TRANSFORMING THE J-SCHOOL IN AN AGE OF CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

by

BRINKLEY THOMAS WARREN

(Under the Direction of NATHANIAL KOHN)

ABSTRACT

In this thesis, I conduct a case study of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative to Transform Journalism Education*. Through a naturalistic enquiry that engages multiple qualitative methods – including in-depth interviews with J-School leaders and textual analysis of J-School innovation initiatives – I seek to understand how J-Schools are transforming themselves, which innovation initiatives are working, and how, if at all, this transformation is changing what it means to be a professional in the new media landscape. I conclude that J-Schools are interdisciplinary hubs on campus, and that a new ethic of entrepreneurial journalism is emerging. Top J-Schools are radically transforming their curricula and are seeking to destroy silo and track systems of old while simultaneously creating new experimental approaches within *convergence curricula*. Successful change efforts are driven by strong feedback loops between the J-School and students, alumni, and institutional leaders both inside and outside of the Academy.

INDEX WORDS: Journalism education, Entrepreneurial journalism, Carnegie-Knight Initiative, Case study, Journalism innovation

TRANSFORMING THE J-SCHOOL IN AN AGE OF CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

by

BRINKLEY THOMAS WARREN

B.A., The University of Georgia, 2005

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2012

TRANSFORMING THE J-SCHOOL IN AN AGE OF CREATIVE DESTRUCTION

by

BRINKLEY WARREN

Major Professor: Nathanial Kohn

Committee: Chris Hanks
    Janice Hume

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
December 2012

DEDICATION

For the future.

May it be filled with prosperity, abundance,

and the pursuit of a higher consciousness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPENDICES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Creative Destruction and Convergence

The great media scholar Harold Innis believed that information, and ultimately knowledge, was a commodity of culture that circulated, had value, and empowered those who controlled it.[1] One of Innis's primary contributions to communications studies was to apply the dimensions of time and space to various media, and he divided media into time-binding and space-binding categories. Time-binding media are durable (Egyptian pyramids), whereas space-binding media are more ephemeral, such as radio, television, and newspapers. Innis argued that a balance between both forms of media is crucial for the sustainment of any empire, and his analysis of the effects of communications on the rise and fall of empires led him to warn grimly in the 1950's that Western civilization was now facing its own profound crisis because of our society's obsession with "present-mindedness" over concerns about past or future.[2] Innis argued that, "The overwhelming pressure of mechanization evident in the newspaper and the magazine, has led to the creation of vast monopolies of communication."[3] The fact is that, historically, information industries often thrive on monopoly. Tim Wu is a professor at Columbia Law School and in his 2010 book, "The Master Switch: The Rise and Fall of Information Empires," he argues that the Internet is often upheld as a model for what the free market is supposed to look like despite the history of monopolistic control and resistance to innovation that information monopolies have continued to show throughout history. He notes that apart from brief periods of openness created by new inventions or antitrust breakups, every medium of information, starting with the telegraph, has eventually proved to be a case study in monopoly. Examples include AT&T, Paramount, and NBC, as well as burgeoning monopolies such as Apple, Google, and Facebook. In information industries, value comes from the network, and the value of the network increases as more users join the network. This network power is how firms such as AT&T and Western Union's telegraph monoploy of the 19th century developed; the more customers recruited to the firm, the more impervious the firm becomes to challengers. Wu also points out

that information monopolies have very long half-lives, and eventually they often appeal to the government for subsidies that help the firm remain in power after their innovative thrust is gone from the sails. AT&T's dominion over the telephone lasted 50 years while holding lower prices and new innovative technologies such as magnetic recording at bay thanks much to this kind of state-sponsorship; furthermore, essential to NBC, CBS and ABC's long domination of broadcasting was the governments protection from FM radio and then the cable TV industry, which it suppressed for decades. The problem with information monopolies is that the will to innovate is often replaced by mere will to power, and the costs of the monopoly are mostly borne by entrepreneurs and innovators, who could successfully introduce new alternatives to the marketplace were it not for state-sponsorship. While it is currently convenient that Facebook is the place where you can engage your digital community and extend your virtual self, it is also the company that knows more about you than the IRS, and this monopolistic tendency hints at long-term problems that may not be known for decades, including the potential value that the government may find in this data in the future when Facebook has lost the innovative thrust and is seeking state-sponsorship to stay relevant.[4] The notion of monopolizing information is crucial when considering a healthy democracy, and also understanding the role of journalism and journalism education in maintaining information systems that benefit the public interest and serve the lofty ideals of freedom and self-government.

The Economics of the Technologically Journalistic

Times have changed since Innis analyzed the golden age of the newspaper industry. Mechanization has gone digital, traditional journalism is in trouble, and the balance of power has shifted in favor of digital participation, albeit, still ultimately controlled behind the firewalled fiber optics of international conglomerates and corporate hegemony. New forms of competition in advertising are disrupting the business models that have sustained most journalism in the U.S. for more than 150 years, and in response, both incumbent journalism providers and new entrants are searching to find the business models that will enable them to thrive into the future. They are mostly failing to find these models, largely because news has never been a commercially viable product, but has always been funded with income based on its value for other things.

The traditional mainstream media "dance to strongly conformist and imitative tunes"[5] compared to the expanding and cresting wave of digital convergence, whereby, in the words of

convergence scholar Henry Jenkins III, "the flow of content across multiple media platforms, the cooperation between multiple media industries, and the migratory behavior of media audiences" reigns supreme. Information technology is most certainly tearing down monopolies once held by broadcasters; participatory culture is unleashing a new age of democratized information production and consumption upon modern civilization and making communication more open and efficient in the process. In this emerging era of information abundance – it seems that, economically, from the view of consumers, information and media is at its best price point in history. Importantly though, media convergence and digitization is not just a technological shift, but introduces new socio-cultural paradigms that encourage consumers to engage information socially to create new experiences, new media forms and new content categories – in short, new technology is democratizing information production, and to some extent, consumption. Perhaps Innis would be happy, but perhaps not. He envisioned that the Academy would bring its weight to bear upon the balance of our society's future, and in so much that Google was created in a Stanford dorm room and Facebook was created in a Harvard dorm room, it has; but in large part, capitalism and corporate hegemony has brought its fuller weight to bear, and Academic leadership has mostly stood by the wayside in quiet reflection – hoping the crisis facing journalism would dissipate. As time goes by, the ripples of digital convergence have turned into a tsunami, and many of the stalwart producers of society's most sacred commodity – information – freeze in the face of time's most certain variable. Change. Some Academies in the US are answering the call, and are included in the qualitative study that follows. Many, are still frozen, and for them – I hope this serves to spark them to action, and provide a map for their own transformational change efforts.

In his essay, *A Plea for Time*, Innis suggested that genuine dialogue within universities could produce the critical thinking necessary to restore the balance between power and knowledge. Then, he argued, universities could muster the courage to attack the monopolies that always imperil civilization.[6] Innis saw the Academy as the optimal engine of creative destruction and the holy ground spring of innovative new business models. The Academy, however, has not always lived up to this potential – it has existed in a constant state of evolution, as has the nature of information itself.

Information is Power

   The 20th century can be described as a *republican* (as in representative democracy) information age in that information was carefully managed and pushed vertically to constituents through the mainstream media which was comprised of an elite group of corporate and government actors. Consumers would "vote" to some extent for what media they wanted simply by allocating their time towards one media channel or the other, and this vote was measured with highly unreliable ratings figures which provided the elite media actors with a way to divide up the advertising dollars used to support their respective media monopolies. Today's media environment is more democratic in a "direct-democracy" kind of way; the media ecosystem is comprised of digital business models that are being leveraged by network effects and open participation, and you don't have to look far in the newspaper industry to see a former lion selling shares and laying off good journalists[7]. Network realities of the new media landscape "link individuals beyond face-to-face relationships" as discussed by Eulau,[8] and the rapidly evolving digital environment – circa 2011 – is developed to a point where Habermas may have described it to be in its "ideal state,"[9] -- full of information, interaction and the deafening roar of public opinion, public discourse, and digital culture. In some ways the digital ecosystem seems to be a virtual version of Jung's collective unconscious[10] -- a complex system networked across the entirety of the planet and leagues into deep space – a system that serves as "a reservoir of the experiences of our species."[11] Wikipedia and Facebook are clear examples of this. Wikipedia allows anybody to contribute to a living encyclopedic data repository where factual information about almost any subject matter can be found instantaneously from anywhere that light waves can travel. One's Facebook profile often contains a complete digital record of one's life experience, and because of this, the social graph is perhaps the most abundant reservoir yet.

   Importantly, the wave of digital convergence is a pure example of the economist Joseph Schumpeter's ideal state of "creative destruction"[12] -- whereby radical innovation sparked by creativity, technology, and entrepreneurial initiatives serve to transform society and bring forth new capitalistic realities that replace, restructure or compete with the traditional socio-economic landscape. With creative destruction, innovative business models explode past practices and give long-term benefits to consumers, and there is no doubt that the Internet has brought extraordinary wide-ranging benefits to the American public. One could look at creative destruction as the cyclical economic process of innovation and progress, and capitalism as the system in which this

innovation tendency manifests itself – similar to a positive feed back loop in an ecosystem, whereby each cycle serves to grow and expand the system (i.e., marketplace); indeed, creative destruction serves as the great fungus of our economic ecosystem; it is a networked decomposer, similar to mycelium (the vegetative part of a fungus) which is vital in terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems for its role in the decomposition of organic compounds that allow for future growth.[13] The wave of digital information is upon us – and while the rising tide of innovation seemingly floats all boats, that doesn't mean that some of those boats don't have long-ignored holes in them.

Creative destruction is a process that is at the very heart of our capitalistic society. Even in *The Communist Manifesto*, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels described the tendency of capitalism to constantly reinvent itself at the expense of those unwilling to transform:

> All fixed, fast frozen relations, with their train of ancient and venerable prejudices and opinions, are swept away, all new-formed ones become antiquated before they can ossify. All that is solid melts into air, all that is holy is profaned, and man is at last compelled to face with sober senses his real condition of life and his relations with his kind. The need of a constantly expanding market for its products chases the bourgeoisie over the entire surface of the globe.[14]

The bestselling long-form journalism of Thomas Friedman and his *flat world* hypothesis gives validity to Marx even today. The theory of creative destruction as prophesized and promoted by Shumpeter is clearly demonstrated in today's modern landscape of journalism and communications industries, and as 20th century communications practices grow increasingly obsolete, the educational institutions that support these industries face a similar but mounting challenge to keep up or give up – to transform and evolve, or to become increasingly mired in obsolescence. Professionalism in the field is also transforming and demands that its agents become adaptive innovators in a shifting media landscape – the new professionalism requires more dynamos than specialists. Increasingly, the role of J-School education is to help students understand and make the future, not just report it. This imperative for change and innovative leadership is not new; in fact it's woven into the very fabric of information history. When Gutenberg invented the printing press, those who illustrated bibles by hand suffered as a result because the business process was disrupted. When the federal government under President Eisenhower built the Interstate highway system, those who owned hotels on old federal highways suffered – they were disrupted -- and when the Internet allowed for the creation of online travel

sites that aggregated discounted airline tickets and hotels, travel agencies suffered because their industry was disrupted. Yelp disrupts the Yellow Pages, Amazon disrupts big book stores, Apple disrupts the music industry and the list of Internet start-ups disrupting industries can go on and on. As is mostly the case with creative destruction scenarios, those whose music distribution companies and book stores were shuttered went on to find other jobs – some, perhaps, in related fields, but some not; but change they did. Innovation won the day. The marketplace is made for disruption, and the more disruption, the more efficiency, and perhaps – the healthier the marketplace. Technological advancement is usually a good thing from a meta-economic perspective, and advancement can provide abundance for the masses in many instances.

However, the same type of disruption outcome is not necessarily sufficient in the market for journalism or journalism education, because journalism carries with it a higher moral weight than being a travel agent or selling a book or looking up a business on the Yellow Pages. A healthy democracy still requires watchdogs, investigative reporters, and ethical citizens willing to dig deep for the truth, and to blow the whistle and stand up for our democratic rights when others won't or can't. Journalism producers are a special kind of producer. They are producers of the *check* which is to balance power in our American democracy. The concept of the media as a fourth branch of the U.S. government stems from a belief that the news media's responsibility to inform the populace is essential to the healthy functioning of our democracy.[15] But how can these democratic imperatives continue if journalists are not paid adequately for their work? How can companies afford to pay journalists if people care more about reality television than news programming when both are supported by advertising? How can educators continue to teach students to live up to traditional journalistic standards knowing that they won't be paid for such loyalty in the marketplace? Whose standards should the Academy be teaching students, the standards of *The New York Times* or the standards of Twitter and social media mavens?

The bottom line is that the news and information institutions that helped to shape our current journalism and mass communication (J-School) educational system are struggling to transcend the crisis and forge evolved identities. The digitization of the World's information economy has eroded the monopoly of information once held by newspapers and their array of individual reporters and editorial controls, and that monopolistic power is now falling to the large tech companies such as Google and Facebook. For sure, the evolution of the information economy through innovation and entrepreneurship has led to the most democratic mass

information environment that the world has ever known, and even attempts to serve journalistic ideals have emerged such as the controversial "WikiLeaks" operation. Emerging tech-media companies are usurping the traditional methods of production and consumption by introducing new innovative and socializing digital technologies into the marketplace in a way that makes information freely abundant via efficient two-way transmission channels. Undoubtedly the role of Twitter, for instance, as a means of speaking truth to power has created real impact – a perfect example would be the events surrounding Egypt's Arab spring movement in 2011. The old visions are melting into new realities; YouTube, for example, has already usurped the would-be glories of public television. Indeed, it is less so PBS, but more so YouTube (owned by Google) that is serving as a "global presence, allowing for social interaction, and providing a diversity of voices."[16]

This long tail[17] of content will only get longer, and new rules from physics and economics such as Moore's law[18] and cross-subsidies will rise in tenor.[19] The power of network externalities when combined with cross-subsidies will enable unprecedented systems analysis and digital manipulation by the so-called "Numerati,"[20] and "power invariably means both responsibility and danger."[21] The cybernetic tradition of humans controlling humans is getting easier as technology advances, and this trend places more urgency upon the need to revive depth journalism.

Traditional public information institutions are watching their markets dissipate and influence wane, while more efficient, innovative, and targeted start-up companies and entrepreneurs create new opportunities and paradigms.[22] These new ventures, however, don't require that news producers dig deep for the truth and blow the whistle to protect our democracy, but are instead guided by profit-motives that are sometimes rationalized by a social vision. Today, the world gets their news across a wide spectrum of media platforms and the importance of newspapers and other print publications as a means of disseminating information has whithered. Mike Hoyt, editor of the Columbia Journalism Review, says that "…if newspapers go under, you lose the transparency of government. Journalists are the watchdogs, and being able to shine a spotlight on corruption or scandal is vital to our democracy."[23] Our educational institutions are constrained to keep up with changing realities because of long-standing internal processes and the sheer weight of organizational history; and so how can our J-Schools transform themselves into the kind of nimble, transparent and inclusive entities that can succeed in this

brave new digital world? This question is of utmost importance for current and future J-School leaders and students.

Transformation of the J-School: Hacks into Hackers

As stated so clearly by Donica Mensing in 2010, "During times of disruption, maintaining practices that reinforce an unsatisfactory status quo is a disservice that reduces the credibility of the university."[24] Indeed, journalism education emerged as a way to improve public information standards and raise the educational level of newspaper employees and this effort was part of a US reform movement born in the Progressive Era, [25] [26] [27] [28] but times have changed, and the J-School must once again transform itself in order to stay relevant. At the heart of this change imperative is the notion that the business of news is now equally if not more important than the editorial control of news, because journalism is better when it's well funded, and serious journalism is a public good. The practical nature of journalism education gave way to professionalism in the 1930s because at the time journalism was thought of as a vocational trade, and educators didn't want trade schools in college; but change must be met with change, and the practical aspects of maintaining traditional professional practices, despite the unpractical nature of what is being taught in J-Schools in regards to students' future professions. Herein lays one key challenge that J-Schools face.

Traditionally, the business functions that fund the paychecks of practicing journalists are not taught in J-School. In fact, journalists have traditionally looked at the business side of news with some hesitance, and this hesitance was mostly an effort to maintain their objective autonomy, an ethical norm that has been no doubt taught in J-Schools and upheld at traditional media companies. After all, professional practice requires journalists to provide unbiased information to their audience, not persuasive communications (advertising and sales). However, in today's participatory culture, people are their own enterprise, and the journalists of tomorrow will be those who can build value, carve out a niche, develop a following, and establish professional authority around a specific subject matter. It used to be that journalists existed as an extension of their mother brand (the newspaper or broadcast company), but nowadays, journalists themselves are the brand, and they bring their audience of followers with them and add value to their institutional underwriters. The journalist as entrepreneur is the reality of tomorrow.

Geneva Overholser, Director of the School of Journalism at the USC Annenberg School of Communication and Journalism spoke at a conference called "The Future of Journalism Education" that was put on by the Paley Center for Media on February 11, 2010, where she articulated:

> "I would have rathered cut my tongue out than say to a journalism student, "Be Your Own Brand," five years ago even, and yet...I think that many if not most of our journalism jobs in the future will indeed require the skills of entrepreneurialism. The fact that in the past journalists were separated from the business side and the audience and let somebody else over the fence care about how the news got paid for, really had some bad effects. It got us disengaged from the audience. We weren't supposed to listen to the audience, we weren't allowed to give the audience a say, and our purity demanded it…but look where it got us. Now, one of the great promises of journalism in my view, is that we'll need to have journalists who care about the audience, how to reach those audiences, and also how to sustain themselves financially from those audiences."[29]

There is a current trend happening at J-Schools across the U.S. whereby creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship practices are getting integrated into the J-School curricula in unprecedented ways. At the Walter Cronkite J-School at Arizona State University, entrepreneurship is now a required course for journalism grad students in which they learn to work with engineers to build new digital platforms. At New York University, professor Nick Bilton teaches students how to use technology to collect unprecedented data on which to report, and Professor Adam Penenberg teaches a graduate class called "Entrepreneurial Journalism" where students learn how to build successful freelance careers, manage their own brands, and write business plans and book proposals. At Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, there is now a dual-degree master's program in journalism and computer science with the goal being to design tools for information gathering, synthesis, analysis and circulation. Many J-Schools teach basic production skills, but one goal of the Columbia program, according to Bill Grueskin, the dean of academic affairs, is to produce journalists who will "take it several steps beyond — to where they're creating a lot of their own new tools."[30] At the Annenberg School of Journalism at the University of Southern California, Professor David Westphal and former Annenberg Dean Geoffrey Cowan teach a graduate class called "Entrepreneurship in the New Media." Professor B.J. Roche teaches "Entrepreneurial Journalism" at University of Massachusetts Amherst, and at the University of Maryland the entrepreneurship course is being joint-taught by Asher Epstein, managing director of the Dingman Center for Entrepreneurship at the Robert H. Smith School of Business, and Leslie Walker, Knight Visiting Professor at the

Philip Merrill College of Journalism. Professor Larry Kramer teaches a course called "Case Studies in Media Management" at the Newhouse School of Journalism at Syracuse where students actually consult with real media companies in New York City that are considering starting new media spin-off ventures. The students act as entrepreneurial consultants and advise the conglomerates on start-up strategies and implementation strategies. Professor Alan Mutter at UC Berkeley teaches multiple classes about entrepreneurship and the future of journalism, and at Northwestern University, multiple classes are offered under the term "innovation projects" classes, whereby students work to actually create a venture in a specific area such as interactive journalism, magazine journalism, or community media.

The trend is exemplified in the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*. This initiative, started by the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation have invested more than $11 million in a national initiative to adapt journalism education to the challenges of a struggling news industry. The two foundations joined together with five, then nine and now twelve universities to develop a vision of what a journalism school can be at an institution of higher education.

During his announcement of the expansion of the initiative in 2008, Alberto Ibargüen, president and CEO of Knight Foundation, described the logic of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative.

> Although traditional models of newspaper, radio and local television news dissemination are severely challenged, every community in this democracy continues to have a core need for reliable information, news that informs and news that helps build the common language that builds community. That need will not go away and provide hope for future journalists. They will tell those stories with traditional, verification-journalism values but on multiple platforms and structures influenced by new technology. Journalism can train them to do that and, in that sense, journalism schools have a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to lead the industry. Carnegie and Knight want them to succeed.[31]

These and other J-School initiatives provide a wide array of material that can become the focus of further study, but to date, little scholarly research has been done to bring these initiatives to the forefront and put them in proper perspective.

At first inspection a common theme found in most of these innovation initiatives is entrepreneurship and adaptation driven by iterative design and experimentation. To be successful, students must do more than simply study what came before them; they must be active instead of passive observers, they must study what is going on currently, and apply creativity and innovation in order to build the media frameworks and professional boundaries of the future. To

help students be successfully adaptive, it seems that J-Schools are transforming their students from hacks into hackers. Entrepreneurial tendencies are not just manifesting from students and graduates, but also from faculty and J-School leaders.

The J-School leaders and actors who are initiating these new courses and programs in order to transform their respective institutions have been termed institutional entrepreneurs by DiMaggio, who introduced the notion back in 1988.[32] The field of institutional entrepreneurship has grown exponentially since early studies in the 1950s[33] [34], and more than 60 book chapters and articles on the subject have been published in peer reviewed journals over the past decade, including the first mapping of the field of institutional entrepreneurship in 2008.[35] It is clear to this author that institutional entrepreneurship is a major trend currently occurring in J-School transformation efforts throughout the country. Change agents (professors, college deans, or even students themselves) are initiating divergent changes within J-Schools and J-School norms, and these changes are serving to break the status quo in various fields of activity, and are thereby contributing to the future of J-School education, and therefore, the future of journalism in our democratic society. As with most change efforts, there are challenges; when it comes to J-School education, these challenges must begin within the realm of professionalism as it relates to journalism and mass communications. It is a hypothesis of this thesis that change is challenging traditional notions of journalistic professionalism, but also that these challenges are manifesting innovative new models within J-Schools.

Professionalism: Ideology & Reality

Robert Picard is the Director of Research at the Reuters Institute and is one of the World's leading scholars on media economics and management. In addressing the so-called death of journalism, Robert differentiates between the ideals of professionalism and the reality of journalism's constant evolution, and the result is an optimistic and transcending perspective:

> The pessimistic view of the future of journalism is based in a conceptualization of journalism as static, with enduring processes, unchanging practices, and permanent firms and distribution mechanisms. In reality, however, it has constantly evolved to fit the parameters and constraints of media, companies, and distribution platforms.
> In its first centuries journalism was practiced by printers, part-time writers, political figures, and educated persons who acted as correspondents—not by professional journalists as we know them today. In the nineteenth century the pyramid form of journalism story construction developed so stories could be cut to meet telegraph limits and production personnel could easily cut the length of stories after reporters and editors

left their newspaper buildings. Professionalism in the early 20th century emerged with the regularization of journalistic employment and professional journalistic best practices developed. The appearance of radio news brought with it new processes and practices, including "rip and read" from the news agencies teletypes and personal commentary. TV news brought a heavy reliance on short, visual news and 24hour cable channels created practices emphasizing flow-of-events news and heavy repetition. Journalistic processes and practices have thus never remained fixed, but journalism has endured by changing to meet the requirements of the particular forms in which it has been conveyed and by adjusting to resources provided by the business arrangements surrounding them. Journalism may not be what it was a decade ago—or in some earlier supposedly golden age—but that does not mean its demise is near. Companies and media may disappear or be replaced by others, but journalism will adapt and continue.

It will adapt not because it is wedded to a particular medium or because it provides employment and profits, but because its functions are significant for society. The question facing us today is not whether journalism is at its end, but what manifestation it will take next. The challenges facing us are to find mechanisms to finance journalistic activity and to support effective platforms and distribution mechanisms through which its information can be conveyed.[36]

Ironically, it seems that one of the main strategies that traditional media institutions use in dealing with the creative destruction of their industry is to attempt to increasingly professionalize it instead of taking risks to create the future mechanisms of information conveyance. As MacDonald describes, the calls for increased professionalism are related to periods of concern about the commercial interests and profit motives of media organizations.[37] However, this professionalism strategy does nothing to address the bigger concern of creative destruction that is making the profession of journalism and other communications professions more and more obsolete when compared to the realities of new platforms and distribution functions.

As Freidson articulates, professionalism in the modern world is increasingly under "assault"[38] by a confluence of market and cultural forces, namely digital technology and the democratization of information; but journalism in particular is a profession being swept away by the transformation occurring "out there" in the real world (for a solid overview of the crisis see Downie & Schudson, 2009[39]).

However, the trend in journalism professionalism as described in a variety of academic studies is one of *status quo* and the resistance of news institutions and academic institutions to change their underlying practices and professional culture in the face of *existential threats* such as the democratization of information and digital media technologies.[40] Not to say that

journalistic corporations haven't gone digital. In fact, most practicing journalists are certainly beyond strictly being "print people,"[41] but the big paradigm shifts have mostly been "normalized"[42] to serve traditional ideologies associated with the profession as it was taught and practiced during the age of newspapers and broadcasters.[43] The so-called standards that are by-and-large being taught to budding journalists are still the standards of the early 19th century, not the standards of the here and the now.

Ultimately, the struggle for professionalism within the media disciplines is one of authority – it is a matter of closed control versus open participation, a democratic-republic information ecosystem versus a direct-democracy informational ecosystem. The friction is born from a paradigm shift away from the monopolization of information and towards the democratization of information combined with a tendency of professionals and educators to constantly reassert control over their perceived profession, even if only to serve their own sense of self-importance or the political aspirations of themselves and those around them. Professionalism, in this regard, is arguably the most resilient threat to innovative change, and I suspect to find proof of this from the in-depth interviews included in this thesis.

There is a widening disconnect between the idealized practice of professionalism that is being taught in university classrooms versus the realities that J-School graduates face out in the real world. As argued by professor Barbie Zelizer, educators stress outdated modes of professionalism that are often too narrow to be applied practically outside of the academy, and this presents problems once students try to align their careers within a larger societal context.[44] [45]

Study Purpose

This thesis is not simply the story of media professionalism being eroded or business models being destroyed and disrupted by creative alternatives. Neither is this thesis about Academe's general disregard for systemic innovation or the existential crisis that J-Schools are facing as they navigate the interplay between upholding traditional journalistic principles versus their practical mandate to prepare the next generation of media professionals. Rather, this is the story of how Academe is evolving in response to these changes. This is a story of transcendence.

This is the story of J-Schools transforming themselves and their curriculum for the new media environment – the networked, social, participatory, democratized information age. This is the story of how the spirit of entrepreneurship is playing a heroic role in the transformation of J-

Schools throughout the country, and how initiatives such as those associated with the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* are paving the way for a digitized, collaborative, and entrepreneurial education environment within J-Schools. This is a story about the future of journalism education.

Thus, the purpose of this thesis is three-fold: (a) to explore how J-Schools are negotiating the tension between professional control and the democratization of information; (b) to understand if and how that negotiation is being manifest through innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives within J-Schools; and (c) to discuss the implications of J-School innovation logic and what it means for future generations of J-School leadership and graduates.

