

## Stephen D. Reese

Living up to Wilbur Schramm's vision. Becoming a reflective practitioner as an educator means turning the same scholarly scrutiny upon our educational practice as we do on the subjects we study in our research. The attention paid to educational mission and practice in journalism education is an encouraging development over the last several years, and a necessary one if we are to make a case for journalism's place within the university. In a 1998 New York Times article, Vartan Gregorian of the Carnegie Corporation expressed the view that journalists should be the sense makers of the society and educated accordingly. Communication institution builder Wilbur Schramm has been quoted as saying he would "like to see the kind of School of Journalism that would be not as weak as itself, but as strong as the university..." (Medsger, 1996, p. 56).

Few educational reform issues are not touched upon in some way within journalism education: writing across the curriculum, experiential projectbased learning, service learning, and critical thinking, to name a few. Indeed, journalism is potentially a valuable model for a professionally and societally engaged field. Here we can have desirable interaction of bodies of knowledge and problems to be solved: "developing the liberal arts (reading, thinking, civic participation) in a context of application" (Reese & Cohen, 2000). Elsewhere I have discussed the many countervailing pressures our field is subject to, including the need to seek external funding and demands of the media professional constituencies (Reese, 1999). We need a strong "professionalism of scholarship" to cultivate a defining ethos in the face of these pressures.

Although more influential than its numbers, the profession j-schools feed is relatively small (about 122,000 fulltime English language mainstream U.S. journalists by one count - compared, for example, to some 185,000 pharmacists). By and large, journalism education is an undergraduate enterprise, feeding entry-level employees to an industry committed to a labor pyramid based on hiring from the lower levels. The tendency of many external critics is to limit the entire enterprise to professional skills training, specifically as needed within media organizations. But that, of course, is not the extent of what we are about. Thus, the justification for the enterprise must be found in other than the sheer impact from numbers of our graduates, especially considering their initial low status and income. There must be a larger motivating principle, to educate the future leaders of this profession - and on our part to speak to issues that provide guidance to the rest of the university community and to the profession in general.

The scholarly side of the mission also risks considerable drift. In 1941 Paul Lazarsfeld characterized two styles of research, which he termed "administrative" and "critical." These labels have been widely used and burdened with broader connotations, but the basic sense of them is still relevant. In administrative research, the cart is put before the horse; the

question of who wants to know is not primarily the scholar, but external interested parties. It is work for hire. In more recent years this attitude has so thoroughly penetrated our outlook that "who wants to know?" is no longer problematic. The tugs on the field on one side from the professional community needing trained practitioners, and on the other side from an academic, neo-administrative style, lead to symptoms of disconnect and fragmentation. Journalistic skills training gravitates to faculty with specific prior professional experiences in those skills, and "studies" courses (history, law, theory) toward those with the academic training and inclination, with the whole enterprise cut off from the larger university. This risks leaving a hollowed-out core, a no-man's land in our field where nothing of any great interest or importance goes on unless it is plugged up with something else.

As with any field, ours must confront the influence of what C. Wright Mills called the "bureaucratic ethos." I believe there is considerable value in organizing academic resources around the area of journalism. It keeps questions about the press and society front and center within the university. Although other disciplines venture into media issues, these issues are not central to their outlook as they are to ours. We assume that some synergy is found in organizing academic resources, that in establishing and labeling fields of study we energize and make explicit assumptions about worthy questions, methods of study, and, in the case of journalism, logical professional constituencies who can help.

Departments, however, can work against healthy intellectual work when they artificially demarcate an area of study and prevent fruitful interdisciplinary links from being established. Thus, the continuing great challenge lies in creating the synthesis that makes our combination more than a sum of its parts, finding educational routines that allow students and faculty to put it together. In a fundamental strategy to make this conglomeration of skills and concepts cohere, we have drawn our faculty from those trained within the field, which assures some degree of common outlook and an internally validating reference network. In obliging faculty to have advanced credentials and professional experience, we hope the result will be this melding. The risk, however, lies in getting neither the best scholars nor the best practitioner-teachers.

In journalism, we should seek scholars who are professional in Lee Shulman's (1994) sense: committed to important social ends, pursuing understanding through deep and systematic discovery, testing theory in the field, and reflecting upon practices within a community of peers. Although the Ph.D. is the surrogate measure for being able to do these things, I am prepared to accept, but not by definition, that professionals from the field can do these things too. The work recently carried out by Rosenstiel and Kovach (2001) as an outgrowth of the Committee for Concerned Journalists is a good case in point. Their discussion of the Elements of Journalism would fit very easily into and would enrich the university conversation.

Several years ago, there was much talk about making journalism more central to the university. But other than declaring it to be so, we need to continue to consider how to make it so. How do we connect our programs with the larger university? The field needs to be continually replenished by the best thinking from the practitioner field and around the university, and this may come in - for example - hiring faculty from allied fields prepared to make their career within a journalism home, team teaching across department boundaries, and special degree plans for non-majors. In my recent experience, proposed projects with the law school on a wrongful conviction project and with the college of education on media literacy training for high school teachers have attracted my attention as examples of fruitful links.

I wish I had cleaner answers to the problems we face as a field. My own thinking has changed over time as I try to find the right balance, and limited resources and energy often hamper innovation. Old habits die hard, and the same problems seem to keep getting recycled. But we have a fascinating field, which can connect in some way with just about any issue on campus and in public life. I would like to see it live up to Schramm's hope that the field be "as strong as the university."