



<http://www.diva-portal.org>

This is the published version of a chapter published in *Becoming a Journalist: Journalism Education in the Nordic Countries*.

Citation for the original published chapter:

Gardeström, E. (2016)

Educating Journalists: The Who, When, How, and Why of Early Journalism Programmes in the Nordic Countries.

In: Nygren, Hovden & Zilliacus-Tikkanen (ed.), *Becoming a Journalist: Journalism Education in the Nordic Countries* (pp. 25-37). Göteborg: Nordicom

N.B. When citing this work, cite the original published chapter.

Permanent link to this version:

<http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:sh:diva-31676>

# Educating Journalists

## *The Who, When, How, and Why of Early Journalism Programmes in the Nordic Countries*

Elin Gardeström

### Abstract

This article compares systems of journalism education in the Nordic countries, focusing on how education programmes for journalists first emerged. The theoretical perspective of the sociology of journalism education used by sociologist Margaret Archer, who views national educational systems as always being shaped through a struggle between interest groups. The questions are when education programmes for journalists were founded, who initiated them and how the process of founding schools and programmes progressed. In addition to these questions, the article discusses the emergence of journalism education in relation to the party press system and to the process of professionalisation. The respective developments of journalism education in the Nordic countries emerged in similar patterns. The apprentice system was, at first, combined with short courses arranged by press organisations, and then step-by-step replaced by journalism schools. In this process, the press organisations lost control over journalism education, even if they tried to maintain control through independent schools or through cooperation with universities. The mix of subjects in the journalist training curriculum has been discussed in all countries, centred on the balance between theoretical and vocational subjects.

**Keywords:** journalism education, apprentice system, sociology of journalism education, national educational systems, theory versus practice, history of education

### Introduction

For a long time, journalists managed without special training or education. The usual tale that is told is that the formal education of journalists was a key factor in the professionalization of a former trade, and education made journalism better (Pettersson, 2006: 305-348; Weibull, 1991: 176ff; Melin-Higgins, 1996: 9-15, 24, 127ff; Stuart, 2001: 2). But another tale is waiting to be told. What if we look at the emergence of journalism education from a different perspective, as a system emerging parallel to the expansion of the powerful print press? In this context, what various interest groups tried to shape journalism education in the past? This path of study has been described by Lee B. Becker as the sociology of journalism education, a perspective he believes to have

been neglected in the research on journalism education (Archer, 1984). The sociology of journalism education asks *who* initiated education programmes for journalists, *when* they were founded, and *how* the process of founding schools and programmes progressed (Becker, 2003). This article compares systems of journalism education, focusing on how education programmes for journalists first emerged in the Nordic countries. In addition to these questions about the emergence of Nordic journalism education, I discuss different answers to *why* journalism education emerged.

This theoretical perspective leans heavily on sociologist Margaret Archer, who views national educational systems as always being shaped through a struggle between interest groups. In this view, a long-term stable educational system is a sign of a prevailing group's long-term holding of power. One crucial difference between countries is whether various interest groups choose to build their own schools or try to influence the government to centrally create the education system they advocate. Archer argues that debates about "the ideal training" often serve to clarify the objectives of the group and to persuade others to share these goals. Archer also describes the change that takes place when a new educational collective takes control over an education, through a government takeover and becomes autonomous, independent from the various interest groups (Archer, 1984: 1-3). Her perspectives can apply to journalism education as well as a national educational system. In this view, journalism education can be analysed through how the institutions were shaped by an interplay of interest within a nation, or even an interplay of interest within a journalism education institution.

Journalism education has developed differently in the Nordic countries, despite the fact that they have similar media systems. My understanding of journalism education in Sweden derives from years of archival studies. My thesis *Training Journalists* (2011) analyses the interaction between various interests in Sweden when the existing apprenticeship system for the journalism profession was to be replaced by a formal journalism education programme (Gardeström, 2011). By contrast, my understanding of journalism education in the other Nordic countries is based exclusively on secondary sources. Thus, my treatment of journalism education in Norway, Denmark, Finland and Iceland is somewhat more tentative than my treatment of its emergence in Sweden.

In this article I give an overview of the origins of journalism education in Sweden, and will survey the emergence of similar programmes in other Nordic countries as recounted in the literature. I will proceed to compare these educational efforts, asking *who*, *when* and *how* questions. Finally, I will propose a tentative answer to the question of why journalism education was established, showing in the process how the history of journalism education can develop into an interesting field of research.

### In the beginning of the beginning

In the beginning of the 1900s a journalist could be an author, an agitator, a politician, a dropout from university, or almost any kind of male person. Wages and status were

low, forming a period in early journalism with a drunken romantic aura described to us by novels and seen in films. In Sweden there was a distinct difference between the average journalist and publishers who wrote editorials, had a university degree and sometimes held a chair in Parliament (Gardeström, 2011: 45-52).