This naturalistic enquiry makes use of multiple qualitative methods – including interviews with J-School leaders from top universities and textual analysis of J-School innovation initiatives to generate a holistic portrayal of how J-Schools are seeking to transform themselves, the challenges and opportunities that this transformation presents to educators, and how, if at all, this transformation is influencing J-Schools' efforts to change what it means to be a professional in the new world of digital media communications.

The Democratization of Information: Journalism in Crisis

Innovation democratizes culture. The best well-known example of this is the Gutenberg press in the 1400s. Before the Gutenberg press, people would hand write pages and at best someone could write 40 pages a day; but with the printing press, almost 4000 pages could be printed each day. This crucial piece of innovation, created by the entrepreneur Johannes Gutenberg, is widely regarded as the most important event of the modern period and played a crucial role in the development of the Renaissance, Reformation and the Scientific Revolution, and laid the material basis for the modern knowledge-based economy to thrive.[46] Howard Rheingold, author of the 2003 book *Smart Mobs,* notes that the printing press allowed for the rise of coordinated and cooperative action such as democracy, science and global trade, and that the ensuing spread of self-government, rationalism and complex webs of enterprise is an example of millions of individuals acting collectively to produce outcomes vastly beyond the power or even understanding of any individual or even any nation involved.[47]

As innovation scholar, Don Kash points out:

There's always been innovation, but we learned something in World War II that has become permanently embedded in our minds. And that is, you can build organization systems that can do almost anything you can think of, and they will do that without anyone understanding how it's done. No one person knows precisely how the organization accomplished it.[48]

The Internet, ironically, is democratizing our ability to innovate, and this innovation is increasingly democratizing knowledge and information at an exponential rate. The democratization of innovation is a really profound idea, and is comprised of a few components. Firstly, there is the collapsing cost of production and product building associated with open-source software, commoditized technology (digital cameras, etc.), crowd-sourcing (user-driven innovation), and cloud computing with scale. The result is that new digital products and platforms can be built rapidly and with relatively low costs, and this allows for more experimentation and creative development opportunities founded on iteration. The second element of innovation democratization that stems from digital convergence is rapid business model development. Experimentation, again, becomes a leveraging element, and new business models can be tested quickly and iterated upon. For the first time, a product creator can have a direct dialogue with hundreds of different customers (users). In addition, demand creation and customer acquisition via social media allows for unprecedented speed to market for new products as friends recommend to countless friends as fast as light can travel – like word-of-mouth on steroids. In short, the Internet leverages our ability to experiment quickly and effectively, and this is incredibly empowering for inventors and entrepreneurs who thrive on discovering value via multiple iterations of creation. Gutenberg didn't create the press in one day, in fact he had to borrow money from others, sacrificed much, and spent 11 years of his life iterating and testing and (re)creating his invention before passing away in poverty and with little recognition for his great achievements. The tools that are used for creating high-quality innovations are getting so cheap and ubiquitous that individuals can innovate for themselves at a steadily higher quality and at a steadily decreasing cost and decreasing time interval. Therefore, users are able to solve their own problems instead of relying solely on outside producers, and users now have unprecedented opportunities to build exactly what they need for themselves instead of relying on manufacturers to innovate on their behalf. Once the users reveal what they have developed, the whole user community can benefit through social sharing and open-source

development. When information is shared socially like this, the resulting abundance of new tools provides a feedstock for even more new products that can be brought to market by other users and also by the manufacturers, which leads to even more information, which leads to more innovation, more products, and more feedstock. Today, cash is no longer the king of innovation, but the people and ideas are. In my view, human capital is rising in importance. Society is the new king, and within our society, information is more freely abundant, and innovation is much easier to accomplish because of the speed and flexibility that digitization leverages. This trend is resulting in a more democratic informational ecosystem, where ideas can be created and engaged with by huge publics in real-time.

In characterizing the liberal-utilitarian tradition of mass media from a perspective grounded in economic theory, James Carey says, "If men are free, they will have perfect information; if perfect information, they can be rational in choosing the most effective means to their individual ends, and if so, in a manner never quite explained, social solidarity will result."[49]

Journalism is the constant flow of relevant information, and these days, atoms are turning into bits. This is not to say that a stream of constant information serves the public interest, or that any of that information is perfect, but for sure, one of the most fundamental changes that is affecting the information industries is democratization. Media is no longer a one to many exercise, but is increasingly a many to many exercise.[50] More and more, media and information are disseminated via a multi-directional relational apparatus instead of being disseminated through a uni-directional mass medium such as a newspaper or a broadcasting monopoly. Careers in the communication arts are now founded on a network of information, not simply a broadcasting of it, yet the name of the college that grants the new professional's degree still says "journalism & mass communications" where a more apt title might include words such as "network" or "information" or "digital media." Some would argue that the word "journalism" is actually the word that should change; but there is no denying the importance of journalism to our democracy. Robert Picard says that journalism, "is not a business model; it is not a job; it is not a company; it is not an industry; it is not a form of media; it is not a distribution platform. Instead, journalism is an activity. It is a body of practices by which information and knowledge is gathered, processed, and conveyed. The practices are influenced by the form of media and distribution platform, of course, as well as by financial arrangements that support the journalism. But one should not equate the two."[51]

Indeed, journalism, when defined as an activity, leads us to believe that anyone can and should participate in its construction; but because of journalism's history of information delivery to citizens, it is important to make the link between journalism and the so-called fourth branch of U.S. democracy; importantly however, the perception of an American "free press" is somewhat of an illusion because for most of the 20th century the business models associated with American journalism relied upon scarcity, exclusivity, and control by which media corporations would govern media production technologies and media distribution technologies, which in turn leveraged their access to expert source material and information, which in turn endowed them with monopolistic authority in local advertising markets and a professional eminence within society. However, in today's transformational environment, media production and distribution technologies are now available to literally anyone who desires to use them, and this democratization of the means of production, distribution, and consumption of information is challenging the authority[52] and power[53] of traditional journalism institutions, as well as destroying those institutions' gate keeping control over information and the advertising dollars that come with it.[54] The increased opportunity for citizen participation within the field of journalism is in many ways a positive development, for back in 1989, Herbert Schiller said that, "big business…is the site of the concentrated accumulation of the productive equipment, the technological expertise, the marketing apparatus, the financial resources, and the managerial know-how" and that this incorporated brand of capitalism was leading towards a weakening of the democratic order. Although Google and other start-ups are corporate, it is now more so the case that the productive equipment, expertise, know-how, and marketing power is spread out among the digital social graph, and with this shift, there has been a strengthening of the democratic order – albeit precarious and still nestled into a state that is still mostly dominated by the military-industrial complex and teaming with pervasive ideological characteristics that are often very un-discerning and entirely dis-engaged from democratic civic life. With this in mind, though, it should be noted that the democratization of information that is being experienced at present may be precarious when considering the historic monopolization of new mass communication mediums throughout history as discussed by Wu, and this revelation creates even more urgency for reviving and strengthening modern journalistic practice. History teaches us that the consolidation of mass communication start-ups seems to be inevitable, and it often occurs with the help of the U.S. government.[55]

Benjamin Rush, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, said, at a time when the U.S. government subsidized the delivery of newspapers, that "they are not only the vehicles of knowledge and intelligence, but the sentinels of the liberty of our country."[56] However, financing the news is harder than it may seem, as Picard explains so masterfully:

Historically, the first collection and dissemination of news was funded in ancient times by emperors and kings, who used governors and officials throughout their realms to collect news and information and send it to the seat of power. Emissaries, consuls, and ambassadors collected foreign news and information in places important for trade or seen as potential threats to the realms. In this Imperial Finance Model, news and information were collected and shared with officials throughout the realms to assist in governance activities. This revenue model was based on official financial support because it served the interests of the state. In the Middle Ages, a Commercial Elite Finance model developed in which wealthy merchants hired correspondents in cities and states with which they traded to collect information about political and economic developments relevant to their trade. Linen, porcelain, sherry, and spice merchants used the news for commercial advantage and held it in confidence rather than sharing it with others. In the 18th and 19th centuries a broader Social Elite Finance Model developed to support newspapers that served the needs of the aristocracy and widening merchant class. Even with high cover prices, this model news was not viable and newspapers were subsidized by commercial printing activities and income from other commercial activities, governments and political parties, and merchant associations. The Mass Media Finance Model appeared in the late 19th and 20th century, made possible by the industrial revolution, urbanization, wage earning, and sale of finished goods. In this model news was provided for the masses at a small fee, but subsidized by advertising sales. Because most of the public was uninterested in day-to-day events and "hard" news, the bulk of newspaper content was devoted to sports, entertainment, lifestyle, and features that increased the willingness of the public to spend pennies for the product. This mass media financing model remain the predominant model for financing news gathering and distribution, but its effectiveness is diminishing because the "mass" audience is becoming a "niche" audience in Western nations as those less interested in hard news continue abandoning newspapers for television, magazines, and the Internet. This is creating a great deal of uncertainty how society will subsidize and pay for journalism in the twenty-first century. Focusing on news as a commercial product appears futile and commercial news providers would do well to put their efforts in creating other commercial activities that can subsidize news provision, such as events, education and training, bookstores, travel agencies, and a variety of merchandising activities. Many publishers subsidized news activities with these types of activities a century ago and some continue to do so. It is likely that news providers will rely on a far wider range of revenue streams in the future than merely on the consumer and advertising streams upon which they depend today.[57]

And so what, I ask, will be the Social Media Finance Model or the Virtual Media Finance Model or the Networked Media Finance Model or the Digitized Media Finance Model of the future? Will journalism of the future be supported by advertising or by some other means?

Importantly, only when advertising came along did journalism move to a more self-sustaining commercial model, but has it been self-sustaining? Current trends would seem to suggest that it hasn't been. Indeed, in late 2010 the Federal Trade Commission released a whitepaper in conjunction with the National Press Club called "Potential Policy Recommendations to Support the Reinvention of Journalism."[58] In the paper the team concludes that although news organizations are experimenting with new business models to sustain themselves, virtually no organizations have found a sustainable business model that would allow them to survive without some form of non-profit funding support, and that policies should be created to encourage innovations in the support of journalism business models for the future health of U.S. journalism and civic information. This crisis is one that extends from the ink of hard journalism to the halls of global power – because if funding for hard journalism goes, then a crucial pillar of the American democratic system will go with it – and power will go unchecked and the masses beholden blindly to PR strategy and viral memes.

In my view, the history of the U.S. clearly showcases the fact that journalism is a public good that is necessary for government engagement and participation by an informed citizenry. Journalism is also a public good by economists' standards in that it is non-rivalrous (one person's consumption of an item of news does not prevent another person's consumption of the same item) and non-excludable (once the producer supplies anyone, it cannot exclude anyone, and people will naturally share information with others for free). The fixed costs associated with journalism involve production, but technological advancement has decreased the costs all around, from production to consumption. The problem, then, is an economic one at heart. Consumers can free ride instead of paying for the value of the journalism that they consume, and they can copy and share it infinitely on the Internet without paying a dime to anyone, and all consumers are in this same boat. Many bloggers cite and discuss the ideas presented by traditional media companies, and in 2010 the Associated Press announced plans to begin citing bloggers officially for the first time. The democratic media uprising has begun and power is being distributed more equally to more members of society, but the problem still exists how will the source producers pay to continue production? It's quite easy for a blogger to develop opinions around a news story, but it's much harder to create an original piece of depth journalism involving a plethora of original sources and extensive investigation and fact-checking. If journalism can't be paid for, won't the bloggers rely more heavily on press releases and events?

What's the best way to fund journalism so that we can keep the crucial pillar of the United States intact? This challenge is paramount.

The journalism industry is paralyzed in solving this problem, and the Academy is equally paralyzed in preparing students to seek careers in this uncertain environment. What role and consequence can J-Schools play in a professional environment that has lost substantial economic viability and professional authority, and where the technological imperative has transcended the era of "mass" communications, and is now oriented towards "networked" and "niche" communications? What are these J-Schools, and the leaders who run them, doing to reconstitute and reorient the profession for the future?

These uncertainties form the backdrop for this study. I examine the evolving nature of professionalism in a world of open participation. I seek to introduce the concept of the *democratization of information* and describe the trend of the J-School professions moving away from a representative democracy orientation and towards a direct democracy orientation that harnesses the power of networked communication and niche information delivery. I also examine the role that entrepreneurship is playing in disrupting traditional professionalism models while also creating new ones.

In the study of journalism and mass communications, the polarity between professional control and open participation has become most prominently explored and detailed in recent studies about social networking, participatory culture, and citizen journalism.[59 60 61 62 63 64 65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76] A common theme found in this vein of literature is creative destruction, not only of the traditional technological apparatuses and business models associated with journalism and mass communications, but also of the professional identity that is bound and determined by these elements. As the transition from a representative democracy orientation of information towards a direct democracy orientation continues, there is a surplus of occupational and philosophical voids that must be filled.

As Singer and Ashman articulate: "If the content space is shared, is responsibility for the content itself also shared? Who decides what is credible, true, or even newsworthy in the first place? What happens to the prized journalistic norm of autonomy in this environment?"[77]

Along with challenges to professional identity, the business models of the old-guard are also being destroyed and replaced by more efficient models that are better suited for the current technology environment.[78] The oft-used example is that U.S. metropolitan newspapers are

suffering greatly as their readership, revenue, market value, workforce numbers and advertising revenues plummet downward.[79 80 81 82 83 84] This spiral of creative destruction leads to newspapers having less influence in framing and shaping public discourse.[85 86] This is important because most hard civic news originates from newspaper journalists, and without them out there at civic meetings digging deep for the truth, who will? Funding that once came from classified ad revenues has shifted (i.e., Craigslist.com), and ad dollars now come when a citizen searches for information (Google.com) of their own choosing, or when they click links recommended to them by someone they know (Facebook.com, Twitter.com), not necessarily when they view what an institution broadcasts to them. This is important because a lot of citizens don't like to learn about their civic environment, and would rather search for Brittany Spears or Michael Jackson gossip. Although the market is rewarded when people search for this infotainment, we all share the cost if and when nobody is paying attention to our civic responsibilities – a duty once upheld largely by whistle blowing journalists. Is information in this democratized environment, then, truly democratic? Perhaps an abundance of information and digital access doesn't equate to a more democratic society after all. Does this process only seem democratic now in the early phases of innovation, when in reality companies like Facebook are collecting unprecedented public data only to monopolize it and abuse it in the future? Tough philosophical questions like these add uncertainty to the crisis, and Academe's tendency to freeze and mull over the possibilities becomes a threat to creating solutions to these and other hypermodern challenges.

As information and media access is democratized, power is transferred from the select few to the salty masses, and with this power transfer comes new ideologies, new professional authority, and new paradigms. Instead of teaching outdated ideologies of professional authority, universities and J-School programs should be on the forefront of redefining what it means to be a professional in this new democratized media environment just as Harold Innis suggested in the 1950s. If nothing else, J-Schools should at least be encouraging students to figure this out for themselves, shouldn't they? It seems logical and rational, therefore, that if economics are at the root of many of the challenges that journalism faces, that perhaps we should look to the field of economics for insight into possible solutions. In economics, the field of endogenous growth theory posits that policies which embrace the ethics of openness, competition, change and innovation will promote growth and serve the entire community. As contemporary economist Peter Howitt describes:

Sustained economic growth is everywhere and always a process of continual transformation. The sort of economic progress that has been enjoyed by the richest nations since the Industrial Revolution would not have been possible if people had not undergone wrenching changes. Economies that cease to transform themselves are destined to fall off the path of economic growth.[87]

How are J-Schools going to grow and ensure that they don't fall off the path? What are the hurdles that they're facing in this regard? How can J-Schools take advantage of new opportunities to overcome the current crisis?

The renowned J-School scholar James Carey suggested in 1997 that:

The process of social and cultural change is ceaseless, particularly in the United States where little is solid and most things continuously melt into the air, and there are critical junctures where the social capsule breaks open. The work of Dewey and the sociologists who followed him, the symbolic interactionists, is particularly apt and useful in these moments of rupture.[88]

Therefore, my investigation seeks to put this J-School crisis in proper historical contxt while also taking Carey's lead and including the insight of one of the most influential American philosophers of the last century: John Dewey.

Education

In November of 1894, while at the newly opened University of Chicago, the great educational reformer John Dewey wrote a letter to his first wife Alice Chipman where he describes all of the essential elements in his philosophy of the school:

There is an image of a school growing up in my mind all the time; a school where some actual & literal constructive activity shall be the centre & source of the whole thing, & from which the work should be always growing out in two directions – one the social bearings of that constructive industry, the other the contact with nature which supplies it with its materials.[89]

To re-imagine this conceptualization for modern J-Schools, perhaps Dewey would suggest that students are working to serve the public interest with relevant information while also building revenue models and technology systems that sustain and extend journalism's purposes. In the case of a new J-School, perhaps those two directions would include studying network communications, citizen participation, and viral marketing; and the "contact with nature" would include business development, software development, computing, and even optics (physics). Dewey believed that knowledge is inseparably united with doing, and his philosophy for

education was based on the idea that knowledge is a by-product of activity, group experimentation, and relevance to society at large. His favorite metaphor for curriculum development was cooking: preparing a meal (as opposed to memorizing the recipe) is a goal-directed activity, it is a social activity, and it is an activity continuous with life outside of the education system.[90]

Intriguingly, John Dewey was not only an educational reformer, but also had very definitive ideas about journalism. For Dewey, communication was an ethical principle, and whatever inhibited free and open communication was a roadblock to circumvent. Dewey was hopeful and optimistic about media acting as the great facilitator of a unified global village.[91] Most importantly, in his 1927 book *The Public and its Problems*, he promotes the idea that the news should not just deliver information from past events, but that the news should be in a constant state of flux as the public continually adds value to the news by generating knowledge in a communal way, and that the audience would ideally be "users" who would do more with the news than simply consume it.[92] While his idea for journalism is actually very close to the reality of the news as it currently exists on the Internet, the education system that Dewey envisioned is not as close when it comes to the modern J-School and many of the practices that J-Schools still espouse.

Accreditation rules have promoted journalism curriculums that focus on a small core of conceptual coursework and an emphasis on reporting, writing, editing, and production that serve the standards of traditional newspaper industries.[93] However, this kind of curriculum doesn't successfully address the new realities confronting J-School students as they join the post-postmodern (i.e. hypermodernity or transmodernity or, in my words: neu-modernity) workforce. The skills and theories being taught in universities don't do enough to prepare students for several key aspects of the new media environment: network distribution, convergence, asynchronous communication, technological innovation, information abundance, and emerging business models that support the idea of free content.[94] Traditional track sequences are still rampant in J-Schools, whereby students must choose at the outset if they want to graduate for a profession in journalism, magazines, new media, public relations, advertising, mass media, marketing or film. The reality, however, is that almost none of these professional sequence tracks are represented outright in the real world anymore. A public relations professional of tomorrow will be expected to know all about new media, and a journalism professional will be expected to

know how to use integrated marketing techniques to cultivate an audience. Convergence has brought unprecedented overlap to the professional reality of the real world, and so why isn't that overlap translating to the sequences experienced by students in J-Schools?

As described by Becker et al. back in 1987, "The goal of journalism education, whether implicitly or explicitly stated, is socialization to the profession. In other words, the intent of the curriculum, including the internships and laboratory experiences and the areas of study outside journalism, is to produce an individual who can effectively and efficiently function in the occupations of journalism and mass communications."[95]

Therefore, teaching students how to function in the past does disservice to current and future professionals, and developing new models that are more tailored to the needs of current and future media industries is a critical responsibility of J-School educators and scholars. Especially when U.S. enrollment in J-Schools is so staggering, with over 200,000 enrolled students at over 460 units that grant some 44,000 bachelor's degrees and about 4,000 master's degrees each year. [96] The U.S. news industry draws around 60% of its workforce from graduates who have no degree in journalism or mass communications.[97] This should be an eye-opening statistic for J-School educators, students, and university presidents alike. If ever there were to be a statistical red flag to acknowledge, this is surely it.

Historically, the intersection of community and profit is where journalism and the communication arts typically operate. As Dewey described in 1916, "men live in a community in virtue of the things which they have in common; and communication is the way in which they come to posses things in common."[98] The role of J-School professions in the past was to build and maintain a commons by providing information via often monopolized communications channels. However, with the rise of the Internet and digital production, information is abundant and the commons is free and open for all to participate. It is now much easier for the public to create their own communities and share information through any number of digital communications channels. As evident in the events surrounding the Arab spring seem to indicate, these digital communities weld significant political, cultural, and economic power in our modern society.[99] To what ends is this power being exerted? Are we training students to fight this power or harness it? This too is a major philosophical challenge facing J-School educators.

Journalism scholars have long recognized a duty to community,[100][101] but this duty was founded in an old technological regime where information was scarce and communication

channels were more uni-directional. Educators are now struggling to evolve from an industry-centered model of education to a community-centered model, and they are attempting to solve the problem in a few ways, including emphasizing skills that are more appropriate for a networked communication environment instead of the old uni-directional environment,[102] and also developing a culture of problem-solving within journalism schools instead of focusing so much on socialization.[103] [104] These changes are mostly disjointed, and un-unified, and much experimentation is happening at J-Schools across the U.S which has garnered little scholarly study. How are J-Schools transforming their curricula in regards to skill-sets and sequences? What role is entrepreneurship playing in transforming the J-School from within?

Networked communication skills are a new imperative for any career in journalism or the communication arts. However, producing for a networked environment is fundamentally different from the uni-directional industrial production of the past. [105] [106] [107] [108] [109] Many universities are behind the curve when it comes to teaching students how to manage and study new media effectively, let alone create new services and paradigms that take advantage of the underlying technological innovations that have disrupted the information industries which they serve. Importantly, working within a networked environment requires a paradigm-shift not only in the creation of information products but also for processes and the ways in which educators assess and evaluate success in the networked environment. How are J-Schools transforming these processes?

Clearly, as Zelizer articulated in 2009, "it is imperative that educators, scholars and practitioners work together to productively create faculties that operate in community modes rather than as autonomous ones."[110]

Developing a culture of problem-solving within journalism schools would certainly serve the whole of society – not to mention the graduates, faculty members, and industries that they serve. Productive experimentation, creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship are at the very heart of societal, cultural, and economic transformations throughout history, and, in my view, these faculties should again be relied upon to deal with the creative destruction and technological disruption facing the information industries. In the present day, Stanford economist Paul Romer has another cooking reference in regards to innovation and economic growth which seems to build upon Dewey's ideas and bind them more completely to our current crisis:

Economic growth occurs whenever people take resources and rearrange them in ways that are more valuable. A useful metaphor for production in an economy comes from the kitchen. To create valuable final products, we mix inexpensive ingredients together according to a recipe. The cooking one can do is limited by the supply of ingredients, and most cooking in the economy produces undesirable side effects. If economic growth could be achieved only by doing more and more of the same kind of cooking, we would eventually run out of raw materials and suffer from unacceptable levels of pollution and nuisance. History teaches us, however, that economic growth springs from better recipes, not just from more cooking. New recipes generally produce fewer unpleasant side effects and generate more economic value per unit of raw material. Every generation has perceived the limits to growth that finite resources and undesirable side effects would pose if no new recipes or ideas were discovered. And every generation has underestimated the potential for finding new recipes and ideas. We consistently fail to grasp how many ideas remain to be discovered. Possibilities do not add up. They multiply.[111]

Faculty and scholars should not only look backwards in focused reflection upon what has come before, but should reach boldly into the future with a renewed spirit of collaboration, experimentation and entrepreneurship to define the boundaries of media professionalism in the new digital age. To some extent, this is already happening, and institutional entrepreneurship seems to be playing an increasingly important role in transforming J-Schools to meet the new realities of our networked-society.

Tina Seelig, neuroscientist and Executive Director for the highly lauded Stanford Technology Ventures Program, is always teaching budding entrepreneurial students that every problem is an opportunity for a creative solution. The bigger the problem, the bigger the opportunity, and the way one views any problem depends on one's personal attitude.[112]

Responding to the deep changes catalyzed by digital technologies requires looking at the opportunities instead of the challenges, and finding creative solutions with an entrepreneurial attitude. Doing so will allow educators to be at the forefront of constructing new communication practices that enrich learning, invigorate democratic communities, and enhance public life. How are J-School leaders cultivating entrepreneurial attitudes and building problem-solving capacities?

In a speech given on June 10, 2008, the president of The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation (the leading journalism non-profit), Alberto Ibarguen explained:

[T]here's little to be gained from lamenting how the media landscape has changed. A more productive approach is to embrace the change and make it yours, infusing it with your values. That's what we've chosen to do at Knight Foundation. We believe

technology can strengthen community information, and through that information, communities themselves. … Today, our work is focused on innovation and experimentation. The question we ask is not "How do we save newspapers?" The question is, "How do we save effective communication that communities need to manage their affairs in this democracy?

Conclusion

To recap, journalism is in crisis, and J-Schools face the threat of obsolescence. Creative destruction is re-defining socio-economic paradigms associated with information production and consumption, journalism scholars are facing massive philosophical and practical voids, and as a result, a great transformation is occurring whereby J-School leaders are attempting to innovate and create new professional identities for J-School graduates . Much experimentation is being done to promote non-traditional ways of teaching journalism, but J-Schools are not united in these efforts, and they are getting mixed results that are going largely unstudied.

These trends raise some questions of professional and scholarly concern: What are J-Schools hoping to accomplish by innovating? How are J-Schools transforming their curricula? To date there is no published scholarly research that has attempted a systematic investigation of U.S. J-Schools' current innovation efforts or the entrepreneurial activities that seem to be occurring there.

The purpose of this thesis, therefore, is three-fold: (a) to explore how J-Schools are negotiating the tension between professional control and the democratization of information; (b) to understand if and how that negotiation is being manifest through innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives within J-Schools; and (c) to discuss the implications of J-School innovation logic and what it means for future generations of J-School leadership and graduates.

In this thesis, I conduct a study of J-Schools' efforts to transform themselves in an age of creative destruction. Through a naturalistic enquiry that makes use of multiple qualitative methods – including interviews with J-School leaders from top universities and the innovators that are transforming education practices there along with textual analysis of J-School innovation initiatives, and secondary-data analysis – I seek to understand how J-Schools are transforming themselves, which innovations are working and which are not, the challenges and opportunities that creative destruction is presenting to educators, and how, if at all, this transformation is influencing J-Schools' efforts to change what it means to be a professional in the new media landscape. Put together, this course of research can be seen as a three-step progression: from the

macro-level view of J-School transformation (both in modern context and historical context), to meso-level considerations of J-School innovation initiatives, to a micro-level analysis of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* – the member schools, their actors, outcomes, and the logic behind them. Through it all, my ultimate aim is to understand how organizational and individual actors perceive and act upon journalism and mass communication education in relation to the democratization of information in an age of creative destruction. I hope to create a connection between J-School transformation, entrepreneurship, and the future of U.S. journalism.

Understanding how J-School innovators perceptually reconcile transformation in their field and incorporate new paradigms into their projects is important for what it might suggest about the future of education at J-Schools. The traditional professional logic of power and control of information has historically given journalists authority, distributional reach, and access through which to hold special interests accountable on society's behalf. However, as information has become democratized, the traditional press is increasingly considered an institution of special interest instead of a public interest,[113] yet an informed citizenry is crucial for a healthy democracy, and public information is at its best when it's well funded.

