Searchlights and sunglasses: Field notes from the digital age of journalism,* Retrieved from http://searchlightsandsunglasses.org/

Nielsen, R. (2012). *Ground wars : personalized communication in political campaigns*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Nielsen R.K. & Levy D.A.L. (2010) The Changing Business of Journalism and its Implications for Democracy. In: Levy D.A.L. and Nielsen R.K. (Eds) *The Changing Business of Journalism and its Implications for Democracy*. Oxford: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, pp. 3–15.

Ninan, S. (2007). *Headlines from the heartland : reinventing the Hindi public sphere*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Om os. *Dmjx.dk.* Retrieved from http://www.dmjx.dk/om-os/kontakt/medarbejdere/hans-henrik-holm.

Pavlik, J. V. (2013). A Vision for Transformative Leadership Rethinking Journalism and Mass Communication Education for the Twenty-First Century. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, *68*(3), 211–221.

Placement, *asianmedia.org,* Retrieved from http://www.asianmedia.org/placement/testimonials.asp

Principles of Accreditation, *ACEJMC.ku.edu,* Retrieved from http://acejmc.ku.edu/PROGRAM/PRINCIPLES.SHTML

Program Overview. *Asianmedia.org*. Retrieved from http://www.asianmedia.org/programme/overview.asp

Prospective Students, *journalism.columbia.edu,* Retrieved from http://www.journalism.columbia.edu/page/4-prospective-students/4

Publication, *IIMC.nic.in*. Retrieved from http://www.iimc.nic.in/publications.html.

Ragin, C. (1992). Introduction. In H. Becker & C. Ragin (Eds.), *What is a case?* (pp. 1-18). New York, NY, USA: Cambridge University Press.

Ranganathan, S. (2010, March 11). Professor Larry Pinkham, journalism educator, passes away. *The Hindu*. Chennai. Retrieved from http://www.thehindu.com/news/national/professor-larry-pinkham-journalism-educator-passes-away/article229026.ece

Rauner, M. (1999). UNESCO as an organizational carrier of civics education information. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *19*(1), 91–100.

Reay, D. (1998). 'Always knowing' and "never being sure": familial and institutional habituses and higher education choice. *Journal of Education Policy*, 13(4), 519–5 29.

Reay, D. (2004). "It's All Becoming a Habitus': Beyond the Habitual Use of Habitus in Educational Research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431–444.

Reese, S. D., & Cohen, J. (2000). Educating for journalism: The professionalism of scholarship. *Journalism Studies*, *1*(2), 213–227.

Roland Wolseley, 94, Syracuse Professor. (1998, June 29). *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/1998/06/29/business/roland-wolseley-94-syracuse-professor.html

Sanders, K., Hanna, M., Berganza, M. R., & Aranda, J. J. S. (2008). Becoming Journalists A Comparison of the Professional Attitudes and Values of British and Spanish Journalism Students. *European Journal of Communication*, *23*(2), 133–152.

Sarfatti-Larson, M. (1977). *The rise of professionalism: A sociological analysis.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Scholarship: Research, Creative and Professional Activity, *ACEJMC.ku.edu*, Retrieved from http://acejmc.ku.edu/PROGRAM/STANDARDS.SHTML#std5

Schramm, Wilbur (1947). Education for Journalism: Vocational, General, or Professional? *The Journal of General Education*, *1*(2), 90–98.

Schramm, Wilbur. (1968). Dr. Schramm Visits Institute. *Communicator, 3*(3), 7-12.

Schudson, M. (2011). *The sociology of news* (2nd ed.). New York: W.W. Norton & Co.

Schudson, M. & Anderson, C. (2009). Objectivity, Professionalism, and Truth Seeking in Journalism. In. T. Hanitzsch & K. Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (Eds.). *The handbook of journalism studies.* (pp. 88-101). New York: Routledge.

Schultz, I. (2007). The Journalistic Gut Feeling: Journalistic doxa, news habitus and orthodox news values. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(2), 190–207.

Scott, W. (2014). *Institutions and organizations : ideas, interests and identities* (Fourth edition.). Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Shoemaker, P., & Cohen, A. A. (2006). *News around the world : content, practitioners, and the public*. New York: Routledge.

Sloan, W. (1990). *Makers of the media mind : journalism educators and their ideas*. Hillsdale, N.J.: L. Earlbaum Associates.

Small, M. L. (2009). `How many cases do I need?' On science and the logic of case selection in field-based research. *Ethnography*, *10*(1), 5–38.

Sparrow, B. (1999). *Uncertain guardians : the news media as a political institution*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Splichal, S., & Sparks, C. (1994). *Journalists for the 21st century : tendencies of professionalization among first-year students in 22 countries*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Pub.

Taylor, E. W. (2003). Attending Graduate School in Adult Education and the Impact onTeaching Beliefs A Longitudinal Study. *Journal of Transformative Education*, *1*(4), 349–367.

The Class of 2014: The Weak Economy Is Idling Too Many Young Graduates. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.epi.org/publication/class-of-2014/

Thomson, R. (2007). The Qualitative Longitudinal Case History: Practical, Methodological and Ethical Reflections. *Social Policy and Society*, *6*(04), 571–582.

Thussu, D. K. (2012). India and a New Cartography of Global Communication. In I. Volkmer (Ed.), *The Handbook of Global Media Research* (pp. 276–288). Wiley-Blackwell.

Top 10 Journalism Colleges in India, *Way2College.com,* Retrieved from http://www.way2college.com/topjournalismcollegesinindia.htm; Top 10: Other Professional Colleges, *Outlook India,* Retrieved from http://www.outlookindia.com/article.aspx?281301

Tuchman, G. (1973). Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected. *American Journal of Sociology*, *79*(1), 110–131.

Vos, T. P. (2012). "Homo journalisticus": Journalism education's role in articulating the objectivity norm. *Journalism*, *13*(4), 435–449.

Waisbord, S. (2013). *Reinventing professionalism : journalism and news in global perspective*. Cambridge, UK; Malden, MA: Polity Press.

Watson, L., & Watson-Franke, M.-B. (1985). *Interpreting life histories: an anthropological inquiry*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.

Weaver, D., Beam, R., Brownlee, B., Voakes, P., & Wilhoit, G.C. (2007). *The American journalist in the 21st century : U.S. news people at the dawn of a new millennium*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

Weaver, D., & Wilhoit, G. C. |. (1996). *The American journalist in the 1990s : U.S. news people at the end of an era.* Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum.

Weaver, D., & Willnat, L. (2012). *The global journalist in the 21st century*. New York: Routledge.

Willig, I. (2013). Newsroom ethnography in a field perspective. *Journalism*, *14*(3), 372–387.

Wise Summit, *wiseqatar.org,* Retrieved from http://www.wise-qatar.org/divina-frau-meigs

Zelizer, B. (2004). *Taking journalism seriously: news and the academy*. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: Sage.