Professionalism as it's often taught in J-Schools includes a code of ethics, quality-control, and a truth-seeking (un-biased) imperative which is intended to serve freedom and democracy.[114] [115] As information is democratized and J-Schools innovate to prepare students for new professional realities, it is possible that the normative mission of journalism is getting pushed to the wayside. Are the innovations that J-Schools are experimenting with creating a kind of hybrid professionalism that both facilitates truth-seeking while also allowing for citizen participation via digital technologies? How are J-School innovators viewing the user participation issue, as an ideal or a threat to democracy? These questions underscore the importance of understanding where the field is headed based on the perceptions and intentions of its innovative educators at top US J-Schools.

J-Schools in the U.S. by themselves do not constitute a statistically representative sample of the field's innovators, but their educational mission gives them an agenda-setting influence that warrants further study. In order to give more rigor to my study, I will focus exclusively on how the leaders at the member schools of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* perceive and act upon current transformation efforts, and I hope to

contribute to the field's understanding of the profession's present innovations and likely future orientation toward longstanding democratic goals. In short, I intend to show how these innovators are attempting to shape both the curricula and ethical imperatives that are taught in J-Schools of the future.

To make such claims, however, I must establish the rationale for and significance of examining J-School leadership and innovation initiatives in Academe, and specifically, those associated with the Carnegie-Knight Initiative.

CHAPTER 2

CONTEXTUALIZING CURRENT TRANSFORMATION EFFORTS

To re-emphasize, the purpose of this study is to explore how J-Schools are negotiating the tension between professional control and citizen participation in journalism; to understand if and how that negotiation is being manifest through innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives within J-Schools; and to discuss the implications of J-School innovation logic and what it means for future generations of J-School leaders and graduates. Before proceeding with these analyses, we need a baseline understanding of J-School education, its history, and an appreciation for how it has evolved and transformed throughout its existence. This chapter sets forth a basic history of J-School education and its relationship with journalism and communication studies and also provides an overview of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*.

Insights from the History of Journalism Education

In the 1800's, journalism existed as a vocational trade to be learned through apprenticeship. Professional printers, therefore usually acted as the educators for the field by taking young learners under their wing and showing them the ins and outs of the trade. It's important to note that this system was created and sustained by entrepreneurs of the day, and many of those journalism entrepreneurs are responsible for efforts to professionalize journalism and establish journalism education in America. The story of J-School education parallels the story of the evolution of higher education, and involves such public figures as Benjamin Franklin, Robert E. Lee, Joseph Pulitzer, Charles Eliot, and Andrew Dickson.

Benjamin Franklin is one of the earliest journalism entrepreneurs and certainly the most well known. In the mid-1780s, Franklin set out to create a collective of several young entrepreneurial printers with the goal of promoting moral virtue and defining proper journalistic conduct.[116] Indeed, educating future journalists was on the mind of other journalistic entrepreneurs way before any formal education began in the United States. John Ward Fenno was an entrepreneur who published the first edition of his *Gazette of the United States* in 1789 to support Federalist Party positions, and the paper became the semi-official government newspaper

with contributions coming from the likes of John Adams and Alexander Hamilton. Fenno called the newspapers of his day the "most base, false, servile and venal publications that ever polluted society"[117] and wrote in the Gazette on March 4, 1799:

> I have not the vanity to recommend any preservative, but I cannot concede the propriety of requiring some qualifications and pledges from men on whom the nation depends for all the information and much of the instruction it receives. To well-regulated colleges we naturally look for a source whence such qualifications might in proper form be derived.[118]

Throughout much of the literature concerning the very early developments of J-School education in the U.S., there is evident a consistent drive towards notions of professional morality, refinement, maturity and respectability associated with the tenets of a classical liberal education which were based on the Romans' Seven Pillars of the Temple of Wisdom: the Trivium (grammar, rhetoric, and logic) and the Quadrivium (music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy).[119] Because of this, journalism education was lumped in with a classic college education of the day, and the idea of training students for the vocation of newspaper journalism had some supporters but no real implementations until after the Civil War. In this period, the newspaper had become an information institution in American society, and the classical curriculum at universities began to move towards more specialized practical curricula spurred by the Morrill Federal Land Grant Act of 1862. This federal act began the tradition of state-sponsored public institutions that are now prevalent in the U.S., and with it came the charge to not only educate the industrial classes, but also to train for pursuits in agriculture, mechanization, and public service. [120]

It was Robert E. Lee who first put forth a plan in 1869 to merge practical newsroom training with a college degree, saying, "The importance of a more practical course of instruction in our schools and colleges, which, while it may call forth the genius and energies of our people, will tend to develop the resources and promote the interest of the country."[121] Lee's program, however, ended after the newspaper industry took offense to the notion that young boys could enter the trade without first paying their dues on the job. Despite Lee's failed experiment, however, journalism courses began to spring up in the midwest and in 1872 the first journalism textbook, *Hints to Young Editors* (An Editor, 1872) was written anonymously by "An Editor" and the first course in newspaper printing was established at Kansas State College in 1873.[122] Interestingly, however, the first journalism curriculum on record was offered at a Detroit

journalism school for women which began in 1886 in response to Benjamin Franklin's call for vocational preparation.[123]

The editor of the Philadelphia Times, Eugene Camp, proposed to establish a journalism curriculum at the Wharton School of Business in 1888, and the program, titled "Courses in Journalism," has been referenced by scholars as the first definitely organized journalism curriculum in the U.S. The coursework at the Pennsylvania program consisted of practical coursework such as the news side of newspapers as well as advertising and business management, a combination that would soon be championed by President Charles Eliot of Harvard also.[124] By the end of the 19th century, journalism education had been established at 14 colleges throughout the U.S., and around this time is when the American university was taking a bigger role in the professionalization of society. In 1978, J.W. Carey described this movement as follows:

> The struggle which the American university led on behalf of the professions was a struggle between professional studies versus practical ones, academic studies versus the apprenticeship system, social-science knowledge versus common sense, ethical practitioners versus amoral hack.[125]

Joseph Pulitzer was an entrepreneurial newspaper man at the turn of the century who also acted as a driving force in efforts to professionalize the field of journalism by merging the trade with academics. In 1902, Pulitzer set forth his vision of the role of the J-School when he said, "My idea is to recognize that journalism is, or ought to be, one of the great and intellectual professions, to encourage, elevate and educate in a practical way the present, and still more, future members of that profession, exactly as if it were the profession of law or medicine."[126] Importantly, however, as noted by O'Dell and Dickson, Pulitzer insisted that J-School education should be focused on the editorial department and not on the business side which included elements such as newspaper manufacture, advertising, and circulation. In an article in *North American Review*, Pulitzer (1904) wrote that:

> If my wishes are to be considered, business instruction of any sort should not, would not, and must not form any part of the work of the college of journalism. Nothing, in fact, is more inconsistent and incompatible with my intentions or repugnant to my feelings than to include any of the business or commercial elements of a newspaper in what is to be taught in this department of Columbia College.[127]

Pulitzer's view differed greatly from President Charles Eliot of Harvard. Although both men were concerned with improving journalism and civic life by improving journalism

education, Eliot's view was more on par with the Wharton model, whereby the operation of the business office and advertising office and a close connection with the mechanical department were taught in addition to training for the editorial elements. This difference of opinion is interesting because the wealthy entrepreneur Pulitzer was more concerned with training writers, whereas the progressive educational reformer and scholar was more concerned with a well-rounded curriculum that intended to give budding students insight into becoming wealthy entrepreneurs in their own right. You'd think the roles would be reversed, but they weren't. According to Dickson and other journalism historians, Eliot's practical well-rounded approach to J-School education was not put into practice at Harvard, but at the School of Journalism at the University of Missouri – the first journalism school in the U.S. In "The Journalist's Creed" of 1908, Walter Williams, the first dean of the Missouri school, noted that the curriculum there would include newsroom concepts and techniques, but would also do more. The creed stated:

> I believe that advertising, news, and editorial columns should alike serve the best interests of the readers; that a single standard of helpful truth and cleanness would prevail for all; that the supreme test of good journalism is the measure of its public service.[128]

The "Journalist's Creed" is posted in bronze at the National Press Club in Washington, DC and is often evoked as the definitive code of ethics for journalists today. In it, Williams hints not only at the ultimate aims of J-School education, but also showcases how inseparable journalism education was from the traditional newspaper business of the times:

> I believe it is possible for this School to give dignity to the profession of journalism, to anticipate to some extent the difficulties that journalism must meet and to prepare its graduates to overcome them; to give prospective journalists a professional spirit and high ideals of service; to discover those with real talent for work in the profession, and to give the State better newspapers and a better citizenship.[129]

Practical professionalism aimed at creating a healthier democracy – this is the ethos indoctrinated at the beginning of J-School education in the U.S.

From those early beginnings, the rise of the J-School was pretty steady. In 1912, there were 32 colleges and universities that offered instruction in journalism; by 1929, there were 190 with 56 of them offering professional curricula. In 1932, there were 326, and in 1936 there were 894. After accrediation standards were first enacted in 1945, the field narrowed down to 47 "accredited" journalism schools in 1965, and that number would climb to 106 by 1997.[130] James Carey notes that, "The history of journalism education is part of the history of the transformation

of the American university into a professional school, and the transformation of American society into a domain of professional power and expertise."[131]

Despite the practical vocational foundations, J-School education also evolved to be included as a broad-based liberal education and social-science in American universities. Chief in this movement was Willard "Daddy" Bleyar who created the J-School at the University of Wisconsin in the early 1900s. O'Dell wrote of Bleyer's curriculum: "Emphasis is placed on preparation for the editorial department. Training is given in journalism only after the student has made preliminary preparation in literature and in the social sciences. The business interests of the newspaper are given attention, but are not as heavily emphasized as the editorial department."[132] In short, Bleyer's curriculum took J-School education in a different direction. He emphasized a broader background for students with the rationale that trained journalists needed to improve democracy, but should be given training in a wide array of knowledge disciplines. In short, it is Bleyer who espoused firstly espoused the need for interdisciplinary practices within the J-School. Importantly though, it seems as if Bleyer was a bit of a bureaucratic jockey. He realized that a J-School was more likely to survive in a research institution like Wisconsin if it was painted as a social science rather than a vocation, and so he also noted the need for research in journalism education.[133]

Bleyer's legacy is one of broadening J-School education while also keeping the practical foundations focused on societal problems of the 'now.' He wrote:

> Even the courses in journalism in so far as they undertake to train students to think straight, to write clearly and effectivey, and to apply what they have learned in other fields to the practice of journalism, are broadly cultural rather than narrowly technical… [T]hey aim to give greater significance to liberal arts studies, because they show students how to apply these studies to the events and problems of today.[134]

In 1929, the president of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism, Edward Marion Johnson, announced the need for professionalism in J-School education in addition to the vocational training that had already been established. Johnson said that if journalism were considered a profession, then J-Schools would teach students about "the nature of the services of the press, the measuring of these services, and the ascertainment of the methods by which they may be made to contribute to social progress."[135]

From healthy democracy to social progress, clearly journalism education and its professional ethic has grown most prominently out of the printing press and newspapers. As

we've seen, however, journalism education of the future will grow prominently from new paradigms such as interconnectedness, participatory constructs, digital information, and multi-platform distribution. As we will see, teaching students about the practical side of journalism and allowing for more interdisciplinary experiences are playing major roles in modern J-School transformation efforts. So it was, in the mid-2000s, as the industry began to wake up to the crisis at hand, the field got some help from a couple of non-profit organizations who realized the need to guide change at top US J-Schools.

The Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education

Andrew Carnegie, the entrepreneur and icon who founded the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1911, was also dedicated to the idea that our national democracy required an informed citizenry who have a deep understanding about issues ranging from world events to local events. Carnegie believed that true freedom in society depends on the unfettered flow of information. Carnegie famously said, "Conquerors cannot rule as conquerors a people who publish newspapers."[136] The rationale surrounding the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education is best explained by Vartan Gregorian, who is the acting president of the Carnegie Corporation of New York; he gave a speech about the initiative on the eve of a Carnegie-Knight Forum that took place in New York City on February 11, 2010:

> As Carnegie Corporation approaches its centennial year, we look back at our work and forward to our future with the knowledge that strengthening our democracy has long been – and will continue to be – at the heart of our mission with the goal of enriching and securing our national life and helping to fulfill our international obligations. Journalism and its practitioners have long served as the messengers of democracy, but the great upheavals in the field that have caused a sea change in the way that we interact with the news have raised significant and as yet largely unanswered questions about where we go from here. Advances in technology, for example, have forever altered the way people consume the news, upsetting the basic business model for delivering content. In order to successfully ride the wave of technology that has swept across the world, today's journalists not only have to master the traditional arts of the trade but must also become proficient in new skills in order to reach a 21st century audience. How, though, do we best train young men and women to successfully employ innovative technologies and become both nimble and effective journalism practitioners in a relentless – and endless – news cycle that now goes full tilt twenty-four-hours-a-day, seven-days-a-week? How does the business of news adapt to the new realities of online media and adopt its most successful practices while not falling victim to its worst? It was these questions and concerns that in 2005 led us to work in partnership with the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation to

launch the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education. Our shared goal was to develop a new cohort of well-educated journalists who are analytic thinkers and adept communicators, as at home in the virtual universe as they are in the day-to-day world of what has become a news cycle that knows no global borders and never sleeps.[137]

In June of 2002, the Carnegie Corporation of New York convened a gathering focused on revitalizing journalism education and a product of that gathering was an expression of interest by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation to form a partnership with the Carnegie Corporation to fund work on the issue. In 2004, at the request of Vartan Gregorian, McKinsey & Company conducted 40 one-on-one interviews with news leaders to produce a report entitled "Improving the Education of Tomorrow's Journalists." The goal of the task was, in president Gregorian's words, to "give a baseline foundation for America's leading deans to craft a curriculum that will advance what we all hold dear: a free and independent press that ensures an informed public and a vital democracy."[138] Geoffrey Sands who was the director of Global Media, Entertainment and Information Practice at McKinsey & Co., led a team that researched and prepared a report for Carnegie Corporation on improving the education of tomorrow's journalists. While the McKinsey team reported disagreement among news executives and journalists about the details of current trends in the field, there was broad agreement that the implications of those trends were profound and required new skills that were very different from what had been traditionally taught in journalism schools. Some news leaders responded with indifference when asked about the value of J schools, while others felt that J-Schools are the surest and most reliable path of entry into the profession. All participants, regardless of their attitude toward J-Schools, had suggestions for how schools can respond to today's challenges. While the report was largely complimentary of journalism education, the overall judgment was that a "crisis of confidence" had seized journalism, and that journalism schools were not providing an answer to that crisis. The report showcased the need to raise the degree of mastery that young journalists bring to the field and expressed the need for a new level of analytical skills that could be put to use in explaining and covering a complex world.[139] Hence, the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education was announced on May 26, 2005 by Dr. Gregorian and Hodding Carter III, the president and CEO of the Knight Foundation.

The initiative joined together with five, then nine and now twelve universities. The foundations contributed $6 million each for the first two years and, in 2008, agreed to fund an additional three years. The universities, and their presidents, made their own commitments of

institutional and financial support to more fully integrate their school of journalism into the intellectual life of the wider university.[140] Eric Newton is the senior adviser to the president at the Knight Foundation and the vice president of the journalism program there, and he says that the origin of the initiative played out because of a network that was already mostly in place.

> If journalism schools are to improve, university presidents must be involved. The first group of five universities in our initiative was chosen because Carnegie president Vartan Gregorian, himself a former university president, personally knew those presidents. Gregorian believed they would contribute financially. He was right. In every case, the presidents put money behind the idea that journalism education must either modernize or become irrelevant. And when the second group of seven universities was chosen, from schools with Knight Foundation funded chairs or centers, those presidents too contributed.[141]

The Initiative's agenda is comprised of three parts: the first was a *curriculum enrichment effort* to deepen the journalism curriculum at member schools. Carnegie's Susan King coordinated curriculum reform grants aimed at connecting journalism and mass communication schools with the rest of the university. King has since gone on to become the Journalism Dean at the University of North Carolina. The second major component was *News21*, an innovative news reporting project for students that builds on intensive content-based coursework, and this effort was primarily headed up by Knight. The third piece of the initiative was *The Carnegie-Knight Task Force*, which is the research arm of the Initiative. The Task Force has produced four reports on journalism and journalism education and coordinates group efforts by the deans to speak out on public policy issues affecting journalism and journalism education.[142]

The participating schools include: Arizona State University's Walter Cronkite School of Journalism and Mass Communication, Columbia University's Graduate School of Journalism, Harvard University's Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy, Northwestern University's Medill School of Journalism, Syracuse University's S.I. Newhouse School of Public Communications, University of California Berkeley's Graduate School of Journalism, University of Maryland's Philip Merrill College of Journalism, University of Missouri's Missouri School of Journalism, University of Nebraska-Lincoln's College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's School of

Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Southern California's Annenberg School for Communication, and the University of Texas at Austin's College of Communication.

The participating institutions were provided modest curriculum grants to develop innovative approaches to journalism education. Carnegie Corporation said:

> The goal . . . is to elevate journalism schools within university communities and to integrate them into the life of the campus so that they will attract and prepare the journalism leaders of tomorrow for a more complex and intellectually challenging industry. A key feature of the initiative is curriculum enrichment, which demands a reinvigoration of the journalism curriculum to offer students a deep and multilayered exploration of complex subjects like history, politics, classics and philosophy to undergird their journalistic skills.[143]

The Knight Foundation expressed the goal by saying:

> In today's changing world of news consumption, journalism schools should be exploring the technological, intellectual, artistic and literary possibilities of journalism to the fullest extent, and should be leading a constant expansion and improvement in the ability of the press to inform the public as fully, deeply and interestingly as it can about matters of the highest importance and complexity.[144]

Thus, it's evident that there was a concerted effort towards inspiring more interdisciplinary practices and this strategy seems to have been driven by the goal of attracting and training future leaders while also raising the status of the J-School at the Academy.

The Knight Foundation

The John S. and James L. Knight Foundation deserves further coverage because it is widely considered to be the leading nonprofit supporter of journalism in the United States, in addition to its substantial influence in press-related issues around the globe. Its history cannot be understood apart from journalism education, in that the foundation owes its very existence to a couple of newspaper entrepreneurs. The Knight brothers established the foundation in 1950, using $9,047 they transferred from a scholarship fund set up a decade earlier to honor their late father, Charles Landon Knight. In 1965 when the foundation received its first major infusion of assets: 185,000 shares of Knight Newspapers stock from the Knights' mother, Clara I. Knight. When those shares were later sold in 1972, the foundation's assets ballooned from $3 million to more than $24 million, kick-starting an expanded grant program to serve the "Knight communities" and also setting a course for investing in journalism. At that time, "journalism, especially the education of journalists, became a matter of more pronounced funding interest."[145]

In 1975—shortly after Knight Newspapers merged with Ridder Publications to become Knight-Ridder, the largest U.S. newspaper company at the time—Jack Knight, the majority shareholder, bequeathed the bulk of his estate to the foundation. He died in 1981, and by 1986 the foundation had received a full transfer of funds, which totaled more than $428 million—a 20-fold increase in assets. Suddenly, the Knight Foundation was the 21st-largest U.S. foundation based on asset size. By the time the foundation received Jim Knight's $200 million bequest in 1991, it was operating in 26 communities and deepening its commitment to journalism training. Today the foundation, now based in Miami, has some $2.5 billion in assets and has made grants totaling more than $1 billion since its founding. Since 2007, Knight has invested more than $100 million in new technologies and techniques, including in more than 200 community news and information experiments. As the nation's leading journalism funder, knight funding has supported training for more than 100,000 journalists worldwide, and had helped transform journalism education with endowments of more than $50 million. In seeking to broaden its influence, particularly during the past decade, the foundation has given special attention to *transformation* as a guiding light for their efforts. "Knight Foundation supports transformational ideas that promote quality journalism, advance media innovation, engage communities and foster the arts. We believe that democracy thrives when people and communities are informed and engaged."[146]

The Role of Nonprofit Foundations

To include the meta-view, the Carnegie-Knight Initiative must be considered in the context of nonprofit foundations and their role in promoting change in American societies and in cultures around the world. Structurally and operationally, nonprofit *foundations* are defined by several key characteristics: these include the fact that they are established with a specific purpose and retain a level of organizational consistency over time; they are private and institutionally separate from government; they have internal governance procedures and enjoy a meaningful sense of autonomy from government or corporate interests; and they do not return profits to their trustees or directors, with any surpluses re-invested in the basic mission of the foundation.[147] Well-endowed private foundations include the likes of the Gates, Ford, and Knight foundations, which are the largest and most influential players in a space. Although they have different goals, these and other nonprofit foundations generally are united in their intent to work

on public problems, particularly in addressing social problems that have proven intractable to government and market-based solutions. Despite this ideal, philanthropy is not without controversy in American public life, or abroad. For instance, consider that there is currently much bub-bub surrounding the American non-profits that allegedly ewre operating illegally in Egypt and using their influence to provoke the democratic uprisings surrounding 2011's Arab Spring. This kind of influence on historical events should not be taken lightly. Wealthy donors and major foundations tend to pursue individualistic aims[148], and yet they operate in the public sphere[149]. Foundations must have sufficient autonomy to "fulfill their mission of challenging, reforming, and renewing society"—and yet, because of their tax-exempt status, foundations must also be held accountable by society.[150] Research into the effectiveness of initiatives funded by foundations is needed to assess the worthiness of their causes, and to keep in check their powerful policy-making influence, even as benevolent as it may seem at first glance. I mention this because the focus of my thesis is limited to J-Schools which received substantial grant funding (and assumedly marching orders) from the Carnegie and Knight foundations, and this fact deserves special consideration in regards to future research related to this study.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS OVERVIEW

This chapter proceeds to describe this study's research methodology and includes discussions with regard to the following: (a) rationale for qualitative methodology, (b) justification for the case-study and interview method, (c) overview of the research design, (d) methods for data collection and analysis, and (e) ethical considerations.

Qualitative is as Qualitative Does

Assessing the perceptions and practices of J-School educators and leaders requires an appropriate set of methods. Hard evidence of innovation efforts and entrepreneurial activities at different J-Schools is difficult to pin down because J-Schools and their initiatives are abstract, experimental, and in constant evolution – and therefore can't reliably be measured through typical variable-analytic methods that are so often called upon in the social sciences. I admit that such methods should be used when they can help to explain some facet of the challenges being faced by educational practitioners. My primary methodology is qualitative in nature however, and the result is a mixed-methods case study approach that includes elements of a few different veins of qualitative research tradition.

In some ways, at the edges of my method of inquiry is the model of organizational communication, which grew out of the 1980s realization that organizations have unique cultures. The study of topics such as performative dimensions of organizational roles and the "nonrational practices underlying the gleaming face of the corporate machine"[151] are certainly at the heart of my thesis. Indeed, "qualitative methods are valued as a means for creating fine-grained and preservationistic accounts of organizational symbol use that contributed greatly to a variety of topics including leadership, ethics, implementation of new technologies, and organizational innovation."[152]

It is also noted that my research is a practical way to help organizational members "identify and resolve pressing problems, reflect on the premises that guide their sensemaking, and develop cultures that successfully balance the tension between individual and organizational goals."[153]

To be forthright, it is most certainly my goal that this research project contribute to solving the day's pressing problems, especially in regards to journalism providing for a healthy democracy. Admitedly, however, my main interest is entrepreneurship, and this research is mainly the result of me being a scholastic product of journalism education. I've been a student at the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communications at the University of Georgia through both my undergraduate and graduate experience. I've never been a fan of restricting social science research to the quantitative domain. As Denzin and Lincoln (2000) note:

> Qualitative research is the critical site where theory, method, praxis, action, and policy all come together. Qualitative researchers can isolate target populations, show the immediate effects of certain programs on such groups, and isolate the constraints that operate against policy changes in such settings. Action-oriented and clinically oriented qualitative researchers can also create spaces for those who are studied (the other) to speak.[154]

My methods are designed to not only be practical, but also critical. Critical theory involves a morally and ethically heightened and politically reflective study into the relationships between knowledge, power, and discourse that are "produced in contexts of historical and cultural struggle."[155] I believe that my research project fits into this vein also, and the previous chapters most likely indicate to the reader my interest in critical cultural studies.

This thesis poses four sets of research questions, and in this chapter I will describe how I worked to address each: (1) Based on interviews with seven leaders from the member schools of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*, along with textual analysis, how has the Carnegie-Knight Initiative served as an impetus for innovation in journalism education; (2) Based upon the interviews and the textual analysis of J-School innovation initiatives, what are the distinguishing features of the various projects and what are the distinguishing characteristics of the actors who are leading those initiatives; (3) Based upon the qualitative interviews, how do J-School leaders perceive the negotiation between professional control and open participation in journalism practice? (4) Based upon the qualitative interviews,

how do J-School leaders perceive entrepreneurship as it relates to the future of journalism, and what role is it playing in transformation efforts?

Many scholars point to qualitative research as the key mode for seeking *validity* (as opposed to *reliability* which comes more from quantitative approaches). However, some scholars prefer to use different terminology such as the pursuit of "legitimation" and "credibility" as was the trend with scholars such Newman & Benz in the late 1990s.[156] The main difference that I see between quantitative methodologies versus qualitative methodology has to do with meaning. Qualitative research is usually conducted by leaders in the field who are interested primarily in focusing on matters of importance, whereas quantitative research is usually done by managers in the field who are concerned mainly in producing a high output of scholarly work by merely increasing the reliability of findings surrounding specific topic areas and preexisting theories. I see both as viable within the modern Academy.

Rationale for the Case Study Method

Robert Stake is one of the leading case-study scholars and notes that, "Case study is not a methodological choice but a choice of what is to be studied."[157] Case studies involve the investigation of a bounded series of events occurring between individuals and organizations in order to gain a deep understanding of the case itself and its relationship within a broader context.[158] Yin (2008) describes the case study as being most important when the boundaries between the phenomenon being studied and its context are not clearly evident.[159] For this study, the boundaries between J-School transformation efforts and the larger context(s) of digitization, convergence, creative destruction, innovation and entrepreneurship, and the de-professionalism crisis currently being faced throughout the journalism industry makes for a whole lot of grey areas to be investigated.

I firmly believe that it is precisely these grey areas that must be studied. Moreover, quantitative analysis would miss many of the nuances of what is happening in J-Schools across the country. Although an ethnographic account of mine or others' experiences at one or a few J-Schools might provide context in limited cases, I would miss the interplay that is happening on a broader scale; not only among J-Schools and their innovative actors, but also on a meta-policy level. In short, case studies deal with depth and context. For this thesis, I have sought to explore J-School rhetoric and activities in relation to innovation and entrepreneurship, while studying this material with an eye toward the context of the process of creative destruction being faced in

journalism and the media professions in a broad sense. It is my intent to build an exemplar case upon which the disciplinary paradigm of entrepreneurship within J-School education, as well as the study of J-School actors negotiating between professional tradition and innovative change within Academia, can be founded and solidified for future study. I understand that "the purpose of a case report is not to represent the world, but to represent the case"[160] – which is to say, I am seeking to represent the world of top J-Schools which are participants in the Carnegie-Knight Initiative and which are undergoing transformation efforts in the United States circa 2010-2012, not pretending to speak for the entire sphere of journalism or journalism education. Nonetheless, my hope with this study is to show that entrepreneurial initiatives and innovative change are examples of the influence that future-oriented leaders can have on organizations, and that organizations can have on the field as a whole as these actors and organizations attempt to change the professional milieu in which they operate.

Overview of the Research Design

The overarching "sample" was limited to accredited J-Schools in the U.S.; with an even further limited interest in J-Schools' transformation efforts by way of innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives funded and inspired by the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*; and, more particularly, a subsidiary focus on a chosen set of actors who are leading those initiatives.

In-Depth Interviews

As a qualitative method, depth interviews are a common tool for exploring how people make sense of their world, illuminating the rhetorical construction of their experience and perspective.[161] In journalism research, scholars in recent years have used depth interviews to understand how journalists think about issues such as occupational authority[162], professional identity[163], and citizen participation.[164] In this research, because my participants are geographically dispersed, Skype is the preferred means of communication. Although I have not conducted depth interviews meant to be used for a published scholarly product, I do bring with me over a decade of experience in journalism and documentary film production whereby I interviewed hundreds of subjects.

Human Subjects and Safety

I received approval from the Institutional Review Board at the University of Georgia before proceeding with any interpersonal elements of this research (for evidence of IRB

materials, see Appendix). All recipients were notified of the nature of this research and were given an opportunity to opt-out at any point. I conducted the interviews in a public manner, meaning that identifying information is included as part of the research report and all subjects agreed to allow me to conduct the interview "on the record."

Textual Analysis

In addition to interviews, I have also closely studied J-School transformation texts (which include everything from blog posts to policy speeches to newspaper articles). My intention was to look both for manifest and latent themes, subtle phrases, and key words that can call up larger meanings in relation to issues of professional control, open participation, and the evolution of journalism practice in regards to innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives at J-Schools.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS OF THE CASE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to explore how J-Schools are negotiating the tension between professional control and the democratization of information; to understand if and how that negotiation is being manifest through innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives within J-Schools; and to discuss the implications of J-School innovation logic and what it means for future generations of J-School leadership and graduates. In this chapter, I take up this purpose – an examination of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education*, the member schools, their actors, outcomes, and the logic behind them. I assess how the initiative has addressed the democratization of information and the dichotomy between professional control and citizen participation, and how the member schools have manifested unique and innovative solutions to transform their respective J-School to meet the demands of future professionals working in the journalism and mass communication fields. I seek to discover the nuances of the innovation efforts going on at leading J-Schools, and what similarities and differences exist among those leading schools.

The importance of this chapter's analysis is rooted in the prominence of the foundations supporting the initiative – the Carnegie Corporation and the Knight Foundation. The Knight Foundation is widely considered as the most influential journalism-oriented nonprofit organization, and that distinction has become particularly apparent in the past decade, as it has become the primary funder of nonprofit news startups and other major journalism initiatives. [165] [166] [167] [168] [169] It's important to understand how the leaders and participants of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative *talk* about innovation in journalism education, and understand how these leaders *translate their articulation* into actions via innovation programs that require organizational change at their respective institutions. Altogether, how do they seek to *shape journalism's professional orientation* for the future? For sure it matters for what it could suggest about the role of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative in the boundary work of journalism education and thus,

journalism, based on its cultural rhetoric and structural activities – the two components to jurisdictional claims within the system of professions.[170]

Thus, this chapter addresses the following interrelated research questions:

RQ1. How has the Carnegie-Knight Initiative helped to transform journalism education?

RQ2a. What are the distinguishing features of J-School innovation initiatives associated with the Carnegie-Knight Initiative?

RQ2b. What are the distinguishing characteristics of the change agents who are leading innovation initiatives at the member schools?

RQ3. In their perceptions and practices, how do J-School leaders negotiate the tension between professional control and open participation brought on by digital convergence and the democratization of information?

RQ4. What role is entrepreneurship playing in transformation efforts, and how do J-School leaders perceive entrepreneurship as it relates to the future of journalism?

Methods

To understand how the Carnegie-Knight Initiative has defined journalism and acted in relation to it, I needed grounding in the initiative's rhetoric and activities as a whole. Over the course of sixteen months (May 2010 to September 2011), I collected and concurrently analyzed a body of material that was produced by or about the Carnegie-Knight Initiative. The resulting collection included foundation reports, videos, blog posts, news articles, interviews, podcasts, scholarly publications, case studies, press releases, and speeches. In total the materials came from a wide variety of sources that were publicly available across the Internet. The materials were found through relevant keyword searches and my own immersion in the Carnegie-Knight's Web-based presence. Among the most important of these texts were speeches, policy statements, and reports released by the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy which is a Harvard University research center dedicated to exploring and illuminating the intersection of press, politics and public policy in theory and practice, and is the centerpiece of the *Carnegie-Knight Task Force*, which is the research arm of the initiative.

Additionally, these texts were supplemented with a series of formal in-depth interviews conducted with the deans of the member schools of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative, including Dean Gary Kebbel at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln (he was also former journalism program director and head of the Knight News Challenge at the Knight Foundation); Dean Bill Grueskin at the Columbia Journalism School; Dean Roderick P. Hart at the University of Texas-Austin; Dean Henry Henry at the University of California-Berkley; Dean John Lavine at Northwestern University; Dean Geneva Overholser at the University of Southern California; Penny Abernathy at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill; and Dean Nicholas Lemann at the Columbia Journalism School. The purpose of the interviews was to conduct a focused investigation of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative's member school leaders to explore their perceptions and practices, and to assess how such reflect the logics of journalism innovation articulated by the Carnegie-Knight Initiative.

The interviews analyzed here were conducted by phone (via Skype software) between January and April of 2011. I contacted all twelve of the member schools to request interviews with their leaders, and of these, I heard back from eight of the member schools, and eventually conducted interviews with seven of the eight contacted. Each was contacted with an e-mail invitation asking them to take part in an interview and as needed, follow-up emails were sent. The interviews ranged in length from twenty-five minutes to more than an hour, with the average length being about thirty-five minutes.

Because of the high-profile nature of being a Dean at a top Journalism school in the US, I was able to research each interviewee pretty thoroughly prior to the interview, and I was prepared with knowledge of their professional background, and also some of the innovation initiatives taking place at their respective school.

Questions were prepared in advance (see interview guide in appendix), however the interviews were conducted in a loosely structured manner to allow for exploration and open-ended responses. From a meta-view, the Deans were typically asked to describe their relationship with the Carnegie-Knight Initiative; how they were implementing innovation and change at their school; why they were doing what they were doing; how they went about making the changes; what role entrepreneurship was playing at their school; and how they were negotiating the tension between professional control and the democratization of information as they implemented innovative changes at their school. Each interview was recorded and transcribed,

and the resulting texts (roughly 120 pages' worth of interview data) were analyzed using the Atlas.ti qualitative data analysis software. I textually analyzed this broad sweep of evidence, looking for the emergence of key themes and patterns that express the innovation efforts taking place and the implications these efforts may have for future journalism graduates. The key phrases in regards to professional control versus the democratization of information or entrepreneurial journalism could not be operationalized and measured in any systematic fashion; but I was able to read for textual cues that could speak to these themes. From this close reading, I found several interlocking themes that will be explained in this chapter.

Overview of the Findings

The purpose of these interviews was to assess the impact that the Carnegie-Knight Initiative was having at member schools in regards to innovative change, and to gain insight into the underlying processes and motivations related to innovative change. A brief observation should be made in this regard. It's interesting to compare the interview results with the stated goals of the initiative as expressed by Carnegie-Knight officials in retrospect (i.e. – in 2010 or later). Discussing the impact and outcomes of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education, Knight program manager Eric Newton has said as recently as 2011:

> What we hoped the Carnegie-Knight Initiative would offer is a high-visibility example of what happens when university presidents, deans, faculty and students all are interested in reform. We wanted to show what the turning point in journalism education looks like… The big lesson of the initiative: Great journalism schools can teach substantive "knowledge journalism" and at the same time practice innovative real-world digital newsgathering. Applied nationally, these practices could unlock the potential of more than 200,000 journalism and mass communication students to help underserved communities.[171]

Newton said in a pre-conference address to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC) in 2010 titled "Journalism Schools as News Providers: Challenges and Opportunities," that there are four "transformational trends" in journalism education right now: (1) connecting with the whole university; (2) innovating content and technology; (3) teaching open, collaborative models; and (4) providing digital news in new, engaging ways.[172]

After conducting and analyzing the interviews, I see definite parallels between the initiative's outcomes as reported by both Carnegie-Knight officials and by J-School leadership at

member schools. However, my interviews with J-School leaders brought forth definitive deviation and expansion from the statements made by Carnegie-Knight officials, and I acknowledge that not all of the leaders' perceptions were unanimous – indeed, I see this as a natural tendency of innovation efforts as being new and experiential in approach as opposed to cookie-cutter and unified across institutions. It's important to note that as I describe and analyze the Deans' perceptions, I will focus on outlining general themes and trends that emerged from my analysis of the interview data regardless of the stated goals of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative or its officials. It was obvious that some Deans were more versed in innovation efforts than others, and likewise some were more excited to talk about change and innovation whereas others were more hesitant to do so, and therefore some Deans were unable to articulate their normative bases as thoroughly as others. Nevertheless, the findings that I outline below represent my best effort to aggregate, analyze and synthesize how the leaders at top J-Schools in the US, as a collective body, frame their perceptions and practices. Keeping this in mind, my major discoveries can be summarized as follows:

Finding 1: Interdisciplinary practices represent the leading innovation effort at top US J-Schools, and these practices are experimental and diverse in approach.

Finding 2: Teaching new digital skill sets (and technological tools) represents a top challenge that top J-Schools are addressing.

Finding 3: Entrepreneurial journalism is emerging as a new professional ethic and entrepreneurial competencies represent a future requirement for top J-School graduates.

Finding 4: The participatory nature of interactive tools is generally seen as a better way to engage communities and serve democracy, but this rise in interactivity is generally seen as an inevitable trend that must coexist with the traditional journalistic norm of gatekeeping.

Finding 5: The organizational change process and the successful implementation of innovative approaches at top J-Schools involve strong feedback loops with top university leaders, alumni and students.

Destroying Silos and Building Bridges: J-School as the Academy's Hub of Innovation
Finding 1: Interdisciplinary practices represent the leading innovation effort at top US J-Schools, and these practices are experimental and diverse in approach.

This study began on the premise that creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship are playing major roles in regards to transforming journalism education, but that J-Schools are resistant to change because of outdated professional ideologies and sequences, siloes that define and confine faculty specialization, and an organizational environment comprised mostly of bureaucratic inertia instead of entrepreneurialism. However, in the minds of leaders from some of America's leading J-Schools interviewed here, this inability to forge innovative change because of siloed faculty and professional "tracks" was downplayed mainly because leaders had already recognized this challenge, and most had already succeeded in destroying the silo and track system at their respective J-School. Moreover, not only are these leading programs tearing down silos, but they're also building bridges across their campus to other disciplines and turning the J-School into a trans-disciplinary hub -- a port-of-call whereby journalism students become the ambassadors of the university, seeking to forge relationships with faculty and students from other departments such as political science, computer science, and business. When articulating their construction of the challenges presented by the traditional track system (whereby students must choose to specialize in magazine journalism versus broadcast journalism, for instance) Deans spoke about more modern approaches, but some also used language indicative of creative destruction. As Dean Kebbel from Nebraska described it:

> We are, every year, *tearing down certain walls* related to the track system. It still exists, but it's really been modernized. Right now, we have two tracks -- journalism and advertising and public relations. *We are tearing down the walls* between those two so that we're moving slightly towards having just mass communication but we're not there yet….any good reporter should want to take an advertising and public relations class. I know that every good public relations writer wants to take a journalism class and I think every good advertiser should want to take a journalism class. It's recognizing those realities. The students who want to be good in their particular concentrations realize the skills they need are all over the place and they should go all over the place to grab those skills.

At Columbia where they only teach journalism to graduate students, Dean Lemann describes the problem with traditional track systems when he said, "I believe that journalism is different from public relations, advertising and marketing because it's a truth-seeking activity rather than a persuasive activity."

At Northwestern, the destruction of silos seemed to be initiated by Dean Lavine himself, and the changes in the system there have been implemented quite rapidly:

Pre '06, you'd come into Medill saying, "I'm majoring in television, and you're majoring in magazine, and somebody else is majoring in newspaper." I said to the students at the time "You don't want to work for a television station, or a magazine, or newspaper that does only that." I mean, you know pick your, pick whatever it is. "You don't want to work for the 'New York Times' if it only comes out on dead trees." I'm a great fan of the Times. But, of course, you want to work for it if it has a website, a mobile policy, a digital policy. These days if it's on an iPad, etcetera. The lines between the traditional media were blurring then and that's part of what I recognized. And we said, "*We're doing away with that." Those silos just got in the way people see the world.*

Not every J-School Dean that I interviewed had destroyed the track-system, but even those who hadn't seemed to be at the beginning phase of such a process, or had done away with that system long ago, and all of them related the change process within the curricula to the Carnegie-Knight Initiative in important ways. At the University of Texas, Dean Hart described the situation as follows:

> The journalism school is going through a complete *reevaluation* of their curriculum. In terms of Carnegie-Knight this was an attempt to try out different kinds of courses, primarily ones that were *highly interdisciplinary* in nature. I think the initiative has had an indirect and maybe at some points direct effect on the *wholesale reevaluation* and *reformatting* of the graduate program in journalism and the curriculum in journalism.

Whereas the destruction of traditional curriculum elements were varied, the enhancement of curriculum (the creation elements) was unanimous and highly experimental. Every single Dean that I interviewed described interdisciplinary change in regards to curriculum reform at their institution. They talked about how the Carnegie-Knight Initiative helped them "teach the disciplines of history, political science, and economics in a field as complex and dynamic as Africa" (Henry) and supported "cross-school, interdisciplinary classes, in, among others, national and homeland security and civil liberties" (Lavine). The interdisciplinary component was not only limited to one-off classes, but also included more substantial changes such as new degree programs. At the University of Texas, for instance, Dean Hart describes some of the new additions:

> We have a number of joint programs, mostly at the MA level, we have a joint program with the Business School, the School of Public Affairs. We have a variety of programs with the College of Liberal Arts within the different programs. Our college has a lot of strength in the area of political communications. We have some strength in Health Communication. We have strength in International Communication and again, those go across the department. Those are Interdisciplinary within the college and then, as I say, we have these little formal programs. We're developing a program now in the Computer Science Department in the area of gaming. As we're finding more and more people

interested in teaming up with us, because frankly of the new media, and it's affecting everybody else outside of this college as well.

At the University of Southern California, Director of Journalism Geneva Overholser downplayed the interdisciplinary nature of their program, but she, like Dean Lavine at Northwestern, seemed to be the one who initiated much of the change:

> I decided I wanted to bring students together in interdisciplinary ways to be innovative. USC is a pretty interdisciplinary place. LA is pretty welcoming of creativity. I didn't think I would find barriers, exactly. It's just, always when you're starting out something new, you have to figure out some... You always find new challenges, new problems to solve like how to figure out which students at the various schools would be the likeliest to collaborate fruitfully, would it be grad students or undergrads, that kind of thing.

Overholser described USC's curriculum as being a, "*convergence curriculum* so that every student coming in, either undergraduate or graduate, takes courses in video and audio and text." She expands on this by relating the trans-disciplinary approach to learning outcomes:

> I believe firmly in giving every student here, whether they're in public relations or broadcast or online or text... Or, we're developing a documentary program also. We have an audio emphasis. I believe that each of these people ought to be exposed to multidisciplinary thinking and activities. This is sort of like you take courses outside of the school. Obviously, you won't do that every time, or every journalism school does that. But you could call that an interdisciplinary experience, right? Learning is heightened when you're exposed to different ways of thinking. That's kind of the same philosophy.

Likewise, versatility and a convergence philosophy was espoused by Dean Henry at the University of California-Berkley. However, he also describes how a convergence curriculum can co-exist with a paradigm of specialization when he said:

> When students get here they are *not required to take a particular track*. We encourage them to, by the time they finish their two years of studies to be as *versatile* as possible in all areas of journalistic practice, which includes reporting and writing for print but also visual, documentary, radio, all other disciplines as well. The only thing we require is the students produce a Master's Project, which is the finest example of their work in a chosen medium and we have people who specialize in multimedia for their Master's Projects, people who specialize in photography, magazine writing, newspaper writing, photography, television, radio, all the disciplines.

Dean Grueskin at Columbia took a more moderate approach to curriculum change by also arguing in favor of specialization. Although interdisciplinary aspects are still emphasized in his view of curriculum enrichment, he downplayed the destruction of traditional tracks by focusing

on the creational aspects when he said:

> There's so much interdisciplinary stuff that goes on between the tracks. We have the video classes for students who are in print. We have digital classes for students who aren't in digital. All the students here come about a month before school starts to do a pretty intense digital boot camp, and the photo, audio, Final Cut Pro editing tools. But we also believe that there are certain skills that are heavily geared towards the medium that you realize that you get a lot better at it. If you want to be a documentarian, simply learning how to use a Flip video camera, and uploading the video to your computer and then using iMovie to edit it, it's just not going to get you were you need to be. There's just a polish to doing documentaries, to writing a long form magazine article, to writing books. We have a very successful book writing class. Those things are very specific, and the truth is our students don't have enough time to cram it all in, but also, having some specialization is a very helpful and important thing.

Thus, the Deans all expressed a view of journalism education that is more focused on interdisciplinary training, and this training included not only specialized training within the journalism profession such as digital versus print versus documentary, but also in a broader sense, it included training in other disciplines entirely – disciplines that have typically not been included in communications education in any way. Although the exact nature of the interdisciplinary curriculum enrichment was quite diverse in format and approach, it was present in some form at all of the schools. The approach chosen by each school seemed to come from a combination of unique campus resources and also the ideas promoted by top leaders at the school. Moreover, all of the Deans made a direct connection between this interdisciplinary curriculum strategy and the Carnegie-Knight Initiative. When describing the outcomes that were sparked by the Initiative and the funds that it provided to member schools, Deans said things like "the outcomes are rich" (Henry) and how the Initiative allowed for developing "richer relationships" (Overhoulser) with faculty from other departments. Another key outcome described by many of the Deans was the rise in status of the J-School within the university, and this rise in status paralleled the integration aspects that sprang from the interdisciplinary curriculum enrichments. Indeed, Dean Kebbel said the intended purpose of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative was serving to:

> Strengthen, improve, modernize, and innovate journalism curricula across the leading journalism colleges in the United States. Improve the opinion or status of the colleges of journalism and mass communication within each of their university structures. Further integrate the benefits of being at a university and having so many faculty with great specialties able to teach journalism students a variety of topics about which they could

use in the future. You've got various goals of strengthening and improving the curriculum, improving the status of the Colleges of Journalism and Mass Communication on their campuses, and taking much greater advantage of the specialties, expertise and knowledge on the campus and bringing it into the journalism classroom.

At Cal-Berkley, Dean Henry echoed this sentiment but also went further to emphatically describe the impact that the Initiative has had on both his program and on him personally:

> The journalism school has a much greater stature on campus as a result of the Carnegie initiative, in that, because of it other disciplines recognize journalism and the roles it plays in the Academy. They want to work with us, as a result of the collaboration we've undergone. I believe that *the Carnegie-Knight initiative has been one of the most innovative, and generous, and enriching experiences of my time in 20 years in education.* I would like the ideals and values it brought to bear in our program and other around the country to be sustained. One thing that will not change about it, whether the funding continues or not, some things will change and will continue as a result of what Carnegie and Knight brought to our program. We see, for instance, our collaborations with physicists, with historians, with political scientists, with economists as continuing to better the education of journalists about the complexities of this world and the subjects they will be asked to investigate when they finish their training.

This last quote seems to sum up the most important finding of this thesis. What Carnegie-Knight provided to programs was, most importantly, a financial incentive to initiate innovative curriculum changes that emphasized interdisciplinary training, and which, as a result of this, raised the status of the J-School from a silo of tradition to an innovative melting pot. As Dean Kebbel so eloquently stated:

> I think it's fair to say that up until five years ago, and clearly up until ten years ago, colleges of journalism and mass communication were not the leaders of innovation or change in the mass media industry. In fact, *they were probably the cabooses and they should have been the engines.* The Carnegie-Knight Initiative has helped colleges of journalism realize that they must be the engines, number one. Number two, by giving such a focus to curricula, the project itself has awoken all of the other colleges and universities across the country about the fact that they do need to focus on if they have revised or modernized their curriculum the past five, ten, fifteen years. Is the curriculum recognizing the tremendous changes, upheavals and disruptions occurring in the industry that they're teaching about? Mass media, advertising, public relations, journalism, television, you name it, is an industry that's going through so much upheaval and is finding new ways to do things with new technologies and new processes.

The results of this transformational effort have proven to have profound impacts on the member schools, their graduates, and also on the leaders and faculty members who implement organizational changes there. The Carnegie-Knight Initiative seems to have helped to awaken J-

Schools and remind them of their potential as relevant leaders of the academy and society at large.

News for the 21ˢᵗ Century

Finding 2: Teaching new digital skill sets (and technological tools) represents a top challenge that top J-Schools are addressing.

A major component of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative is called *News21,* which is described as, "a key element of the initiative, funded with $7.5 million by the Knight Foundation since 2005. The program provides fellowships to top journalism students to perform investigative reporting projects overseen by carefully selected, professionally accomplished university professors. The student reports are distributed nationally through both traditional and new media."[173] In researching the creation of News21, the project seems to have outlined three specific goals in grant documents: to result in high-profile jobs for graduates, place important new stories in the national news and, to show that J-Schools have a role to play in defining and innovating the future of news. Almost all of the J-School leaders that I interviewed commented on the impact of News21 at their institution, and more specifically, the impact that digital technology was having on their transformation efforts. Interestingly, interviewees were most likely to mention the word "innovation" when speaking about News21, and they also spoke about student outcomes most readily when discussing News21. In short, it is with this piece of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative that there was the most evident connection between innovation and creating better outcomes for graduates in the job market. In this sense, News21 can be seen as the most practical element of the initiative, and in this way it becomes evident that the most fundamental element of innovative change at top J-Schools is in regards to teaching and learning about new digital tool sets and platforms are being used in the marketplace, and also empowering students to create the future of 21ˢᵗ century journalism practice. For instance, Dean Henry from Cal-Berkley describes the program's impact with the following:

> News21 has been a really fantastic experience for the students and faculty who have taken part. We've had students who've traveled reporting on the American defense effort overseas. We've had students travel the country reporting religion. There's a great *emphasis on innovation* in News21, and there have been a number of terrific sites developed out of News21 through our program. This year, we've decided to try to focus on food and sustainable agriculture. It's an investigative project building on our reputation and our resources in that field and headed by Michael Collins of our faculty.

The idea is to develop a sustainable digital site dedicated to food and agriculture to serve, not just the Bay area, but the national community. Right now, the students are at work *developing new platforms* to explain FDA processes in food safety. We're also doing independent fundraising because we believe this site has a great deal of promise. The News21's charge is to do original reporting to *create big bang*, and to develop *new innovative ways* of delivering news and information. That's been an important part of our school ever since News21 has been launched and we hope it continues. What News21 and other *technically focused aspects of the initiative* have given us, have allowed us to keep Berkeley at the forefront of the *digital media transformation*. Our students when they finish, thanks to the training they received through Knight funded effort, *they are leading. Our students are leading "The New York Times'" digital media operation now; our graduates are, as well as "The Wall Street Journal."*

Dean Lavine from Northwestern describes News21 in a similar fashion:

Our students run *innovation projects*. Because our students run big projects taking and *creating new media ventures*, taking professional media ventures and redoing them for the digital age or for the 21st century. We are doing projects like News21 and have for years regularly. News21 is among the biggest. It was focused and it allows us to share what we do with other Carnegie-Knight schools, see what they do, show it comparatively. News 21 and Carnegie-Knight Initiative classes are part of a sweeping change at Medill. We've leveraged it. We take what we got as part of News 21 and use it to leverage what we know into the curriculum. We take what we're changing in the curriculum and leverage it into making News21 better.

What's interesting about these kinds of examples is that they speak to this notion of leadership and student empowerment. Indeed, it is with these technology-driven elements of transformational change efforts that the interviewees put the students at the center of the effort through their phrasing and language choice. In these instances, the description of change efforts were presented not so much as an effort on their (the faculty's) part to change the system, but moreso, an effort to empower the students to define and lead that change themselves. Therefore, it's important to note that the transformational change efforts that empower students the most and make use of cutting edge technology are the same ones that reportedly resulted in the best professional outcomes for the students, including this idea of *high placement* upon graduation. Not only this, but the notion of putting students at the forefront of change efforts also speaks towards a more entrepreneurial expectancy upon students in these instances. In many cases, especially with News21, there is not a roadmap for how best to accomplish the meta-goal for a group of fellows. The assumption is that if the best students from a diverse range of backgrounds are put together, funded, and given a common goal and strong professional guidance, they will

create strong outcomes through an iterative process of an emergent quality.

Not only did the Deans speak about the opportunities that technological advancement present both for transformational change efforts and for student graduates, but they also described this notion of keeping up with technological innovation as being the most challenging aspect of their efforts, and specifically, most Deans seemed to posit that technological change was challenging traditional value systems in some way. Columbia's Dean Lemann said that the most important change going on in journalism education is "trying to figure out what the world of digital journalism is going to look like and train people to be part of it." In a similar vein of discussion, Dean Grueskin commented:

> When you think about journalism now, it doesn't simply exist within the channel in which you published it if you. Fifteen years ago, if you wrote a story for the "Baltimore Sun," it existed on the pages of the "Baltimore Sun," and that's pretty much the only way that anybody could access it. Now, obviously you could do a story for baltimoresun.com, and instantaneously and ubiquitously available everywhere, and it really changes a lot of the dynamic about the business model and the editorial model. I think the distribution platform has changed a lot also with the advent of social media, in which, who tells you about a story is often as important as where the story came from. So, if you see a trusted source on your Facebook page, it says, "This is a really interesting link," you may click on it. You may have no idea where that link's taking you, you just know that it's really interesting.

Dean Henry encapsulates the internal conflict that many of the interviews espoused in regards to new digital tools. He describes how technological advancement is challenging J-Schools but also presenting opportunities:

> Well there were multiple challenges. Schools, institutions, can be very high bound and be very attuned to doing things old school ways. For many years it was enough to teach reporting and writing and to do their work in print and hand it to the professor and the professor would mark it up and get it back to the student within a couple of days, maybe, if the student was lucky. That's the way it was when I first came to Berkeley 15, 20 years ago. Since that time and the *revolution in technology* the turn around times are much swifter, obviously, with *the rise of the Internet and digital communications*. Teachers have had to adjust by virtue of those changes. *It's been a difficult process* and there are some professors who believe the school is veering too much towards the digital at the expense of traditional values. It's a continuing conversation we have based on mutual trust and mutual understanding that as long as we realize we need to row all in the same direction we'll be in good stead. *Technology has brought so much change to what we do that you can't afford to be an ostrich and hide your head in the sand.* At the same time it helps to be skeptical about this age it helps to be skeptical that *not all the answers can be*

found in technology. That a lot can be said for old school reporting, old school interviewing, old school ways of digging through records, old school ways of holding public officials accountable. Those are the old school values that must live on at the same time as we play with the new digital tools that are so accessible now. As our reputation in digital media spreads, other outside groups are coming to us for our students and our expertise. YouTube has started an interesting program in which our students are working for YouTube now to find a way to better harness and organize the proliferation of video on their site. In addition, we have "The Bay Citizen," which is a new nonprofit news organization set up by a philanthropist in San Francisco. He was concerned about the collapse of the "San Francisco Chronicle" and other local newspapers and wanted to know what comes next in information. He came to us and we are co-founders of "The Bay Citizen." Our students are working as multimedia specialists and as reporters for this site. One of them, in fact, is in charge of the innovations that you alluded to. She is the innovative specialist for "The Bay Citizen" and she's just one year out of finishing our program. *We encourage students to take up these opportunities as they find them because they are coming to us now, knowing a hell of a lot more about the digital world than, in many ways, we as the faculty do.*

Dean Kebbel of Nebraska relates that the digital components of transformational change efforts are the most important of all, and stresses the importance of leveraging these new technologies in ways that give leadership opportunities to students while protecting traditional values. Kebbel says:

First of all, J-Schools should teach current students is how to integrate the newest tools and processes, whether that's multimedia, digital, social media, mobile media, or things that haven't been invented yet. How to integrate the current tools and processes into the traditional values of fairness, accuracy, responsibility and truth, number one. Number two, how to work in a culture of constant change. Number three, how to become a leader in that culture of constant change.

Another major theme that emerged from my interviews was the role of experimentation in regards to new technologies and even new methods of teaching students how to be journalists. Dean Grueskin discussed the importance of experimentation in regards to encouraging students to make use of new digital platforms. As Grueskin put it:

We think we really strongly *encourage students to think broadly about how to tell a story.* There's so many more tools at their disposal, and you can publish using these tools in ways that were unimaginable only a few years ago. So if you're covering a complex issue about healthcare or if you're covering a fire down the block, we want to be sure that students think kind of broadly about what's the best way for my users to understand what happened today and what's going on with this issue. That involves a lot of very interesting *experiments.*

Dean Kebbel noted that experimentation could be one of the best tools to make use of in times of rapid change when he said:

> Change is difficult. Change is uncomfortable and it's not all good. *A lot of change is risky. A lot of change is experimental. A lot of change has to be changed.* If you could go slow and figure everything out and find the right answer, then universities are ideally designed to do that. In an industry that's being so disrupted, you can't sit back and study the way to do things for four or five years and then talk about it for four or five years.

Similar to other Deans, Geneva Overholser at USC also posited that keeping up technologically should be priority number one. She said that "understanding how to do journalism across multiple platforms so you understand some videos, some audios, some texts, you understand mobile and digital" represents the next frontier of journalism education. Bill Grueskin from Columbia echoes this sentiment and comments that the reason that technological change is the number one priority, and the reason that it's so challenging is because of the exponential rate of change itself:

> To me the biggest challenge is just that the pace of change has picked up so much, that a year ago the iPad app basically didn't exist. Now there's a whole industry set up around creating applications for the iPad. *It's just stunning to me how quickly things have moved in both the hardware and the software areas.* Twitter didn't exist a few years ago. There's so many different applications and…it's an administrative issue because a year ago I wasn't really thinking we'd need to have a class helping students understand how to create iPad apps. Now I feel like for a certain number of our students, that's a really important thing for them to learn. So I think administratively what we're really talking about is we need students to leave here with this kind of massive skill set, which still includes bending the journalist talents that we expect of our students.

It was clear from my interviews that the area of technological change was an area mired with challenges, but one that was being tackled in complex ways by each of the member schools. Interestingly, another finding in relation to this is that most of the Deans conveyed that "obviously all the younger faculty get it" (Kebbel) in regards to engaging with the new technologies and integrating new digital tools into the traditional journalistic ethics of truth and storytelling, etc. Dean Hart from Texas described the resistance to change by some older faculty members when he explained that some faculty members do resist change, but that:

> It's sort of like trying to resist rain. It's going to rain. There are people who will put up an umbrella and stuff, but I think generally speaking there is something of an age effect. Younger faculty members are obviously much more likely to leap in with both feet. I

think everybody is trying to wrestle with these changes and what it means and how to educate students in a world where all of this is going on. When I'm on the road and I'm talking about all of this I always end the speech by saying that we continue to be the College of Storytelling. Those are the skills that we've always taught and will always teach. You tell stories differently depending upon the medium. The Principles of Storytelling aren't going to change in any fundamental way, although the new media are going to allow us to turn a phrase differently because of the electronic possibilities.

In a similar fashion, Dean Kebbel described his faculty leaders as the ones who were more flexible in terms of tool set and more attached to the broad view as opposed to a specific niche or content track. He commented:

Yes, there are leaders and they are the type of people who, number one, have never identified themselves as, "I'm a print guy. I'm a print journalist, that's what I do. I'm a journalism law teacher. That's all I do." I think the leaders of change right now are the people who have identified themselves as, "I'm a communicator and gosh, I love all these new tools because they allow me to communicate differently and sometimes better." It has a lot to do, number one, with how you self-identify. Do you identify yourself as a radio reporter or do you identify yourself as a reporter or a communicator who happens to be using radio at the moment? If you're that kind of person, if you're the person who identifies yourself as a communicator, it's easier to tell your faculty and understand what the alumni are saying that, "We're just using different tools here. We're still teaching our ethics and our principles and our values, we're just using different tools."

The rate of change seemed to be a common challenge across the board, with most of the Deans echoing the following comments of Dean Lemann:

The challenge is just how rapidly can you keep up, and how rapidly can you adapt to what's going on, and the picture is highly indeterminate. So, figuring out where this is all going is a real challenge.

It is perhaps because of this need for rapid adaptation that the role of entrepreneurial thinking and entrepreneurial activities seems to be on the rise at top J-Schools also.

Hacks AND Hackers: Towards an Ethic of Entrepreneurial Journalism

Finding 3: Entrepreneurial journalism is emerging as a new professional ethic and entrepreneurial competencies represent a future requirement for top J-School graduates.

This thesis began because of a personal interest in entrepreneurship, and because I noticed a trend whereby journalism graduates were being required to act more and more entrepreneurially in the job market after graduation. Furthermore, it was evident that a handful of top journalism programs were beginning to implement new classes, joint-degree programs and

special projects aimed at giving journalism students more experience in the realm of business, marketing oneself and one's career as an independent brand, and also giving students the opportunity to collaborate with computer scientists in order to build the technological communications tools of the future. After researching these observations more fully, and after interviewing the leaders of top J-Schools, I can verify that entrepreneurial journalism is here to stay, and many programs are making a big bet on the future role that journalism students will play in regards to creating the future of the industry. That being said, I also discovered that the term "entrepreneurial journalism" means different things to different people, and is often vague in regards to its usage. In addition, the Deans that I interviewed related with some components of entrepreneurial journalism more strongly than others. For instance, although Columbia now has a joint-degree program in Journalism and Computer Science aimed at giving students advanced training in creating new digital communication tools, and although they also have a course aimed specifically at writing a book and marketing yourself as an author, they aren't completely gung-ho in regards to journalism graduates acting as their own brand. Dean Lemann stated:

> We certainly have had many, many speakers come to the school who say that you should be your own brand. The truth is, as far as I can tell, there's about 50 people in the world who can really pull that off, maybe 100. In other words, we'll graduate a class in May. In that class, the biggest single employers will probably be Dow Jones Newswire and Reuters, would be a guess. Those people, their job is not to be a personal brand. Their job is to cover a beat. So I think people take this too far when they relentlessly push the "everybody's going to be a brand from now on." So Andrew Ross Sorkin, yes, he's a brand. Walt Mossberg, yes, he's a brand. Some of my students who work for the New York Times or Reuters or the Washington Post or whatever, they're not necessarily brands. I think that gets a little overstated. Because there still are lots of big news organizations, and they still employ people to do traditional journalistic functions like being producers and reporters and editors and things like that.

It was obvious that Columbia seems to be building an infrastructure based on many of the notions encapsulated by entrepreneurial journalism, but it was also obvious that they are still fully committed to teaching students how to pursue fruitful careers with large corporations. However, Dean Lemann was the exception in regards to believing that journalist-as-brand is overstated, and the rest of the Deans that I interviewed were unanimous in touting the branding of journalism graduates, and even more unanimous in the belief that entrepreneurial journalism represents a future requirement of the the J-School experience. Most of the interviewees related the need for entrepreneurial journalism to the recent disruptions that were covered earlier in this

thesis. What was also evident is that many of the Deans related the idea of entrepreneurial journalism to leadership, collaboration, and teamwork. As Dean Kebbel explained:

> I think journalism students must think more entrepreneurially. I think that the days of aspiring to work for the New York Times for the rest of your life are done. The days of aspiring to work for UPI, which at one time would have been a perfectly normal aspiration, are clearly gone. The same thing with AP or BBC or any other major network. The days of assuming that you're going to work for one major news organization for your life are gone. What probably has replaced it are times in which you will be working for yourself or in a group of two to five or six people. You have to learn how to be entrepreneurial, how to take risks, how to work in a culture of change, and how to partner. That partnering is a really key element and that means partnering with advertising, public relations and marketing, something that journalism students are not used to doing.

> Dean Henry describes the future of journalism education with the following:

> I believe that students ten years from now will have *entrepreneurial journalism as probably a required course*, along the lines of ethics as well as basic reporting. And I believe that our school will increasingly, as it has begun to do over the last five years, will increasingly be in the role of providing news and information to the public. This has been a change that has happened at our school, in which our students are providing content, content under the expert eyes of our faculty as editors and mentors, but content through our local news sites as well as the Bay Citizen. In so doing, they are creating the future for themselves and heaven hopes that there will be a secure place for professional journalism and professional values ten years from now.

Dean Lavine at Northwestern said that they are already teaching journalism students there how to become entrepreneurs and that this is happening mainly because incoming students were asking for it. Interestingly, Lavine sees the journalist-as-brand existing both within and outside of larger organizations. He describes the rational by saying:

> When this school was founded in 1921, it taught journalism, advertising, and circulation. In 1930 a young social scientist came to Medill and taught courses in what were then called reader's interest. Today we would call it audience interest. His name was George Gallup and he went on to found the Gallup Poll and the Gallup organization. We have been talking about better, more meaningful stories and brand and audience and how to distinguish what we do since we began almost 90 years ago. The simple fact is that my colleagues in integrated marketing communication teach our journalism students that they are a brand and they are a media. Many of them these days come absolutely to... They say, "I don't want to work for the New York Times. I don't want to work for the AP or a broadcast outlet or whatever. I want to start my own X, and how do I create a brand to do that?" So that's one piece. Other pieces are absolutely that we help them think about themselves as a brand even when they join a big organization. I mean, Anderson Cooper

is a brand; Anderson Cooper is at CNN. Both are real.

Dean Hart related the idea of the journalist as entrepreneur to the disintermediation of the music industry during the last decade when he said:

> In the way that musicians have become their own brand, the record companies have become less powerful as the individual artist tries to control more of their own rights. At the same time, I always put my money in aggregators, because I think most people are pretty lazy. I can go and chase down the websites of 111 bands that I follow, but if someone told me that I could go to one place and get them all at the same time, I think I'd go to that place, just cause I'm too lazy to go and chase all my 111 bands. I think that would probably be true for any kind of information system, journalism included.

At USC, Geneva Overholser has been in many ways one of the most aggressive when it comes to promoting entrepreneurial journalism publicly. When I asked her what represented the next frontier of journalism education she said that one of the future requirements was "thinking entrepreneurially, having the economic literacy to think about how journalism is going to be sustained." Overall, however, she was less committed to entrepreneurial journalism and journalist-as-brand as I had anticipated prior to interviewing her, and she explained her rationale as follows:

> A lot of journalists are going to be working toward minor city news organizations, but many will not be. Among those, there will be many who will kind of go out on their own as independent operators, people who are going to be doing journalism just a little bit like freelancers of old, and who will need to get word out about their own skills and will offer their wares, so to speak, to different editors and publishers and across different platforms. You really do have to think about being your own brand. Who are you? What is your particular expertise? What are your credentials? How do you get the word out about yourself?

Evidently, however, the idea of entrepreneurial journalism seems to be separate from the issue of journalist-as-brand in Overholser's mind. She differentiates them when she says:

> I can't say that we teach people here specifically how to be their own brand, although I think there have been workshops offered about developing your own brand. But we do teach here *economic literacy and entrepreneurial thinking*. We have workshops on *how to work with engineers and business people to develop ideas*. We have an innovation laboratory. It's important that we think about our audience and what we think about what they can absorb and that we know where they are, that we understand that they're expecting information on the platforms they're using and when they're using them. Sitting here in our kind of ivory towers and saying we're going to give you what you need and that's what we're going to do, it's pretty clear that isn't working. That's not the way to

think about journalism's best future. We need to understand that thinking about audience needs and interest, far from making us unethical journalists, makes us more connected with the public service aspect of what we do.

This idea of connecting entrepreneurial journalism to a broader ethic of collaborating with a team in pursuit of public service is a theme that emerged from many of the discussions that I had. Dean Hart sees the journalist as a renaissance person who is able to produce and lead a variety of media ventures, including the creation of educational video games:

> They call them backpack journalists, but it used to be if you could write a copy or write a lead, that was fine, but now you have to know something about animation and digitalization and picture taking and moving picture taking, all these things that a young journalist that is going to have to do these days to be more self-sufficient. I think that's probably going to be true. There will always be specialists within the sub-fields, but I think increasingly our students are having to be much more digitally literate than they'd had to be in the past and I think that's true throughout the college. Gaming people are kind of Renaissance people. To create a game, you have to have someone who can do computer code, but most people who do computer coding couldn't tell you a story if their life depended on it. People who are good at storytelling don't compute very well. People who can tell a story or compute don't have all of the graphic skills that they would need to bring a story or a game to life. We're working with the College of Fine Arts and the Computer Science Department to involve a kind of prototype in the area of gaming, which is a new way of not only being entertained, but also of teaching. We're at an early stage in that project, but it's moving along pretty quickly.

Likewise, at Columbia, the collaborative and cross-disciplinary theme emerges again in regards to teaching entrepreneurial journalism practices. When asked what Columbia was doing in this regard, Dean Grueskin responded:

> One thing is two years ago is that we started a mandatory business and journalism class. So, every student in the full-time MS program has to take the class. It helps them understand the legacy of business models and how online has disrupted those and what new models are emerging. A part of the class involves getting the students to help devise new business models, or to reform the old ones. We also have this spring a class called "How to Make Business and Journalism Work," which is kind of a step above that one. This one is an elective. It's not mandatory, but it is a deeper dive by someone who also teaches at the business school at Columbia on understanding the emerging business models. We have a series of sessions with Eric Hippeau every year. He's the former CEO of the Huffington Post and has done a lot of really interesting things in the investing in the media space that really helps students get a much clearer idea on how to think about business plans, the audience, sources of revenue, and controlling cost, that kind of thing.

What's interesting is the logic behind these kinds of collaborative models. Grueskin

explains the logic with the following:

> What we want to do is *bridge the gap that exists in a lot of visual news rooms, where you have the digital folks standing on one side and the journalists standing on the other. They literally don't speak the same language, and they don't kind of understand what's the journalistic utility of technology and what's the technological utility of journalism.* It really helps. I mean our goal with this is kind of is to get to create a genre of highly skilled basically computer science engineers who also have a really deep understanding and practical hands on experience with journalism.

Dean Kebbel also related this idea of entrepreneurial journalism to the broader context of interdisciplinary and collaborative models, and also the idea of solving the problem of funding the news when he explained:

> We've worked with the College of Business. We've worked with the Department of Computer Science, the College of Engineering and we've worked with the Department of Political Science to create new programs offered in their colleges for journalism students, but team taught with journalism professors. For instance, with political science, we're creating a course in political media literacy, in particular campaign literacy. It's organized, structured and created by political scientists. It will be taught by them and eventually team taught with journalism professors. Computer science, we're doing the same thing having them create computer programming classes for journalism students. In business, they're creating a business. We wanted to *improve our entrepreneurship offerings* so they're creating a business minor for journalism students. Typically in the colleges of business, a minor is a major minus a few classes. That major minus a few classes always includes things like accounting. *Journalism students don't really need that unless they want to go into forensic accounting reporting, but they do need to know about financing, marketing, entrepreneurship, business principles, how to read spreadsheets, how to read quarterly statements.* This business minor is a newly created minor specifically for non-business majors that does not include things like accounting, but includes topics of substance that reporters would find very useful. One of the key elements of the Carnegie-Knight program is interdisciplinary work and getting the Colleges of Communications to work with other colleges across the campus. That's a key push of the initiative and that's one that we're moving ever so strongly with.

When asked to comment on the logic behind working with both business experts and computer scientists, Dean Kebbel's rationale proved to be similar to other Deans in that he doesn't necessarily see journalism students becoming computer scientists, but sees it more as learning to work with computer scientists and create a bridge across that language barrier:

> We're working with a great school of computer science and management. It's a specialized school for students who have incredibly high ACT scores in both engineering, computer science and business skills. They take on a lot of projects. They create

applications. They create websites. They create new products. We are working with them both as a client and as team teachers so that we can our have journalism students work a lot more with computer scientists who are creating things at the moment of creation. *It would be good for journalists to speak at least some of the same language that computer scientists and engineers speak so that when they work in a team with a developer, a code writer, they know how to say, "Here's what I want this thing to do. Here's what I want to happen," They know how to say it in a way that the computer scientist understands it. Do they have to be able to build it themselves? No, I don't think so. Should they be in on the building from the beginning? Yes, I think they should.* Ideally, you've got a team that is the entrepreneurial financer, the marketer, the product creator and the contents specialist all working together to, number one, create a product that they know for which there's a market because they've already studied it. They know how to market it. They've got a business plan. They know when they're going to become profitable They know how to get their money until they become profitable and they know that they're creating something that people want to use. They've studied all this and worked together to create it. It's exactly what should be happening everyday in business, everyday at news organizations. We ought to be teaching people how to do that here.

Dean Lavine actually downplayed the role of entrepreneurial journalism by framing it in a historical context. When I asked him about entrepreneurial journalism he responded:

I think it's a trend, but I also think it's [laughs] not much that's new. It may be more visible. It may be larger. I think the opportunities are greater. But people have been creating new kinds of media in new and exciting ways for a very long time, so it's not like it's "new" new. But the barriers are really different now. When I started, if you wanted to start a newspaper, you had to own a press or have access to it. You're talking about an enormous investment to own it or price to pay to get at it. Obviously, creating things online these days is pretty straightforward. [laughs] I need a computer and an Internet access, and I can be in business. So the barrier to entry is very different.

However, he too expounded on some of the things that they're doing at Northwestern to teach these kinds of entrepreneurial skills by putting journalism students on the same team as computer scientists. He describes one of those unique projects here:

We have joint classes with and joint faculty with the school of engineering's Intelligent Information Laboratory, our students and theirs jointly have created a whole new technology, that create journalism, that help journalist dig deeper, that can write a baseball game story and weave into it four years of Major League Baseball statistics and do it in 11 seconds and put with it still photos they found on the web and write cut lines and headlines, all of that happens in seconds literally. Driven by journalism students, writing the rules about how to do it, but also taking 40 years worth of Major League Baseball statistics and being able to say as a result, that the double in the second inning was the pivotal play of the game according to those statistics. What that allows is the sports reporter, who would otherwise have to churn out that story and should, but it is on

some level commodity journalism, everybody has to turn it out, instead of taking 20 minutes at the end of the game to churn it out, they can take it in 20 seconds, go over it, make sure it's just right, make sure the places that went to get it is fine, and then, they go down and interview the coaches and the players and deepen the story for their audiences. So, that was the first iteration of the kind of innovation projects we run now between the schools all the time. Taking that to the next level, it becomes a tool in something like business reporting or military affairs reporting, where you can have the computer keep track of and build trends of large data sets. We have, in addition, a new faculty member who's an expert in taking giant data sets and turning them into intelligent information, graphically or otherwise. So while we're teaching all of that, we're folding it into stories that are more targeted for what the audiences need to be smart and the reporter gets essentially more tools to add value to the story's trend lines, et cetera, that they otherwise just couldn't do in real time. It's not the machine doing it, or the reporter doing it. It's saying, "How do you get the best of both so the audience is most informed?"

At Cal-Berkley, Dean Henry relates the notion of teaching entrepreneurial journalism to an increase in community engagement and outreach. This is an interesting connection that was made by other Deans also. It seems that the logic behind entrepreneurial journalism training is often directly related to the community service and outreach aspects of both journalism, and more specifically, journalism schools. In this quote Dean Henry brings together a few themes quite nicely, including interdisciplinary models, teaching new multi-media tools, providing more entrepreneurial skills, and doing all of this in order to ultimately serve the community. He said:

> We have started, in recent times we've teamed up with the business school and have gotten from Berkeley's Entrepreneurial Center of the Haas School of Business, to co-teach a class on entrepreneurial journalism in which the students are taking, for instance, sort of models of businesses that they would like to grow, journalistic business, and they get intense feedback and training from business school professors. It's not a steady class. This is a class that's been offered a couple of times, but we would like it to be an important feature of the school because *as time goes on it's clear that entrepreneurial skills and business training are going to be critical to the future careers of journalists when they leave our program.* Under the Ford Grant I told you about in which multimedia specialists are training our students in multimedia journalism, one key aspect of that grant was to develop digital news sites serving local communities in the Bay Area. So our students, once they arrive and learn journalism and learn multimedia, so to are they practicing it and serving communities including the Mission District of San Francisco, City of Oakland, City of Richmond. As part of their training it's been important to have the students go out and learn about the communities, to learn about what the communities want in journalism. So they've gone out and they've gone and blanketed these communities with questionnaires and surveys and are asking people what it is they'd like in local news sites and we respond to those wishes in our sites. That's one thing that journalism students do nowadays at our school that they didn't do as recently as five years ago. It used to be journalism was something that you just gave out a one-way

street whereas now it's sort of a dialog that young journalists are having with communities. I think this makes journalists more responsive. It makes them better informed and attuned to the needs of communities *and brings a kind of entrepreneurial spirit to our classroom, which is not a bad thing*. If journalism is to survive it has to be marketable. So our students are doing that kind of work, community engagement that they didn't do before, and the role of journalists is changing to that extent.

Dean Grueskin of Columbia believes that its really business skills that matter, not necessarily entrepreneurial skills and this was a linguistic caveat that I noticed primarily only at Columbia and to some extent at USC. As Dean Grueskin explains:

I think that students need to have business skills, and sometimes those skills will translate to a small entrepreneurial startup. Sometimes it will translate into working for ABC News or Time Warner Company. I don't think that those skills need to be limited to entrepreneurship within the confines of just a small startup sort of a thing. There have been some great examples of news and journalism based businesses that have started in recent years that fall into that rubric, but there have also been some really interesting things that they've done on a much larger scale.

Dean Lemann echoes this sentiment and also places the rise in entrepreneurial thought on student interest:

Because it's so easy to start a website, many of our students at least have dreams of starting their own news organization that's web resident. So we have a lot of, many more than we used to, classes, and seminars, and lectures on entrepreneurship in journalism. A number of our students have actually gone out and done it. So it's a much bigger part of the picture than it was 10 or 15 years ago. There's a lot of people who think they can teach it, and certainly business schools now almost all have courses on entrepreneurship. There's a sort of personality thing about how to be an entrepreneur. I don't know if you can teach that. But if you can teach people how business models work, and stuff like that, that's eminently teachable. In our business course, that all our students have to take, they're formed into groups, and each group has to, as a final project, submit a business plan for the launch of a new news organization.

Dean Hart says that, "it's important for people to know about entrepreneurial journalism, because there's probably going to be a good deal more of that. It's always good to know something about how the world works financially." Again there is this blurring of the line between "business skills" and "entrepreneurial journalism" – in this case, Dean Hart seems to combine those notions whereas Columbia's Dean seems to separate them. When I asked Dean Hart to expound on his definition of entrepreneurial journalism, he related it to the rise of the long tail due to new digital platforms as covered earlier in this thesis – the rise niche content

verticals:

> I suppose it's finding new platforms to get messages to people, and finding new ways of getting people to pay for those platforms, for the delivery of that information. I think it means a lot of things. Helping to post a post of Entrepreneurial Journal, as Pro Publica is, and the Texas Tribune and others. I think it means a lot of things. It means probably more niche publications. I think it means all of those sorts of things, and I don't think it means one thing. I do think there's going to be more niche kind of journalism being produced. There already is, but that will probably continue. I think that's part of Entrepreneurial Journalism.

Geneva Overholser from USC seemed to come back to the subject of entrepreneurship throughout our interview, and in her parting statement she said:

> Thinking entrepreneurially, I think is going to be key for all of us. I don't think it makes us sullied as journalists. On the other hand, I think it makes us much wiser about what we can actually do, what's realistic, and what connects with people.

Dean Kebbel hopes that the rise in entrepreneurial thinking will give journalists the opportunity to update their ethical standards:

> I hope what it does is make us re-examine our ethics. We were told, and we probably accepted without questioning, that the journalists should not know anything about advertising, marketing or public relations. The journalists should remain pure and focus only on the story. As we look back on that now, that is an approach that only can happen with the luxury of money. If the organization is making money, you have a luxury of journalists not having to care about it. When the organization is not making any money, that attitude not only makes no sense, but it's actually harmful to the entire organization. It hurts the team. Journalists, if they want to be part of a functioning organization, have to realize that they're team members. A new ethic is we're team members. We can't hurt the team, for example.

In summing up what I learned after interviewing the leaders of top J-School programs, I would say that entrepreneurial journalism is emerging as a new ethic that is being espoused in various ways within reformed J-School curricula. What this ethic seems to entail is an increased understanding in business practices and economics combined with a more collaborative and practical approach whereby students participate in the creation of new digital tools and product offerings from inception. The new reality seems to indicate that the journalists of tomorrow will indeed need to operate in the industry as if they are their own brand to some extent, and therefore they should be getting some training on how to do this while in journalism school. Defining the new ethic of entrepreneurial journalism represents a ripe opportunity for future research. It would

seem to point towards an increase in responsibility on behalf of journalists, whereby they act not merely as content providers, but as project managers with domain over information technology development practices. In my view, this is a landmark revelation of this innovation moment, and a phenomenon that deserves a great deal of attention from J-School faculty and leadership. Whereas it used to be that journalists did not participate in setting up the press or worrying about selling advertising space or finding a good market-fit, the disruption brought on by digital convergence now seems to require that journalists do indeed need to be involved in these other boundary-spanning areas of journalism. As we have seen, journalism graduates will most likely not operate as the person who programs computer code to create the digital system or multi-media technology (although they will increasingly), but, rather, especially in the short-term, they will operate more as a leader and project manager who can speak the same language as the programmer and the marketing person, and get the ship going in the right direction to accomplish the meta-goal, which in many cases means effectively producing information technology products that people want and need to consume. In the beginning I saw this new ethic of entrepreneurial journalism from afar as a trend of turning hacks into hackers, but after further investigation, I would say that this trend is more one of "hacks AND hackers" whereby J-Schools are graduating leaders who can manage interdisciplinary teams. This emerging ethic indicates that future journalists should be comfortable acting as IT project leaders.

Community Participation Serves Journalism's Higher Purpose & Challenges its Traditional Norms

Finding 4: The participatory nature of interactive tools is generally seen as a better way to engage communities and serve democracy, but this rise in interactivity is also seen as an inevitable trend that must coexist with the traditional journalistic norm of gatekeeping.

The Deans that I interviewed expressed concerns about the rise in interactive digital media technologies that empower the audience, and their concerns dealt mainly with the lack of gatekeepers and professional control that these new platforms provide to the public. This is a view that was not shared by all of the interviewees, and some were more concerned than others, and those who were concerned still looked at this rise in interactivity as being positive in regards to serving democracy, as long as the professional practices associated with gatekeeping are preserved to some extent. As Dean Henry described it:

One thing I'm *concerned* about is the proliferation of social media and how social media and the *lack of gate keeping and the explosion of information* available through social media. How that fits into the practice of journalism. There's so many things *competing* now for traditional journalism. *So many competitors to traditional journalism that it's hard to take on those other forces head on*. Social media has its place but so does traditional journalism as playing a gate-keeping role and as long as we keep sight of that and not be swayed by the facility of social media and other tools in digital practice I think the better society will be served.

Dean Kebbel took a more positive view and seems to look at audience participation as a new norm:

We're definitely teaching that the world of "I talk, you listen, I decide, you read" is gone. It's a multidirectional world where everyone's a part of the conversation from the beginning and everyone's a part of the comments all along. People have to understand that they're in a new culture. If they learn that culture it can be very useful for them. It's another reporting tool. *It's very positive*. What you're doing, of course, is giving more people a voice. *That's what democracy is all about.*

Dean Lavine at Northwestern views audience engagement as a new reality and opportunity to serve citizens:

The real question is, "How do you enable an interactive audience to be smarter as citizens in their personal and professional lives, and as consumers?" That's very different than what I did when I started in the media decades ago.

Along with this opportunity, he also posits that it's a huge challenge. It's this idea of frustration born from having to compete with all of the information and media noise that's available to the public now that was so prevalent among the Deans. A sense of frustration and also competition inevitably led our discussions concerning citizen participation with relation to journalism practice, and the conversations ultimately went from that point of frustration towards a point of interactivity being a positive trend for democracy and public communities. After interviewing the Deans, I believe it's this sense of frustration and also of competition that seems to inevitably lead the discussion about citizen participation with journalism practice, and that the conversation ultimately seems to go from that point of frustration towards a point of interactivity being a positive trend for democracy. Thus, it is with this portion of the thesis that there seems to be the most complexity. Interviewees seemed to have multiple opinions on this issue, and were not always able to express their normative views as clearly as they were with other parts of the interview. As Dean Lavine explained:

You're competing against this tidal wave of information, but you have no more time. It's growing at a phenomenal rate. We care about it. When I began as a journalist in 1964, a very long time ago. I was 70 years old a couple of weeks ago. When I began, I said my job was to inform people so they could make smarter decisions as citizens, as consumers, and in their personal and professional lives. *I would change that today and say that my job is to enable citizens to be informed so they can make smarter decisions as citizens and in their personal, consumer and professional lives. Because*, of course, it's become interactive. *It's not me as gatekeeper, it's us together*. And that means I've got to not just find things that enable them to be smarter, or to carry a conversation between them or to set up communities that do it, all those things that journalists can now do. A real conversation, which is what we all hoped for. But it also has to be an engaging conversation, because if it's not engaging they're not going to give me their time. And it can't be "or," it has to be "and." So I have to know a whole lot about how they live. That's the first dent we're making. More digital, no time, got to make it engaging as well as valuable. The second dent we're making is the life insurance policy. The annuity for people of journalism. And it is simply that the world is going to get ever more complicated. And people will give you their time and their money to make a complicated life better. *And Levine's only law, my only law, is when in doubt rely on self-interest*. So I'm quite clear that if we do a great job, journalism will thrive. It is our annuity. But that means we've really got to do it better, and we needed to do away with all those silos, because I don't know what a TV station is. It's going to be on my iPad, it's going to be on my phone. Is that a TV station or mobile? And I don't know what "The New York Times is," because I read it sometimes on dead trees, sometimes I listen to it on my kindle, sometimes I read it on my iPad. What is it? It's content. It's a story that makes my life better.

Dean Henry shared a great story about how interactivity is challenging old-school values, but how the positive aspects of interactivity eventually shine through and show how journalists can take advantage of participatory user engagement in order to serve the community:

There was an interesting story in the Oakland site that we launched several years ago that shows how this culture change is happening. The class was taught by a teacher named Bill Drummond who was a very classically trained reporter, very old school, and approached this field of digital journalism with some degree of skepticism. In his class that year one of the sites was focused on Oakland's Chinatown. He had students out doing regular beat reporting, etc. At one point there was a desire to have the community play a role in reporting. There was an elderly Chinese woman who reported that she had been mugged in Chinatown but was afraid to go to the police. She blogged this on the site because she was afraid of the police. The police, who were paying attention to the site as it grew up, posted a message on the blog encouraging the woman to contact them and the officer gave his contact information. It led to greater cooperation between that woman in Chinatown and the Oakland Police Department and this was through the fight being run by an old school professor and driven by the talents of young reporters. That's just an example of the kind of changes that are happening at our school.

Dean Kebbel also gets at this notion of dealing with the change and using it to serve the public. He also differentiates between information and journalism, and therefore doesn't look at it as competition so much as it is an opportunity to better serve democracy. He explains:

> The reason we're doing this is to seek the truth. The reason we're doing this is because an informed public is the best way to keep the democracy healthy. The ultimate goal is how does the communication system feed the lives of the people around it to make them better. How does the communication system improve people's lives? By giving them information that they can use to improve their own lives. That means the information has to be timely, accurate, fair and relevant. It's information that people can use to improve their lives by finding a sale and getting something cheaper. Improve their lives by deciding that a community 50 miles away is a more suitable community for them. Improve their lives by giving them information about the mayor's raise or the president's raise. Information can just sit there and do nothing. Communication is the act of using information and getting it into the hands of people who can and will do something with it. A library is great to have, but if not a single person ever walks in it, it's like the tree falling in the forest. What the journalist is doing is taking public information and either aggregating it, finding stories hidden inside it, helping put it into a format, a form or presentation that makes it easier for people to use, easier for people to see what is of value to them.

Notice that there is still this central tendency to view the journalist as a gatekeeper of information first and foremost. Dean Hart also made this distinction between information and journalistic practice by boiling it down to a matter of authority, and this view also aligns itself with the traditional role of journalist as gatekeeper:

> My sense of things is that the real question is the market for authority. There will be virtually none of the tweeting that I have observed, and most of the blogging that I have observed, have any sense of authority to them. They're interesting, they help pass the time, they may tip me off to something, but they're not something that I take seriously until they develop some level of authority for me. That's why I think the future of journalism is ultimately very strong, because people will ultimately pay for an authority. People are not going to put money, invest money on the basis of some random blogger. They're going to invest it on the basis of information they can trust. The question is who's going to aggregate that trust for them? It might be something like a traditional news operation, although the finances of that is going to have to be worked out. You can be a phony journalist a lot easier today than you could at any point in human history. You can make believe you're a journalist just by getting your roommate to put together a website for you. Unless you have the skills, and frankly the ethics of journalism, it's just your grandmother and your girlfriend that's going to pay attention to it. The credence, it won't have the quality or authority that people... People are busy, they don't want to waste their time. If you want to find out who won the game last night between UT and Arizona State, I don't think you're going to go to your girlfriend's kid brother. You're probably going to

go to ESPN, because you trust it.

On the flip side of this view is Geneva Overholser who separates the notion of journalistic traditions with journalistic principles. She comments:

> The thing that drives me as a journalist is caring about the quality of the information the public has access to. Because it seems to me that is so essential to democracy. We need to understand that people will want to be part of the creation of the journalism. I think for most of us who work with young people it's easier to embrace change and to see the promise instead of holding on to our notion of what was and thinking that that's the only way to do good and ethical work as journalists. The other thing I'd say is, *it's been very helpful to me to think about our traditions and our principles as two different things.* There is a whole set of traditions we've had as journalists. I come from newspapering, myself. We believe in inverted pyramids and we always knew that the most important story goes on the upper right. *We have these traditions. Those are important but they're not the essence of what defines us as journalists.* The principles of verification and proportionality, these are the essence of what define us as journalists. *If we can separate the two we can let go of our traditions and hold on to our principles, our ethical underpinning subconscious characteristics that distinguish journalism as information in the public interest. I think that's helpful.* Once you do that, you realize that, if we can guarantee that the public gets the information they need, then we're doing our job. It isn't that it has to look the way it always looked. It isn't that it has to come from newsrooms that feel just the same as they always felt. Separating traditions from principles has been something that's helpful to me.

Dean Lemann cautioned that although there has been widespread disruption throughout the journalism and communication industries, what it means to be a professional journalist will not change as quickly, and he suggested that this is a good thing:

> In my own view, journalism rises to the level of being a profession, even though it's not licensed. So going to journalism school, I think, trains you to be a better journalist. we are in a moment of significant change in journalism. But what it means to be a professional journalist is things like going out, being able to go out and through a variety of research methods including first-hand reporting and interviewing, arrive at the truth of a complicated situation quickly and communicate it clearly to the general public. And that's the core of what being a journalist is and I don't think that is going to change.

Other deans were not as clear that the professional ethics associated with being a journalist would not change, in fact, some argued, for instance that "the core ethics of journalism have always changed because we're not a licensed, thank goodness, profession" (Lavine); and on the other side of the spectrum from Dean Lemann, Dean Kebbel emphasized:

> I hope what it does is make us re-examine our ethics. We were told, and we probably accepted without questioning, that the journalists should not know anything about

advertising, marketing or public relations. The journalists should remain pure and focus only on the story. As we look back on that now, that is an approach that only can happen with the luxury of money. If the organization is making money, you have a luxury of journalists not having to care about it. When the organization is not making any money, that attitude not only makes no sense, but it's actually harmful to the entire organization. It hurts the team. Journalists, if they want to be part of a functioning organization, have to realize that they're team members. A new ethic is we're team members. We can't hurt the team, for example.

Change Requires Engagement with Stakeholders

Finding 5: The organizational change process and the successful implementation of innovative approaches at top J-Schools involve strong feedback loops with top university leaders, alumni and students.

An unintended discovery brought forth during my interviews was the insight into change management at each respective institution as it relates to stakeholder engagement. The leaders that I interviewed were unanimous in communicating to me that a major tool that they used to guide them through the innovative change process was getting feedback from different stakeholder groups including alumni, current students, other J-School leaders, and in some instances, the university President and Provost. In some cases, the innovative change efforts seemed to be driven by top university leaders. I think it would be helpful to allow some of the interviewees to describe how they went about implementing innovative change at their institution for the benefit of other academic leaders seeking to embark on their own journeys of driving organizational change. I want to include this section so that it may serve as a blueprint for change within the Academy. Beginning with Dean Lavine at Northwestern. Dean Lavine seems to epitomize the innovative leader as Dean:

> Accreditation is the floor of quality. You are saying this school has reached that level. They're accreditable. And then it goes on from there. Some schools should be leaders because they're older, larger, have more resources, are in big cities, or lots of things. The comment made at that time was, "It's a wonderful school, it's accreditable," but no school is leading the way into the digital 21st century. This is '05. Northwestern values leadership deeply and the president, the provost trustees, and everybody is saying, "What do you mean we're not leading? We need to be leading the leader." The faculty had voted to support some strategic principles that matter like audience, digital understanding, and deeper, better quality journalism. The question then is how do you do that? My field is media strategy and I ran a standalone center that educates CEO level media executives around the world and does research on some of the media's most complicated problems. I came into Northwestern, set up that center in '89, '90. Actually, I funded it when we

76

started. That's what I was doing. The provost and the president asked me to layout a plan to form a deal as we were doing for media companies. Here was a way to prepare undergraduate and graduate students for the digital age. Not even just in their first job, but well beyond that. I laid out that plan which called for enlarging the faculty, bringing out new kinds of people, going international, doing away with the silos, and using all of the tools. Although I said then and I will say now, focusing on that is a mistake because quickly the next generation of students...what is challenging the next generation of students is taken for granted. A phone that does video, etcetera. We knew it was a hurdle but a short one in the long term. The real question is, "How do you enable an interactive audience to be smarter as citizens in their personal and professional lives, and as consumers?" We laid out this very ambitious plan that calls for new people on the faculty, new skill-sets, and re-engineering everything that we were doing. On the one hand, it deepened the values of the other. It also called for spending a lot of money. That was our charge. The faculty all then turned around and said "We like the plan and we want you to be dean" which I certainly didn't expect. They said "We'll support it fully" which they absolutely did. In January of '06, I became dean and made the faculty each teach one less class. We created a quarter-long, massive 20 hour a week class with reading and people brought in from around the world so we could all look at where we were. We tore apart the curriculum, deepened parts of it, doubled the writing, etc. We did away with the silos. The faculty did all of that. We trained the faculty and students on the new technologies. We added faculty in these areas. The journalists had become experts in understanding what audiences need to be smarter and what audiences want and what would then let them spend their time with the media. We've got people who are experts with large data sets and how to turn them into smart information. We've got more investigative people doing investigative journalism, not just in the gotcha areas of truth to power or somebody doing something wrong but taking complex stories and explaining them in real ways. We started a school in Doha Qatar and now have a four year school in the Middle East. Every undergraduate student was already spending a quarter somewhere away from Northwestern for credit at a real media company that's even more international. We have students going to South Africa in newsrooms there, we have students in Latin America there, we have new faculty and enterprising reporting, we have some faculty coming on now that are bilingual. We used our marketing communications faculty at Medill and the Kellogg's School of Managements major in Media Management, what I had set up, so that students could actually figure out how to start their own media enterprises and on and on and on. That's a fraction of what we've done. We started the program in the school. Outside the school we started the drug program with the engineering school. We brought students from across the university to take Medill classes because if you're going to have an informed community that's interactive we should start with our own community. We're teaching them how the media works and how they interact with it so they can be a chemist or an economist or a social scientist and be literate about the media and actually able to use it to communicate.

When I asked Dean Kebbel what advice he would give to other J-Schools seeking to implement innovative change initiatives, he replied by saying:

First of all, you have to get the faculty to buy into the fact that the industry has changed

and it's been totally disrupted. It's not the industry that they worked in 20 years ago. I don't think that's too hard to do anymore. That's where you have to start. Then I'd say, number two, with your alumni. If you don't believe the dean who is saying, "You have to start teaching things differently, teaching new tools or new aspects of journalism like social media talk to your alumni." Your alumni will tell you, "Oh yes, you do." I think the alumni could be some of the best help. I try to go out to meet them, particularly ones that are highly placed. I try to talk with them to create an advisory board. We have alumni events. We travel to different cities and meet with them. We bring them back to campus. As much as you try, the sad thing is, you never have enough people to really keep in touch with all of your alums like you should. Every month the faculty reads newsletters in their fields and sees things like mobile advertising up and print advertising down. Every year an alumnus comes back and says, "For my job interview they wanted me to shoot some video, then edit some audio, then write a story and then put it all online. I'm sure glad I knew those things," or, "Why didn't you teach me those things?" The faculty learns really fast. Alumni feedback has been critical to getting the faculty to realize the changes they need to make.

When I asked Dean Hart what the most beneficial aspect of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative was in his view, he described the importance of interacting with leaders from other J-Schools and mixing it up to cross-pollinate ideas and discuss the future:

I think primarily it's been the collaboration among the schools and frankly putting the various Deans in direct contact with one another on a regular basis and I think there's been a lot of interesting and thoughtful discussion that has gone on among the leading schools to talk about where Journalism and Mass Communication education is going and how it might go there. There's been a lot of interchange and bi-play and to me that's been a great advantage of it because otherwise we tend to move along on our own steam and you see people at conferences from time to time, but this has been a much more organized discussion of these matters. I think the discussions have been not disorderly, but they also haven't been completely task driven. We usually meet for about a day and a half or two days and we cover a variety of topics during that time. One of them has been this News21 Operation that's been going on for some time that we've all been part of. It's Summer Program of Internships and that usually will take a period of time. Then the different Deans will talk about the programs that are going on in their individual campuses. Then there will be a period of time during that two days probably we will focus upon national challenges. We've met with the FCC on occasion. We've met with other funding agencies on occasion to talk about where the initiative is going and that thing. There's been a regular set of themes that have come up at each conference, but it hasn't been a completely task-driven one, there's also been an open exchange. People sharing questions and concerns that are faced on their own campuses and then trying to see what kind of collective wisdom might develop to help address it. On about two or three occasions the initiative has brought faculty from the different schools, usually about a half a dozen or so faculty and sometimes students as well. We've done that at least twice, maybe three times and I think in both times have gone to New York. That's been a much broader discussion that would've gotten down more to the grass roots on

curriculum. Those meetings were particularly helpful because it got it out of the C suite, if you will, and got it down to faculty members talking specifically to one another about course work. That has not been the primary focus of the initiative. Most of the work has been done at the grass roots level the way it normally is, but there has been some occasion where the Deans have gotten involved as well.

Conclusion

In summary, this chapter has sought to describe and explain how top J-School leaders and the Deans of the member schools of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative have implemented innovative change at their respective institution to transform journalism education to meet the requirements of modern realities within the communications industries, and ultimately, to create positive impacts that better serve their graduates. I sought to understand what innovative efforts were occurring and why, and I sought to understand what role entrepreneurial practices were playing. In addition, I sought to understand how J-School Deans view the tension between professional notions of journalistic gatekeeping versus citizen participation within journalism practices. Through a series of interviews, I discovered that interdisciplinary initiatives represent the leading transformation effort at top J-Schools, and that these initiatives involved the simultaneous act of destroying the old silo and track systems of old, while simultaneously creating more modern convergence curricula that seek to give students practical training that will help them after graduation. Moreover, I learned that these new convergence curricula are highly varied and experimental in approach and seem to take advantage of unique resources available in the local community of each particular J-School. Importantly, I discovered that entrepreneurial journalism represents a future educational requirement for J-School graduates, and seems poised to become a new normative ethic of journalism practice. However, the idea of entrepreneurial journalism as a new ethic requires that distinctions be made between the business and economic principles, the leadership principles associated with initiative and project management, as well as the tech-creation (hacking) principles. Where these three elements intermingle seems to be in environments such as News21 where students are given the reins to an actual news operation, and are given the opportunity to collaborate and experiment with experts from different domains, and to create and experiment with new forms of digital media, all in the name of serving the community in the name of democracy.

I found that the professional-participatory tension that exists as a result of digital

convergence and the democratization of information is a complex issue J-Schools are still coming to terms with. I found that the tension is existent, but that most J-School leaders see interactivity as a new norm that will ultimately serve democracy, although there also exists the challenge of competing with the flood of information and teaching students how to use social media and other emergent digital forms while still staying true to their role as a journalist. There do not seem to be any easy answers in this regard, and there seems to be much struggle as to where the boundaries of professional quality-control should be drawn for the future. This is an area ripe for future research as well.

Finally, I also discovered that teaching new digital media technologies to students represents the foremost challenge that J-Schools are dealing with, and that strong feedback loops with students, alumni, university leaders, and other J-School leaders provide the best strategy by which to measure and anticipate which skills and technologies should be taught to current students. What struck me the most is that these top J-Schools are acting to keep up with and define the change that is disrupting their industry – they are not sitting idly by, but rather they are proactively aiming for the future in fairly aggressive ways. The leaders and institutions represented in this study are not mired in obsolescence, but are rather seeking to redefine the role of the J-School on their campus as the hub of innovation – a port-of-call for digital technologies and opportunities that digitization presents for our democratic society. In doing this, they are raising the status of the J-School on their campus, and also raising the status of their graduates in the job market, and thus, also the attractiveness of their program to future students. The J-Schools that were involved in the Carnegie-Knight Initiative have clearly become leaders among US J-Schools. I believe that this thesis can be used as a beginner's guide for other J-Schools that are seeking to become leaders in their own right, and that seek to raise their status, better serve their student graduates and their local communities, and help create the future of journalism.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION: TRANSFORMING THE J-SCHOOL THROUGH
INNOVATIVE INTERDISCIPLINARY PRACTICES AND AN EMERGING ETHIC OF
ENTREPRENEURIAL JOURNALISM

This thesis had a three-fold purpose: (a) to explore how top J-Schools – members of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* – are negotiating the tension between professional control and the democratization of information; (b) to understand if and how that negotiation is being manifest through innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives within J-Schools; and (c) to discuss the implications of J-School innovation logic and what it means for future generations of J-School leadership and graduates. This thesis matters for what it might suggest about the role of innovation and entrepreneurship at professional schools in turbulent times of rapid technological change. Educational institutions and professional schools can harness change in ways that raise their status as leaders of the Academy, and in ways that co-create future realities that will shape their industry, and the lives of their graduates. J-Schools, in particular, can act as boundary-spanning agents that create an innovative port-of-call for digital technologies at the Academy, and in doing this, they serve to redefine and alter the professional jurisdiction of their graduates so that, upon graduation, they are more prepared and equipped to take advantage of the external realities that exist in the professional "real" world. Moreover, by positioning themselves as the leading hub of innovation on their campus, J-Schools increase their role as an idea incubator where entrepreneurship and entrepreneurial activities may flourish in ways that serve the ideals of our democratic society.

This chapter proceeds in four parts: first, a review of the findings of this thesis, in order to abstract larger lessons from them; second, a discussion of what these findings suggest about the future of journalism education and journalistic practices; third, a wider consideration of how this case contributes to an understanding of professional innovation beyond journalism; and,

finally, a reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of this case study, and how they point to future research.

A Summary of Major Findings

As explained previously, the components of this theis can be viewed as a three step progression: from the macro-level view of J-School transformation (both in modern context and historical context), to meso-level considerations of J-School innovation initiatives, to a micro-level analysis of the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* – the member schools, their actors, outcomes, and the logic behind them. Through it all, my ultimate aim was to understand how J-Schools are transforming themselves, which innovation initiatives are working and which are not, the challenges and opportunities that creative destruction is presenting to J-School educators, and how, if at all, this transformation is influencing J-Schools' efforts to change what it means to be a professional in the new media landscape.

My belief at the outset of this thesis was that creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship were playing major roles in J-School transformation efforts, but that J-Schools were also resisting change because of outdated professional ideologies and sequences, siloed faculty specialization, and an organizational environment comprised mostly of bureaucratic inertia instead of entrepreneurialism. My research proved this hypothesis to be mostly correct, but there was less resistance to change than I had originally anticipated. What I discovered instead of bureaucratic inertia was actually a whole plethora of innovation initiatives that had already or were seeking to destroy outdated curriculum models while also creating new and improved curriculum models. Moreover, I discovered not only that entrepreneurialism was prevalent among top US J-Schools, but that there is an emerging ethic of entrepreneurial journalism that is being taught and implemented at top J-Schools through a variety of processes and formats. I also discovered that the tension that exists between journalistic control of information on the one hand and the democratization of information on the other hand does present a challenge to educators, but that the challenge is more so about how to integrate new technological tools with traditional professional values. However, in more than one instance, J-School leaders referred to new digital tools as "threats" and "competition" to traditional journalism, and many participants admitted that they were worried about the affects these new technologies would have on journalism as a profession. Overall, although many leaders discussed some form of faculty resistance to innovative change efforts, there was also an acceptance of change as an inevitable

part of the modern J-School existence, and this acceptance of change was driven by strong feedback loops with students, alumni, and top university leaders both within and outside of their own institution.

My research revealed that transformational change is taking on many different forms, and that the process is experimental in nature, but that there are several meta-trends that are prevalent at all of the J-Schools which were covered in this thesis. Importantly, the most common and definitive transformation effort being undertaken was the implementation of interdisciplinary practices. This included not only the destruction of traditional silo and track systems associated with traditional J-School curriculum models, but also a cross-pollination effort whereby students were given experience in a much wider array of subjects and disciplines, ranging from business and computer science to history, health, physics, public administration, agriculture, and political science among others. One of the most important findings of this thesis is that forging these interdisciplinary practices on campus serves to raise the status of the J-School at the Academy, and this in turn allows the J-School to position itself as the port-of-call for digital innovation -- a crucial place where democratic values and entrepreneurial activities flourish. Secondly, another key finding of this thesis is that there seems to be a new ethic of entrepreneurial journalism rising at top J-Schools. All of the leaders that I interviewed spoke to this trend in one way or another as a key component of their transformational reform efforts. However, entrepreneurial journalism was not easily defined by J-School leaders, and more research into this new ethic is certainly required to more fully understand it and what it means for future J-School educators and graduates. Entrepreneurial journalism, as discussed by the participants of this study, includes the notion that journalists should seek to become their own niche brand in the marketplace, and that they should take more responsibility for the business side of the news so that they may help to sustain journalism for the future. In addition, participants discussed the role of students as content producers who are serving actual communities during their training, and this notion of outreach and community service was also a common theme. Importantly, entrepreneurial journalism also includes the notion that journalists are aptly suited to participate in the creation of new communication tools and technologies that serve democratic purposes, acting not so much as the hacker or computer scientist that programs the software, but rather, as a project leader who can speak the same language as the computer scientist, and guide interdisciplinary teams towards meta-goals while also generating revenue that sustains the venture. In short,

entrepreneurial journalism is about J-Schools training students to become future leaders and IT project managers, and this involves thinking less like a 9-5 employee, and more like an entrepreneur who can lead teams to take advantage of opportunities and capitalize on disruptive change. This is a significant development that deserves further attention.

Finally, the participatory logic of new digital technologies seems to be at odds with the professional logic of traditional journalistic practice whereby the journalist acts as a gatekeeper of valuable public information. However, the democratization of information that these new participatory tools have unleashed is seen as positive for communities, and positive for democracy. The tension seems to primarily stem from the rate of change itself, and the challenges associated with integrating a constantly expanding set of digital tools into journalistic practice. From the view of J-School educators, there is simply not enough time to teach a journalism student about the bedrock values of professional journalism, and cover all of the digital tools that are available, let alone to adjust the bedrock values to the realities presented by those new tools. This frustration, I believe, manifests itself when educators perceive and talk about new digital tools such as social media as "threats" and "competition" to journalism. Although there is an "old-school" element at most of the J-Schools I spoke with, change efforts seem to be viewed as inevitable despite resistance by some faculty in some instances. This transformational pursuit by J-Schools to implement innovation and proactively reform their organization in spite of a natural resistance to such change is being driven by strong feedback loops with students, alumni, and other institutional leaders. Keeping up with the realities that exist in the outside world through alumni surveys and active engagement by J-School leadership means all of the difference when it comes to driving change. It is this pursuit to serve their graduates that seems to be keeping J-Schools moving forward, and I would suspect, it is the lack of such engagement and feedback that many J-Schools may be lagging behind the curve as the caboose of change instead of the engine.

The Future of Journalism Education

When I asked Dean Kebbel of Nebraska what he thought the J-School would be like ten years from now, he said, "It will not be in a building. It won't be on a campus. It'll be mobile." In my view, the future of journalism education involves convergence curricula, leadership training, and entrepreneurial activities. The future of the J-School is to act as the cross-pollinator

of the Academy, and the engine of innovation efforts, and I agree that the J-School of the future will operate more in the real world than from within the ivory towers of the Academy. After all, journalism is a practical art, not just a theoretical one.

The Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education inspired the J-Schools that were members of the initiative to break down certain boundaries associated with traditional journalism education practices, and in doing so, it created an opportunity for J-School innovators to create a reformed (and improved) version of journalism education—the boundaries of which have less to do with professional affiliation and more to do with practical leadership training that maintains ethical standards. In seeking to reform journalism education, J-School innovators are not de-professionalizing journalism so much as re-energizing its ideals. Thus, the Carnegie-Knight Initiative is a profound study in the act of creative destruction for the benefit of society and for future generations.

A cursory reading of these findings might suggest that the Carnegie-Knight Initiative and top J-School leaders are seeking to completely destroy the foundations upon which journalism has been built, and destroy the professional ethics that are typically associated with journalism such as objectivity, truth-seeking, storytelling, and transparency. Importantly however, it would be false to connect these critiques with a desire to disrupt and displace journalism's basic mission. On the contrary, I would argue that these J-School innovators are not destroying journalism practices or pushing students away from professional norms, ethics, and values, but in fact they are actually embracing the earliest and most essential of journalism's ideals—its commitment to the public interest, facilitating a space for the community to have a conversation with itself.[174] The journalistic creed seems to be alive and well in this sense and in the sense of training students to solve future problems, and many of the top J-Schools represented in this study seem to be innovating towards the most idealistic form of journalism: a dialogical conversation like that envisioned by Jürgen Habermas (1991)[175], James Carey (1987)[176] and indeed, all the way back to John Dewey (1927)[177].

The creative destructive action is manifest through the simultaneous destruction of traditional silo and track-driven curricula along with the creation and implementation of a broader, more experimental convergence curricula – and this creative destruction within the

Academy represents, both significantly and optimistically, an effort by the Carnegie-Knight Initiative and leading J-Schools to save journalism education by redefining it, and thus, redefining what it means to be a modern professional journalist in the 21st century. In attempting to solve the crisis affecting the journalism industry at large, the Carnegie-Knight Initiative has sought to get at the root of the problem, which is the ability of professional journalists to behave as flexible, adaptive, and opportunistic problem-solvers on behalf of their profession. In short, the Carnegie-Knight Initiative has sought to inspire top J-Schools to graduate more entrepreneurial-minded leaders and innovative change agents who are better prepared to capitalize on the opportunities brought forth by technological disruption, and this logic represents a concerted effort to revitalize journalism.

The Carnegie-Knight Initiative sought to, and succeeded in, showcasing what the future of journalism education could be like. This attempt to reboot journalism education represents an attempt to save journalism and preserve a healthy democratic society. The various forms of innovation at top J-Schools and the espousing of entrepreneurial ethics and an entrepreneurial spirit among faculty and students, as manifest through the varied experiments taking place among top J-Schools, can be traced back to a common theme: journalism must not only survive, but thrive for the benefit of our democracy. By challenging journalism education's ideology of silos and curricula organized by tracks, the top J-Schools included in this thesis are serving as key agents in a process of creative destruction of the professional ideologies associated with the gatekeeping role of journalism, along with the creative destruction of certain practices that had calcified as a result of such ideologies – mainly, J-School training methodologies. There is still an element of stubbornness at top J-Schools to preserve the autonomy and authority of professional journalists so that they may better serve as protectors of American democracy, even while those same schools are creating and experimenting with new tools and methods by which journalists may speak truth to power and give a voice to the voiceless.

Many authors pointed to journalism's mounting doom back in the late 1980s, and the critique of a profession is often ceaseless, but with the rise of digital technologies has come the exponential flattening of the informational economy – a democratization of public information powered by the Internet and the increasing rate of change itself. Alas, even massive tidal waves begin as small ripples. Journalism reformists suggest a rebooting of the profession in the same vein that John Dewey envisioned the "audience" of journalism transforming into citizen

collaborators – users instead of merely consumers of journalism. There is, in this way, truly nothing new under the sun.

The leaders of top J-Schools differentiated between professional authority and public information, and although they see the democratization of information as represented by the rise of social media and other digital tools as a positive trend, they also maintain that it is ultimately beneficial for society if journalists continue to act as gatekeepers and preserve their authority as seekers and bringers of the truth. The problem in their eyes is not so much an either-or scenario, but more so a problem of figuring out how to harness citizen participation while also preserving informational authority in a way that protects citizen participation in the first place. Therefore, the tension that exists between professional control and the citizen participation is really an issue of preserving democratic ideals of speaking truth to power, while at the same time empowering citizens to become more fully engaged in the communication ecosystem that preserves the democratic process and protects the public interest. The future of journalism education will be intimately related to negotiating this tension, for it gets at the philosophical and metaphysical heart of freedom and democracy, and these are complex concepts not to be taken lightly.

I see the future of journalism education existing as a great experiment designed first and foremost to integrate the great journalistic ideals of the past into the technological and economic realities of the future. I hope that J-Schools rise to the occasion and become the drivers of innovation and entrepreneurship, the hubs of cross-pollination both on the campus and off – indeed, this thesis bodes well for this kind of optimism. One thing is for sure, and that is the fact that the future is going to happen, the only constant is change itself. We can either sit idly by, waiting to see what becomes of our future reality, or we can pull up our bootstraps, apply ourselves, take some risks, and go make a better future for us and for the next generation. The choice is just that – a choice.

Innovation & Entrepreneurship Trends Beyond Journalism

Thus far, I have emphasized why the Carnegie-Knight Initiative and the innovation strategies of top US J-Schools are important for both J-Schools, journalism, and democratic life itself, but this study can be linked to broader social processes as well. The theme of professional-participatory tension, for instance, is one facet of a larger crisis facing many professions in contemporary society, not just journalism. The democratization of information and the

democratization of the means of production are jointly having an affect on many different industries, and this affect will continue to increase over time. One key example would be healthcare, where we are beginning to see the rise of mobile sensors, crowdsourcing, and personal data monitoring that transfers the power of diagnosis and treatment away from the doctor and towards the patient. Again, there seems to be a tension rising between the professional authority of the doctor, and the democratic authority of the patient. Indeed, with the rise of professionalization during the last century, the paradigm has been based on a logic of controlling a body of key knowledge and information associated with the profession and its associated practices, and maintaining such control for the normative purpose of doing "good work" that serves public society, and thus, democracy.[178]

Professionalization assumes the public's acknowledgement that the acting professionals maintain exclusive claim to jurisdictional authority[179], and in turn professionals have promised to use their power (both within corporate and governmental institutions) to act in accordance with standardized ethics of a public-service ideology. The exponential rise in digital technologies is challenging the professional control of jurisdictional claims in all information-based professions. This challenge, in my view, represents the natural tendency of democracy, when powered by innovation to flatten the playing field, and distribute power more equally. Information is power, and so with the democratization of information comes the democratization of professional power. I see this trend as natural and good, but it is sure to present many challenges to the status quo whereby power is maintained by a few over the many.

Challenges will certainly arise, but more importantly, this trend is providing opportunities for growth, for improvement, for increased efficiency, for strengthening democracy, for strengthening the American economy, and pushing us as a society further towards the ideals to which we have aspired through the ages. The case of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative presents an opportunity to see how a profession can innovate and adapt through the influence of the most pure of catalytic agents— the Academy. Education is in a prime position to act as professional steward, and they are uniquely positioned to take leadership roles in creating a better future and driving the systemic change that is required to align professional bodies with modern realities. Educators, and especially top US universities, have the requisite human capital and credibility to spark innovation within and across professional boundaries in ways that make lasting impacts for

entire generations of graduates. So much so that this trend continues, Harold Innis's vision is alive and well over seventy years later.

The boundary-spanning, innovative port-of-call role that J-Schools displayed in this thesis is important for what it contributes to the sociology of professions and field theory, and also to theories of innovation and entrepreneurship. The sociology of professions suggests that expert occupations seek to professionalize themselves for purposes of power, authority, and prestige by seeking to *control* an increasing array of subjects and fields of knowledge. The literature suggests that professionals tend to react defensively in the face of outside threats, guarding the gates of professional entry and generally resisting change and innovation—just as journalists and journalism educators have traditionally done. However, my thesis shed new light on this resistance to change in a couple of ways. This study indicates that even the most institutionalized of organizations (universities) may exercise their agency in unpredictable and often very forward-thinking ways during a time of crisis — when the wolf is at the door. Not only can colleges create feedback loops with students and alumni to assist in confronting change, but they can actually embrace change by taking risks and experimenting with innovative practices that help to create their future realities. This being said, I believe that an intra-professional study would be incredibly beneficial for understanding more in this area, and I would posit the need for understanding how different professions respond in different contexts of disruption and change, but I would be most excited to see how similar these themes are. For instance, looking at how the music industry dealt with disruptive change versus how journalism is dealing with it, or healthcare, or tourism, or manufacturing, etc.

This thesis suggests that the role of the boundary-spanning agent and the act of becoming an interdisciplinary port-of-call for innovation needs to be more fully understood in the field approach to the study of professions, including journalism and journalism education, and I believe this vein of research would also prove bountiful for understanding more about innovation and entrepreneurship. Bourdieuian sociology is quite apt and well suited for the study of the silos and the core institutions of our society, but is not so well suited for studying the gray areas that are increasingly emerging between and among professions in regards to trans-disciplinary practices and trends[180].

In my view, the cross-pollination that occurs is at the very root of innovation, and it is the synthesizing act that is often undertaken by many successful entrepreneurs when they create valuable new ventures. We could liken the role of the J-School as a hub of innovation to a recent conceptualization that comes from Brian Eno, the experimental musician, artist, and award-winning producer of U2, Coldplay, Paul Simon, and the Talking Heads. Eno has suggested a word to convey the extreme creativity that networked groups can occasionally generate: Scenius. He says that a Scenius stands for the intelligence and intuition of a whole cultural scene, and represents the communal form of the concept of the genius. The geography of a scenius is said to be nurtured by several factors including:

- Mutual appreciation where the group encourages risk taking.

- The rapid exchange of tools and techniques.

- Network effects of success. (Individuals don't take credit, the whole group does.)

- Local tolerance for the novelties. (The scene is protected from outside critics.)

This notion of Scenius reminds me of technology incubators and some of the classic examples of game changing entrepreneurial activity such as Disney's studio, Hewett-Packard's garage, Google's Stanford dorm room, Dell starting in a Texas dorm room, or Facebook starting in a Harvard dorm room. I would argue that the future of journalism education, and the future of innovation will be driven by the ever-increasing role of Scenius, and perhaps the role of incubator programs should be viewed as a potential model. In the case of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative, I would posit that it has served to inspire J-Schools to create test environments from which a Scenius is more likely to emerge -- and this act of bringing the campus together and challenging students and faculty to think about and act upon the challenges and opportunities that digital technologies are presenting to our American democracy is truly a noble pursuit that should continue.

Strengths, Weaknesses, & Future Research

The primary strength of this case study is that it addresses the most dynamic and important phenomenon in journalism and journalism education today—the rise of innovation, within and beyond the field's traditional boundaries. This thesis investigates this phenomenon through an examination of some of the leading J-Schools in the United States. To date, little

academic research has explored these innovation experiments and initiatives, and none has attempted a systematic study of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative. This thesis represents a holistic portrayal of an initiative that has implications for the future of journalism education, journalism's future, and thus the future of our democratic society.

This being said, by focusing only on member schools of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative, it makes it difficult to generalize too greatly, as with any case study. A study of the future of J-School innovation only begins with member schools of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative, and thus needs to include data on a greater set of J-Schools and the leaders at the those J-Schools in order to have real validity in explaining the present trends and predicting the future directions of journalism education. Even within this case study, there are weaknesses that limit its dependability and credibility. First, with a seemingly bottomless well of texts from which to choose, my analysis of the crisis facing journalism was inevitably limited to those I deemed most salient; others in my position might have drawn different conclusions about which texts to study, let alone how they ought to be interpreted. Secondly, because I limited the set of J-School leaders to be interviewed based on their membership in the prestigious Carnegie-Knight Initiative, the biases associated with which schools were invited to join the group of 12 member schools by Carnegie-Knight officials played a major role in this thesis. I decided to limit my study to member schools as a way to give more structure and "case study" rigor to my thesis, but others may have very well chosen a more of a blanket approach whereby more J-Schools could have been included in the study.

Taken as a whole, these weaknesses point to the need for further research. At the macro level, there remains much to be learned about the nature of innovation and entrepreneurship within J-School education. Exactly how, and under whose influence, is innovation being encouraged, underwritten, and enacted, across J-Schools at large, especially those that may not have had the benefit of millions of dollars of grant funding provided by the Carnegie and Knight Foundations? Among these less well funded programs, how is the professional- participatory tension being negotiated, and to what extent are innovation and entrepreneurship initiatives manifesting in relation to this tension? Does transformational change require millions of dollars of capital, or can it be achieved without external funding? To the extent that entrepreneurial journalism is becoming a new ethic, how are J-Schools seeking to define and teach this new ethic

to students? How is entrepreneurial journalism being defined by a broader sample of J-School leaders? To the extent that J-Schools are seeking to become campus leaders in interdisciplinary practices, how are actors from other fields perceiving and engaging with traditional notions of journalism practice? Are there similar perceptions held by these outside actors in regards to the future of journalism? Ultimately, these questions have to do with capturing a sense for how journalism and journalism education is changing, and what the disruption means for the future of American democracy and the American economy.

In regards to the more narrow (but no less important) question of the Carnegie-Knight Initiative specifically, there is more to be understood as the initiative continues—and as the innovative efforts that it has sparked continue into the near and distant future. To what extent has the Carnegie-Knight Initiative had a ripple effect on the other J-Schools both within and outside of the United States? What kind of success are graduates having in the marketplace compared to other students who didn't attend one of the Carnegie-Knight member schools? How do the alumni of member schools perceive their educational experiences?

Conclusion

"We study communication and we are in an environment where everything is upside down and inside out, and our task is to educate the next generation of people who are going to lead going forward, and we're not sure how to do that. So experiments are really important. Our view at the Annenberg School is that we either innovate or we die. Even Universities -- if we do not innovate, your University, whatever University you're at or came from will be irrelevant. So we've got to take big risks." – Ernest James Wilson III, Dean of the Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism at the University of Southern California

What I have argued in this thesis is that the *Carnegie-Knight Initiative on the Future of Journalism Education* has acted as a catalyst for change, and has sparked more interdisciplinary practices, innovative practices, and entrepreneurial practices at top US J-Schools. Although J-School leaders still believe in traditional professional ideology such as the role of journalist as the gatekeeper of public information, they are simultaneously seeking to create a modified rendering of journalism education, and thus, of journalistic practice. Top J-Schools are still committed to the professional ideals of journalism, even as they embrace new ethics and practices. It is evident based on this thesis that J-Schools are seeking to update themselves to

meet the new realities brought on by digital convergence and technological disruption, and that they are engaging in innovation and entrepreneurial activities, often in experimental and unique ways. What is common across the board is a trend towards interdisciplinary practice whereby the J-School becomes the campus hub of digital innovation – the port-of-call where the cross-pollination of ideas and knowledge fields can thrive. In addition, a key trend is the tearing down of silos and traditional curricula, combined with the creation of new curricula that represent the realities of convergence. Throughout the experimentation and innovation initiatives taking place at top J-Schools, there is a common theme that points towards the emergence of a new entrepreneurial ethic of journalism practice. This ethic suggests that the journalism graduates of tomorrow should understand more about how to sustain their profession from a business perspective, and also that they should understand more about how to work in a team with computer scientists to build the digital tools of the future. Moreover, this entrepreneurial journalism ethic also suggests the need of graduates to build and maintain a personal brand that is better suited to take advantage of opportunities presented by niche channels and the long tail of niche content verticals. Entrepreneurial journalism, at its roots, seems to be concerned primarily with leadership training, and better equipping graduates to identify and capitalize on the opportunities presented by disruptive change.

It is evident that the profession of journalism, so much that it is looked upon as the fourth branch of American democracy, needs to retain a sense of stability and traditional moorings in uncertain times -- ethics such as truth seeking, objectivity, transparency, and public service; but, journalism also needs something radically new—a spark of innovation to enliven a professional field that has lost its way. This spark seems most likely to come from a new generation of J-School graduates who are better prepared for change, and better positioned to seize upon the opportunities associated with disruptive times – thus, J-Schools should not be graduating nine to fiver hacks, but rather, they should be graduating innovative change makers and entrepreneurial leaders who take charge of the future.

I became interested in studying J-School innovation practices precisely because, collectively, they represented the future of journalism, and the Carnegie-Knight Initiative represented the most prominent and organized effort to challenge J-Schools' outdated methods and ideologies. In an effort to be transparent, I will disclose that I am keenly aware of my

strengths as a person. I participated in a seminar produced by the Gallup organization called StrengthsFinder, whereby a Gallup consultant along with a lengthy assessment help you to identify your unique strengths, and how those strengths relate to the strengths of others. My foremost strength is related to futurism, and my second foremost strength is related to command. I am inspired by future possibilities, and I seek to inspire others with my visions of the future, and act in a way that makes those visions a reality. Because the Carnegie-Knight Initiative constituted the construction of the future of journalism education, I was interested in assessing what this innovation movement signaled about the future of the J-School. This interest came not only from my interest in the future, but also from my desire to help build a better future for J-Schools. My purpose in writing this thesis is to leave a guidestone for current and future educators, so that the future may be better than the past. My interest in writing this thesis is directly connected to my personal experience -- having graduated with an undergraduate degree in Journalism from the University of Georgia in 2005 – the same year that the Carnegie-Knight Initiative sprang to life. I was keenly aware of the failings of J-School practices. Similar to a kid in Sunday school asking questions that could not be answered, and eventually losing faith in the church altogether. Why was I only learning about shooting video that would be broadcast on TV and no other medium? Why wasn't I learning how to produce news for the web? Why wasn't I getting any training in business even though the best paying jobs after graduation were in the advertising side of the news? Why wasn't I learning about the software programs that I'd be required to use out in the real world? Why wasn't I allowed to start my journalism training as a Freshman even though I enrolled at UGA precisely because of the high reputation of the J-School? Why wasn't I getting an opportunity to practice the long-form of documentary production, even though all of my internships that I got during college were in documentary production? Why didn't I get any training in public relations or magazine writing or advertising even though my diploma said "mass communications?"

As an undergraduate, I found myself having to build a kind of interdisciplinary curriculum for myself, often fighting bureaucracies to get in certain classes. I went and got a certificate in Leadership from the Terry College of Business, and because I did this, my graduation had to be postponed by an entire year. I took screenwriting courses to get better at long form production – and I took screenwriting courses not only in the J-School, but in the department of English and the Drama department as well. After graduation I discovered that my

interest in working for a technology company such as Facebook, Google, or Twitter was not served by my journalism degree whatsoever, even though these companies were driving the future of journalism and mass communications. My five year degree in journalism was practically worthless in the eyes of these companies, and I was told by most of them that they didn't have a need for anyone with my experience because they didn't have TV stations. All of this personal experience is a part of why this thesis came to be, and indeed, I cannot separate myself and who I am from this investigation so much as a reporter cannot separate themselves from a crime story that has impacted their personal life. I believe in seeking objectivity, but I believe that objectivity as a principle is impossible without transparency, and with transparency, there can be no true objectivity – only the pursuit of it will remain, and this is what I have attempted to provide herein.

My inquiry began with this question: How are J-Schools seeking to get better at serving their students and equipping them for the realities of the real world? The answer is complicated but, on the whole, encouraging – but I'm typically an optimist. I'm happy that some of the leading non-profit foundations in the world look at the crisis in journalism with a similar despair, and with a similar desire to build a better future than the inevitabilities associated with doing nothing. I'm also glad that these powerful non-profit entities noticed the failings of the modern J-School, and thought it necessary to pour millions upon millions of dollars into improving the system I truly hope that this reform movement continues – alas, it must continue.

I'll conclude with a parable: Journalism, as a profession, is like a lighthouse stationed prominently upon the rocky cliffs of our democratic society. Over time, the lighthouse has been battered and beaten by gale-force winds and hail storms which have weathered and eroded the outside layers of the structure – the salty waves of change have crashed open the glass windows and smashed out the fresnel lenses and aerodrome beacons that shine out into the darkness; and so journalism stands – a ruinous martyr of past greatness, worthless to the new ships sailing in from the world of opportunity, their flashy new GPS systems guiding the way. This pillar of safety is not completely dead, however, and it still stands erect before the citizens and travelers of the harbor, to be looked for frantically in dark times when the fog is thick and chaos reigns. The lighthouse just needs an update, some maintenance and perhaps a new steward, but its foundation is still intact. Perhaps a new, younger steward will install stronger plexi-glass

windows, and perhaps dozens of harbor citizens volunteer part-time to install the improved "vega-light" systems powered by LED technology -- making the beacon brighter, automated, and more energy efficient. The old steward of the lighthouse may not trust these changes immediately, or the idea of a bunch of volunteers mucking up the stairwell as they come and go, but over time, as long as the purpose of the lighthouse (journalism) is being served, and as long as the foundational components (journalism ethics) stay strong, then the old steward will come to see the light as it were, and embrace the new generation's methods and tools as necessary improvements. The goal of the old steward is worthy: to save the integrity of the structure's intended purpose —in this case, an enduring commitment to truth-seeking, accuracy, fairness, and public service that forms the structural foundations of journalism. The new steward's purpose is also worthy – replacing broken parts with updated versions that work better and operate more efficiently. This purging and rebuilding, in turn, allows the lighthouse to operate again, and to operate at an increased capacity in a way that better serves the harbor community. The destruction brought on by the winds of time thus leads to a better creation.

This parable isn't perfect, but it captures what I believe is the most heartening element of this innovation moment – synthesis; the notion of preserving certain ethical principles while also making room for new norms—like entrepreneurship—to become integral parts of the profession. If journalism is to survive and thrive in the coming years, it will have to integrate the conflicting impulses of tradition and innovation, letting both grow together and welcoming the service that they might bring to bear on the citizens of our great American harbor. Let us hope that journalism continues to exist as a lighthouse on the salty seas of change, for without it, we will succumb to darkness, and lose the path upon which our forefathers so valiantly journeyed into the future.

REFERENCES

[1] Heyer, Paul. *Harold Innis*. Lanham, Md: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc, 2003, p.30.

[2] Innis, Harold. *The Bias of Communication*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1951, p. 87.

[3] Innis, Harold. *Changing Concepts of Time*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1952, p. 15.

[4] Tim Wu, "In the Grip of the New Monopolists." *Wall Street Journal, November 13, 2010, accessed November 15, 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704635704575604993311538482.html.*

[5] Peter Dahlgren, 2002, The public sphere as historical narrative, McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication, edited by D McQuail (London: Sage), P. 195

[6] Harold Innis, 1950. *A Plea for Time*. University of New Brunswick, 1950.

[7] Tyler Marshall, 2008, The Changing Newsroom: What is Being Gained and What is Being Lost in America's Daily Newspapers?, Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence In Journalism, p. 1

[8] Heinz Eulau, 1980, The Columbia Studies of Personal Influence: Social Network Analysis, Social Science History (Vol. 4, No. 2, p. 225)

[9] Jay G. Blumler and Wolfgang Hoffmann-Reim, 2002, New roles for public service television, McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication, edited by D McQuail (London: Sage), P. 206

[10] Carl Jung, 1921, Psychological types. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

[11] Jensen, Peter S., Mrazek, David, Knapp, Penelope K., Steinberg, Laurence, Pfeffer, Cynthia, Schowalter, John, & Shapiro, Theodore, 1997, Evolution and revolution in child psychiatry: ADHD as a disorder of adaptation. (attention-deficit hyperactivity syndrome). Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. 36. P. 1672.

[12] Joseph Schumpeter, Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy (New York: Harper, 1975 [orig. pub 1942], pp. 82-85)

[13] Paul Stamets, 2005. *Mycelium Running: How Mushrooms Can Help Save the World.* Ten Speed Press, California.

[14] The Communist Manifesto

[15] Peter Gelderloos, 'The Fourth Branch of Government: Corporate Media Complicity from Miami to Iraq', *Eat The State* Vol 8, #8 (December 17 2003)

[16] Jay G. Blumler and Wolfgang Hoffmann-Reim, 2002, New roles for public service television, McQuail's Reader in Mass Communication, edited by D McQuail (London: Sage), P. 206

[17] Chris Anderson, 2004. "The long tail." *Wired Magazine* 12 (10). Available:http://www.wired.com/wired/archive/12.10/tail.html
[18] Lundstrom, M. (2003). Moore's law forever? *Science, 299*(5604), 210.

[19] Chris Anderson, 2008. "Free! Why $0 Is the Future of Business." Wired Magazine 16 (03). Available: http://www.wired.com/techbiz/it/magazine/16-03/ff_free

[20] Stephen Baker, 2008, The Numerati, (New York: Houghton Mifflin Co), pp. 1-7

[21] Peace of justice roosevelt's ideal.(1905, Mar 5). *New York Times (1857-Current File),* pp. 4.

[22] Mensing, Donica. 2010. RETHINKING [AGAIN] THE FUTURE OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION. Journalism Studies. 11(4):511-523. < http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/14616701003638376 >. (accessed 12 October 2010).
[23] CBS News, "Newspapers' Woes Worsening," CBS News, March 6 2009, accessed Septtember 28, 2011, http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2009/02/28/earlyshow/main4835656.shtml

[24] Mensing, Donica. 2010. RETHINKING [AGAIN] THE FUTURE OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION. Journalism Studies. 11(4):511-523. < http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/14616701003638376 >. (accessed 12 October 2010).

[25] Gaunt, Philip. *Making the Newsmakers: international handbook on journalism training.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1992.

[26] O'Dell, DeForest. *The History of Journalism Education in the United States.* New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1935.

[27] Sutton, Albert. *Education for Journalism in the United States from its Beginning to 1940.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, 1945.

[28] Weinberg, Steve. A Journalism of Humanity: a candid history of the world's first journalism school. Columbia: University of Missouri Press, 2008.

[29] http://www.paleycenter.org/carnegie-entepreneurial-journalism, 11:00 into video

[30] Nicholas Carlson, "Hacks Into Hackers,"New York Times, September 16, 2010, accessed October 21, 2010, <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/09/19/magazine/19Essays-HigherEd-t.html?scp=2&sq=&st=nyt>

[31] "Expansion of Carnegie-Knight Initiative Seeks to Transform Journalism Education in U.S.," Knight Foundation press release, July 7 2008, on Knight website, http://www.knightfoundation.org/press-room/press-release/expansion-of-carnegie-knight-initiative-seeks-to/, accessed September 2011

[32] DiMaggio, P.J. (1988). Interest and agency in institutional theory. In L. Zucker (Ed.), *Institutional patterns and organizations* (pp. 3–22). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

[33] Selznick, P. (1949). *TVA and the grass roots.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

[34] Selznick, P. (1957). *Leadership in administration.* Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.

[35] Hardy, C., & Maguire, S. (2008). Institutional entrepreneurship. In R. Greenwood, C. Oliver, R. Suddaby, & K. Shalin-Anderson (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational institutionalism* (pp. 198–217). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[36] Picard, Robert G. June 4, 2009. "The End of Journalism?" *The Media Business*, < http://themediabusiness.blogspot.com/2009/06/end-of-journalism.html>

[37] Macdonald, Isabel. 2006. Teaching journalists to save the profession. *Journalism Studies* 7 (5) (10): 745-64.

[38] Freidson, E. (2001). *Professionalism: The third logic.* Cambridge, UK: Polity. P. 179

[39] Downie, L. & Schudson, M. (2009). *The reconstruction of American journalism*. New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.

[40] Deuze, M. (2008b). Understanding journalism as newswork: How it changes, and how it remains the same. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, 5(2), p.21.

[41] Boczkowski, P. J. (2004). *Digitizing the news: Innovation in online newspapers.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[42] Singer, J. B. (2005). The political j-blogger: 'Normalizing' a new media form to fit old norms and practices. *Journalism*, 6(2), 173-198.

[43] Williams, A., Wardle, C., & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2010). "Have they got news for us?" Audience revolution or business as usual at the BBC? *Journalism Practice.*

[44] Zelizer, Barbie. *Taking Journalism Seriously: news and the academy*. Thoudand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.

[45] Zelizer, Barbie. *The Changing Faces of Journalism: tabloidization, technology and truthiness*. "Introduction: why journalism's changing faces matter." NY: Routeledge, pp. 1-10, 2009.

[46] McLuhan, Marshall (1962). *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man* (1st ed.). University of Toronto Press.

[47] Rheingold, Howard (2002). *Smart Mobs: The next social revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus Publishing.

[48] Garreau, Joel (2004). *Radical Evolution: The Promise and Peril of Enhancing Our Minds, Our Bodies – and What it Means to Be Human.* New York: Doubleday, p. 251.

[49] James W. Carey, "The Chicago School and the History of Mass Communication Research," in *James Carey: A Critical Reader*, edited by Eve Stryker Munson and Catherine A. Warren (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1997),p. 28.

[50] Castells, M. (2007). Communication, power and counter-power in the network society. *International Journal of Communication*, *1*(1), 238-266.

[51] Picard, Robert G. June 4, 2009. "The End of Journalism?" *The Media Business*, < http://themediabusiness.blogspot.com/2009/06/end-of-journalism.html>

[52] Robinson, S. (2007). "Someone's gotta be in control here": The institutionalization of online news and the creation of a shared journalistic authority. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 305-321.

[53] Anderson, C. (2008a). Journalism: Expertise, authority, and power in democratic life. In D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The media and social theory.* (pp. 248- 64). New York: Routledge.

[54] Shoemaker, P. J. & Vos, T. P. (2009). *Gatekeeping theory.* New York: Routledge.

[55] Tim Wu, "In the Grip of the New Monopolists." *Wall Street Journal, November 13, 2010, accessed November 15, 2010, http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052748704635704575604993311538482.html.*

[56] Benjamin Rush, *Address to the People of the Unietd States* (1787), *available at* http://teachingamericanhistory.org/library/index.asp?document=1779.

[57] Picard, Robert G. March, 17 2010. "News Has Never Been a Commercially Viable Product" *The Media Business*, < http://themediabusiness.blogspot.com/2010/03/news-has-never-been-commercially-viable.html>

[58] http://www.ftc.gov/opp/workshops/news/jun15/docs/new-staff-discussion.pdf

[59] Bruns, A. *Blogs, Wikipedia, Second Life, and beyond: From production to produsage.* New York: Peter Lang, 2008.

[60] Carlson, M. (2007). Blogs and journalistic authority: The role of blogs in US election day 2004 coverage. *Journalism Studies*, *8*(2), 264-279.

[61] Deuze, M. (2009). The future of citizen journalism. In S. Allan & E. Thorsen (Eds.), *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives.* (pp. 255-64). New York: Peter Lang.

[62] Deuze, M., Bruns, A., & Neuberger, C. (2007). Preparing for an age of participatory news. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 322-338.

[63] Domingo, D. & Heinonen, A. (2008). Weblogs and journalism: A typology to explore the blurring boundaries. *Nordicom Review*, *29*(1), 3-15.

[64] Domingo, D., Quandt, T., Heinonen, A., Paulussen, S., Singer, J. B., & Vujnovic, M. (2008). Participatory journalism practices in the media and beyond: An international comparative study of initiatives in online newspapers. *Journalism Practice*, *2*(3), 326-342.

[65] Hermida, A. & Thurman, N. (2008). A clash of cultures: The integration of usergenerated content within professional journalistic frameworks at British newspaper websites. *Journalism Practice*, *2*(3), 343-356.

[66] Kern, T. & Nam, S. -H. (2009). The making of a social movement: Citizen journalism in South Korea. *Current Sociology*, *57*(5), 637.

[67] Lewis, S. C., Kaufhold, K., & Lasorsa, D. L. (2010). Thinking about citizen journalism: The philosophical and practical challenges of user-generated content for community newspapers. *Journalism Practice*, *4*(2), 163-179.

[68] Mitchelstein, E. & Boczkowski, P. J. (2009). Between tradition and change: A review of recent research on online news production. *Journalism*, *10*(5), 562.

[69] O'Sullivan, J. & Heinonen, A. (2008). Old values, new media: Journalism role perceptions in a changing world. *Journalism Practice*, *2*(3), 357-371.

[70] Robinson, S. (2006). The mission of the j-blog: Recapturing journalistic authority online. *Journalism*, *7*(1), 65-83.

[71] Robinson, S. (2010). Traditionalists vs. Convergers: Textual privilege, boundary work, and the journalist-audience relationship in the commenting policies of online news sites. *Convergence*, *16*(1), 125-143.

[72] Singer, J. B. & Ashman, I. (2009b). User-Generated content and journalistic values. In S. Allan & E. Thorsen (Eds.), *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives.* (pp. 233-42). New York: Peter Lang.

[73] Singer, J. B. (2007). Contested autonomy: Professional and popular claims on journalistic norms. *Journalism Studies*, *8*(1), 79-95.

[74] Singer, J. B. (2010). Quality control: Perceived effects of user-generated content on newsroom norms, values and routines. *Journalism Practice*, *4*(2), 127-142.

[75] Thurman, N. & Lupton, B. (2008). Convergence calls: Multimedia storytelling at British news websites. *Convergence: The Journal of Research Into New Media Technologies*, *14*(4), 439-455.

[76] Thurman, N. (2008). Forums for citizen journalists? Adoption of user generated content initiatives by online news media. *New Media & Society*, *10*(1), 139-157.

[77] Singer, J. B. & Ashman, I. (2009b). User-Generated content and journalistic values. In S. Allan & E. Thorsen (Eds.), *Citizen journalism: Global perspectives.* (pp. 233-42). New York: Peter Lang.

[78] Downie, L. & Schudson, M. *The reconstruction of American journalism*. New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism, 2009.

[79] Anderson, C. W. *Breaking journalism down: Work, authority, and networking local news, 1997-2009.* Dissertation, New York: Columbia University, 2009.

[80] Compton, J. R. & Benedetti, P. Labour, new media and the institutional restructuring of journalism. *Journalism Studies, 11*(4), 487-499, 2010.

[81] Franklin, B. (2008). The future of newspapers. *Journalism Studies*, *9*(5), 630-641.

[82] Meyer, P. (2009). *The vanishing newspaper: Saving journalism in the information age* (2nd ed.). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

[83] Singer, J. B. (2008a). Five Ws and an H: Digital challenges in newspaper newsrooms and boardrooms. *International Journal on Media Management*, *10*(3), 122-129.

[84] Thurman, N. & Myllylahti, M. (2009). Taking the paper out of news: A case study of Taloussanomat, Europe's first online-only newspaper. *Journalism Studies*, *10*(5), 691-708.

[85] Jones, A. S. (2009). *Losing the news: The future of the news that feeds democracy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

[86] Meyer, P. (2009). *The vanishing newspaper: Saving journalism in the information age* (2nd ed.). Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press.

[87] P. Aghion and P. Howitt, "A Schumpeterian perspective on growth and competition," In: *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory & Applications*, Kreps, D. M. and Wallis, K. F., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, vol. 2, pp. 279–319, 1997. < http://www.cdhowe.org/pdf/commentary_246.pdf>

[88] James W. Carey, "The Chicago School and the History of Mass Communication Research," in *James Carey: A Critical Reader*, edited by Eve Stryker Munson and Catherine A. Warren (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 35.

[89] John Dewy to Alice Chipman Dewey and children, November 1,1894, John Dewey Papers.

[90] Menand, L. (2001) The Metaphysical Club: A Story of Ideas in America, New York, USA: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

[91] James W. Carey, "The Chicago School and the History of Mass Communication Research," in *James Carey: A Critical Reader*, edited by Eve Stryker Munson and Catherine A. Warren (Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), p. 36.

[92] Dewey, John. (1927). *The Public and its Problems*. New York: Holt, p. 144.

[93] Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism and Mass Communications (1994) ACEJMC Mission Statement, 6 May, <http://www2.ku.edu/~acejmc/PROGRAM/mission.shtml>. (accessed 12 October 2010).

[94] Mensing, Donica. 2010. RETHINKING [AGAIN] THE FUTURE OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION. Journalism Studies. 11(4):511-523. < http://www.informaworld.com/10.1080/14616701003638376 >. (accessed 12 October 2010).

[95] Becker, Lee B., Fruit, Jeffrey and Caudill, Susan. *The training and Hiring of Journalists*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing, 1987, p.19.

[96] Becker, L. B. (2005). Enrollment growth rate slows; Field's focus on undergraduate education at odds with university setting. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 60 (3), 286-314.

[97] Weaver, David H., Beam, Randal A., Brownlee, Bonnie J., Voakes, Paul S. And Wilhoit, G. Cleveland. *The American Journalist in the 21st Century* , Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 2006.

[98] Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education: an introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1916, p.5

[99] Rheingold, Howard. *The Virtual Community: homesteading on the electronic frontier*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1993.

[100] Fallows, James. *Breaking the News: how the media undermine American democracy*. New York: Vintage Books, 1997.

[101] Kovach, Bill and Rosenstiel, Tom. *The Elements of Journalism*. New York: Crown Publishers, 2001.

[102] Beckett, Charlie. *SuperMedia: saving journalism so it can save the world*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

[103] Zelizer, Barbie. *Taking Journalism Seriously: news and the academy*. Thoudand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2004.

[104] Zelizer, Barbie. *The Changing Faces of Journalism: tabloidization, technology and truthiness*. "Introduction: why journalism's changing faces matter." NY: Routeledge, pp. 1-10, 2009.

[105] BaraBasi, Albert-Laszlo. Linked: how everything is connected to everything else. New York: Plume, 2003.

[106] Beckett, Charlie. *SuperMedia: saving journalism so it can save the world*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008.

[107] Castells, Manuel. *The Rise of the Network Society*, Vol. 1, 2nd edn. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2000.

[108] Jarvis, Jeff. 2006. "Networked Journalism," Buzzmachine, 5 July, <http://www.buzzmachine.com/2006/07/05/networked-journalism/>. (accessed 13 October 2010).

[109] Halligan, Brian and Shah, Dharmesh. *Inbound Marketing: Get Found Using Google, Social Media, and Blogs*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2009.

[110] Zelizer, Barbie. *The Changing Faces of Journalism: tabloidization, technology and truthiness*. "Introduction: why journalism's changing faces matter." NY: Routeledge, pp. 1-10, 2009

[111] Romer, Paul. 2010. *Economic Growth*. The Concise Encyclopedia of Economics. http://www.econlib.org/library/Enc/EconomicGrowth.html. (accessed 28 October 2010)

[112] "Every Problem is an Oppurtunity, Entrepreneurial Thought Leader Seminar," accessed October 20, 2010,
< http://ecorner.stanford.edu/authorMaterialInfo.html?mid=1464>

[113] Auletta, K. (2005). Whom do journalists work for? Red Smith Lecture in Journalism, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana.

[114] Beam, R. (1990). Journalism professionalism as an organization-level concept. *Journalism and Mass Communication Monographs*, *121*(June).

[115] Shirky, C. *Here comes everybody: The power of organizing without organizations.* New York: Penguin Press, 2008, p.58.

[116] DICKSON, TOM (2000) Mass Media Education in Transition: preparing for the 21st century , Mahwah,
NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. p.1.

[117] O'Dell, D. (1935). *The history of journalism education in the United States*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, p.1.

[118] Mirando, J.A. (1995, August). *The first college journalism students: Answering Robert E. Lee's offer of a higher education.* Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC, p.4.

[119] Hoskins, R.L. (1988, July). *A new accreditation problem: Defining the liberal arts and sciences.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Portland, OR.

[120] DICKSON, TOM (2000) Mass Media Education in Transition: preparing for the 21st century , Mahwah,
NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. p.4.

[121] Mirando, J.A. (1995, August). *The first college journalism students: Answering Robert E. Lee's offer of a higher education.* Paper presented at the convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, DC, p.8-9.

[122] O'Dell, D. (1935). *The history of journalism education in the United States*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, p.1.

[123] Steiner, L. (1994). Career guidance books assess the value of journalism education. Journalism Educator, 49(1), 49-58.

[124] DICKSON, TOM (2000) Mass Media Education in Transition: preparing for the 21st century , Mahwah,
NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. p.7.

[125] Carey, J. W. (1978). A plea for the university tradition. Journalism Quaterly, 55(4), 846-855

[126] Dennis, E. E. (1988). Whatever happened to Marse Rober's dream? Gannett Center Journal, 2, p.11.

[127] Lee, M. L. (1918). *Instruction in journalism in institutions o fhigher education*. (U.S. Bulletin No. 21). Washington, DC: Department of Interior, Bureau of Education.

[128] O'Dell, D. (1935). *The history of journalism education in the United States*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

[129] Williams, S.L. (1929). *Twenty years of journalism education: A history of the School of Journalism of the University of Missouri.* Columbia, MO: E. W. Stephens Publishing Co.

[130] DICKSON, TOM (2000) Mass Media Education in Transition: preparing for the 21st century , Mahwah,
NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. p.17.

[131] Carey, J. W. (1978). A plea for the university tradition. Journalism Quaterly, 55(4), 847-848.

[132] O'Dell, D. (1935). *The history of journalism education in the United States*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, p. 71.

[133] DICKSON, TOM (2000) Mass Media Education in Transition: preparing for the 21st century , Mahwah,
NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. p.21.

[134] Bleyer, W.G., (1931). *What schools of journalism are trying to do*. Journalism Quarterly, 8, p43.

[135] Johnson, E. M. (1930). What of the future of instruction in journalism? Journalism Quarterly, 7(1), p.31.

[136] Carnegie, Andrew. (1915). *A Carnegie Anthology.* Arranged by Margaret B. Wilson. New York: Privately Printed. p. 110.

[137] Vartan Gregorian, "A Way Forward." Presented at a Carnegie-Knight Forum on Solving the Challenges of the News Frontier, February 10 -12, 2010.

[138] McKinsey and Company. "Improving the Education of Tommorow's Journalists," Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2005. http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/Exec_Sum_Journalism.pdf, accessed September 2011.

[139] McKinsey and Company. "Improving the Education of Tommorow's Journalists," Carnegie Corporation of New York, 2005. http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/PDF/Exec_Sum_Journalism.pdf, accessed September 2011.

[140] "Expansion of Carnegie-Knight Initiative Seeks to Transform Journalism Education in U.S.," Knight Foundation press release, July 7 2008, on Knight website, http://www.knightfoundation.org/press-room/press-release/expansion-of-carnegie-knight-initiative-seeks-to/, accessed September 2011

[141] Newton, Eric. 2011. "Eric Newton: Journalism schools can be leaders in innovation and the news," Nieman Lab, October 6. < http://www.niemanlab.org/2011/10/eric-newton-journalism-schools-can-be-leaders-in-innovation-and-the-news/> Accessed November 4, 2011.

[142] "Expansion of Carnegie-Knight Initiative Seeks to Transform Journalism Education in U.S.," Knight Foundation press release, July 7 2008, on Knight website, http://www.knightfoundation.org/press-room/press-release/expansion-of-carnegie-knight-initiative-seeks-to/, accessed September 2011

[143] Gregorian, Vartan. Introduction. In: Gorney, Cynthia (ed.): The Business of News: A Challenge for Journalism's Next Generation. A Report of Carnegie Corporation of New York. pp. v-xi.

[144] "A Manifesto," Knight Foundation press release June 14, on the News21 website, http://news21.com/initiative/the-carnegie-knight-task-force/a-manifesto/, accessed September 2011.

[145] "History About the Knight Foundation," http://www.knightfoundation.org/about/history/, accessed September 2011.

[146] See http://www.knightfdn.org/about_knight/

[147] Anheier, H. K. & Leat, D. (2006). *Creative philanthropy: Toward a new philanthropy for the twenty-first century*. New York: Routledge.

[148] Dowie, M. (2002). *American foundations: An investigative history*. The MIT Press.p. 248.

[149] Frumkin, P. (2006). *Strategic giving: The art and science of philanthropy*. University of Chicago Press.

[150] Fleishman, J. (2009). *The foundation: A great American secret; how private wealth is changing the world.* Public Affairs.

[151] Lindlof, Thomas R. (1995), Qualitative Communication Research Methods, London: Sage.

[152] Lindlof, Thomas R. (1995), Qualitative Communication Research Methods, London: Sage, p.23.

[153] Kreps, G.L., & Herndon, S.L. (2001). Introduction: The power of qualitative research to address organizational issues. In S.L. Herndon & G.L. Kreps (Eds.), Qualitative research: Applications in organizational communication (p. 1-9). Cresskill, NJ: Hampton.

[154] Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (2000). Introduction. In N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), Handbook of qualitative research (2nd ed, pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[155] Lindlof, Thomas R. (1995), Qualitative Communication Research Methods, London: Sage, p. 47.

[156] Newman, I. & Benz, C. R. (1998). *Qualitative-Quantitative research methodology: Exploring the interactive continuum.* Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

[157] Stake, R. E. (2003). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* (pp. 134-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, p. 135.

[158] Haas, T. (2004). Qualitative case study methods in newsroom research and reporting: The case of the Akron Beacon Journal. In S. H. Iorio (Ed.), *Qualitative research in journalism: Taking it to the streets.* (pp. 539-73). Mahwah, NJ: Routledge.

[159] Yin, R. K. (2008). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, p.18.

[160] Stake, R. E. (2003). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry.* (pp. 134-64). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, p. 136.

[161] Lindlof, T. R. & Taylor, B. C. (2002). *Qualitative communication research methods.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[162] Robinson, S. (2007). "Someone's gotta be in control here": The institutionalization of online news and the creation of a shared journalistic authority. *Journalism Practice*, *1*(3), 305-321.

[163] Deuze, M. (2005). Popular journalism and professional ideology: Tabloid reporters and editors speak out. *Media, Culture & Society*, *27*(6), 861-882.

[164] Hermida, A. & Thurman, N. (2008). A clash of cultures: The integration of usergenerated content within professional journalistic frameworks at British newspaper websites. *Journalism Practice, 2*(3), 343-356.

[165] Downie, L. & Schudson, M. (2009). *The reconstruction of American journalism*. New York: Columbia University Graduate School of Journalism.

[166] Massing, M. (2009). A new horizon for the news. *New York Review of Books*, *56*(14). Retrieved December, 2010, from http://www.nybooks.com/articles/23050.

[167] Nelson, A. (2009, October 28). *Experimentation and evolution in private U.S. Funding of media development*. Center for International Media Assistance, a project of the National Endowment for Democracy.

[168] Osnos, P. (2010, May 4). Non-Profit news: How start-ups can pave the way. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved October 22, 2010, from http://www.theatlantic.com/culture/archive/2010/05/non-profit-news-how-startups-can-pay-their-way/56121/.

[169] Wilhelm, I. (2009). Knight of the newsroom. *Chronicle of Philanthropy*, *21*(19), 2.

[170] Abbott, A. D. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[171] Newton, Eric. 2011. "Eric Newton: Journalism schools can be leaders in innovation and the news," Nieman Lab, October 6. < http://www.niemanlab.org/2011/10/eric-newton-journalism-schools-can-be-leaders-in-innovation-and-the-news/> Accessed November 4, 2011.

[172] Glaisyer, Tom. (October 2011). "Shaping 21st Century Journalism: Leveraging a "Teaching Hospital Model" in Journalism Education." New America Foundation, < http://newamerica.net/sites/newamerica.net/files/policydocs/Shaping%2021st%20Century%20Journalism_1.pdf> Accessed November 4, 2011.

[173] Connel, Christopher. "News21: Are Next-Generation Journalists the Future of a Profession in Transition?". Carnegie Reporter, Fall 2009. < http://carnegie.org/fileadmin/Media/Publications/Reporter/PDF/carnegiereporter_v5n3.pdf> Accessed November 20, 2011.

[174] Deuze, M., Bruns, A., & Neuberger, C. (2007). Preparing for an age of participatory news. *Journalism Practice, 1(3),* 322-338.

[175] Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[176] Carey, J. W. (1987). The press and public discourse. *The Center Magazine, 20(2),* 4-16.

[177] Dewey, John. (1927). *The Public and its Problems*. New York: Holt, p. 144.

[178] Gardner, H., Csikszentmihalyi, M., & Damon, W. (2001). *Good work: When excellence and ethics meet.* New York: Basic Books.

[179] Abbott, A. D. (1988). *The system of professions: An essay on the division of expert labor.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

[180] Anderson, C. (2008). Journalism: Expertise, authority, and power in democratic life. In D. Hesmondhalgh & J. Toynbee (Eds.), *The media and social theory.* (pp. 248- 64). New York: Routledge.

APPENDIX A: Oral Consent Script and Interview Guide:

Hi, thanks for taking the time to meet with me today.
My name is Brinkley Warren and I would like to talk to you about your experiences as a leader in Academia at the _____X_____ College of Journalism & Mass Communications. Specifically, I am conducting a qualitative study on the transformation of the J-School.

The interview should take about an hour. I will be recording the session because I don't want to miss any of your comments. Although I will be taking some notes during the session, I can't possibly write fast enough to get it all down. Because we're recorded, please be sure to speak up so that we don't miss your comments. *Do I have your consent to record our conversation?*

Your participation in this qualitative in-depth structured interview is completely voluntary. You can refuse to participate or stop taking part at anytime without giving any reason, and without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. You can ask to have all of the information about you returned to you, removed from the research records, or destroyed. The purpose of the research is to understand how J-Schools are transforming themselves in an age of creative destruction and technological change, and if you agree to participate, I will ask you a series of qualitative questions about your leadership role at your university, change initiatives occurring there, and challenges that you're facing. I will ask you to express your opinion on a variety of subjects surrounding these issues. As a subject of this research study, you may benefit by **gaining insight and understanding into how J-schools and J-school educators are transforming themselves to maintain journalism education in the 21st century. As a subject of this research, you may benefit as a result of thinking about and talking about the research and interview questions, and also learning from the perspectives and approaches of other journalism educators and institutions.**
My hope is that the amalgamation of all of my interviews (with you and also other J-School leaders from around the country) can be recorded, archived, and eventually distributed freely on the Internet to better benefit current and future generations of Journalism scholars and educators. *No discomforts or stresses are expected. No risks are expected.*
If you would prefer, I can keep your comments confidential. However, ultimately this project seeks to understand leadership and organizational change management which involve individual actors and unique contexts, and in order to study various change efforts at public institutions, it is thus important to make the connection between the individual actors, the institutional initiatives, and the institutional environments under study. *Your identity and the results of this participation will be made public.*
Do you consent to allow me to conduct this interview in a public manner, and to make your answers publically available?

Are there any questions about what I have just explained? If you do have any questions about this study, please refer to the informational email that I'm sending you now. Have you received the email?

I will answer any further questions about the research, now or during the course of the project, and can be reached by telephone at 706-255-8920.

Do you understand the procedures that I've just described. Do you have any questions for me? Have your questions been answered to your satisfaction?

Are you willing to participate in this study and interview?
Additional questions or problems regarding your rights as a research participant should be addressed to The Chairperson, Institutional Review Board, University of Georgia, 629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center, Athens, Georgia 30602-0001; Telephone (706) 542-3199; E-Mail Address IRB@uga.edu
I will also email all of this information to you.
We will now begin the interview:

Interview Guide:

1. What is the purpose of a J-School?
2. What is the difference between journalism and public information?
3. How would you summarize the changes being faced by the journalism & mass communication industries?
4. Are these changes for the better or the worse?
5. What challenges are these changes presenting in regards to educating your students?
6. How is your J-School dealing with these challenges?
7. Can you tell me about your involvement with the Carnegie-Knight Initiative and what it has meant for your college?
8. What are the opportunities that your school is taking advantage of in regards to the Internet, the decline of newspapers, digital convergence, and participatory culture?
9. How would you define professionalism for one of your journalism students that will graduate four years from now?
10. How is this different from the definition of journalistic professionalism that you've taught in the past?
11. How do you see future journalism graduates reconciling the interplay between controlling news information and allowing unbounded citizen participation?
12. How is the participatory culture of the internet affecting the future of our democracy?
13. Do you use a track or sequence system at your school, where students must choose PR, Advertising, Telecom, Journalism, Magazines, etc.?

14. Is this track/sequence system still the best system? If so, why? If not, why not?
15. How could you re-orient this track system to meet current and future realities?
16. What are the hurldes to doing away with this system?
17. Do you think journalism is dying like some authors suggest?
18. Is your school experimenting with new methods of teaching and learning? If so, what?
19. How is your school managing change to keep up with the pace of professional change in the real-world?
20. What are the biggest hurdles that you and your colleagues face in regards to creating transformative change at your J-School?
21. Can you describe any projects or initiatives taking place at your school that you believe are helping to transform your J-School to meet the needs of current and future students?
    a. How did this project begin?
    b. What hurdles has the initiative faced?
    c. What are some of the goals of this initiative?
    d. What are the outcomes of the initiative so far?
    e. Would you say that the initiative is related to entrepreneurialism or entrepreneurship in any way?
        i. If so, how?
22. What areas of your J-School curriculum do you feel are outdated and need to be updated?
23. Should students be taught more about funding the news instead of just reporting it?
24. What should J-Schools be teaching today?
25. Should J-Schools be turning hacks into hackers and teaching more computer programming and technically focused curriculum?
26. Describe how your students will need to adapt to their professional realities after J-School?
27. Describe how your students will influence their professional realities after J-School?
28. Do you think that teaching entrepreneurship or providing entrepreneurial experiences for your students would be beneficial?
    a. If so, how?
29. What will J-School look like 10 years from now?
30. What are some of the most innovative efforts in J-School education that you've heard of or are familiar with?
31. If you could re-name your college, would you still call it "The XYZ College of Journalism & Mass Communications"? If not, what would you call it?
32. Is there anything more you would like to add?

Thank you for your time.