In the early 1900s journalism was often seen as a talent, an aptitude some people had. Journalists and the press could be opposed to a formal education. Journalists in Sweden believed that the demand for a special education to enter the trade was an obstacle to freedom of speech and freedom of the press; it was only in totalitarian countries that a journalism education was obligatory (Desmond, 1949; Gardeström, 2011; Hultén, 2001; Jarlbrink, 2009: 208-214). Important questions about the past are: how was journalism developed, and how was the unruly first-generation journalist, using print technology to spread news and views, turned into a profession with its own educational programme? Was it the need of discipline, to “domesticate this unruly class, turn them into disciplined workers and end their flirtation with socialism and trade unions”, as James Carey (2000: 1) states, that served as the driving force for Pulitzer to establish a journalism education at Columbia University in 1903? Partisan journalism could be a problem even in the Nordic countries, where the tradition of a political press had a strong hold. The first Social Democrat leader in Sweden, Hjalmar Branting, also head editor of the daily *Social-Demokraten*, wanted to have a respectable newspaper. He had to argue with one of his young journalist/agitator adepts that describing an old church as a “used up sugar-barn” was not appropriate (Magnusson, 1939: 84).

For a long time, journalists managed on their own. Internationally, journalism programmes were first established in the United States and in many countries did not emerge until after the Second World War. At that time, journalism education became an issue within UNESCO: a substantial journalist training was seen as a tool to guarantee global freedom of information, to prevent propaganda in newspapers. The well trained objective journalist was to become a responsible source of news. The American model, with journalism programmes as part of universities, was presented as a good example. A UNESCO conference in 1956 established the existence of three different journalism education systems worldwide: the first at universities with the US as the leading role model; the second on-the-job training as in England, Belgium and Norway, where journalism education was controlled by the press organizations; and a third system, identified as a mix between the first two (Desmond, 1949; UNESCO, 1958).

The starting point in journalist training in all Nordic countries was short courses to support the apprentice system: young people were accepted as apprentices by newspapers at reduced wages for a couple of years. They were basically educated “on the job”, depending on helpful colleagues or simply fending for themselves. If they were lucky they could attend a course prior to or during their apprenticeship.

The facts differ as to when journalism education was established in the Nordic countries, depending on source and time of publication. In the 1940s a three-month course was considered a valid education, but this is no longer the case. I argue that the

scope of a proper journalism education must be considered in its historical context; we cannot apply today's standards of education to yesterday's programmes, as education as we know it was not available then.

An interesting Nordic aspect is that in the 1920s journalism education was considered a tool to unite Nordic culture. The organization Föreningen Norden, a forerunner to the Nordic Council, arranged courses for Nordic journalists from 1919, as part of their strategy to influence the press to write about Nordic matters. In 1936, at the initiative of the Swedish publisher Torgny Segerstedt, a committee was organized to start a Nordic journalism education programme, which Segerstedt believed to be crucial to cooperation between the Nordic countries. There was also a Nordic journalist training course at a folk high school in Sweden, and in 1957 the Nordic Council initiated a three-month, advanced training course for journalists in Aarhus, later named the Nordic Journalist Centre. Aarhus training courses played an important role later, especially in Iceland (UNESCO, 1958; Gudmundsson, 2009). But over the years all the Nordic countries saw the need for a national journalism education programme, instead of depending on a Nordic initiative (Gardeström, 2011; 47f; UNESCO, 1958; Gudmundsson, 2009: 152).

## Origins of journalism education in the Nordic countries

The traditional path to becoming a journalist was to start working as an apprentice, a volunteer, at a newspaper. In Sweden in 1946, there were early attempts to include a course in journalism within an academic degree at the College of Gothenburg in cooperation with local newspapers. Similar courses were arranged at the College of Stockholm during the 1950s. A private initiative in 1947, the Poppius School of Journalism, offered courses meant to prepare students for the obligatory two-year apprenticeship. Following the Second World War, a growing number of courses were developed for journalists that were run by different interests: political parties, private entrepreneurs, colleges and companies developing courses aimed at providing information to journalists.

The Swedish press organizations had a difficult time agreeing on a programme, and the issue was discussed for over 50 years. Although the apprentice system could not supply enough trained journalists to the labour market, the press organization continued to favour the existing system. Journalism was considered a trade to be learned "hands-on" and not in a school. After three internal reports, Sweden's press organizations finally reached an agreement and founded a journalism school run by the industry in 1959. Two factors forced them to end discussions and agree on an educational programme.

Firstly, as the universities had made plans to start journalism programmes, accordingly the press organizations had to agree in order to maintain control over how journalists were trained. Secondly, there was a huge demand for educated journalists as

the apprentice system was not working. A few years later, in 1962, journalism education was nationalized, although it was not integrated with the universities, which the press opposed. The press organizations' influence on journalism programmes continued, in part through their control over the selection of students and their representation on boards overseeing the programmes. However, the two national journalism schools were able to achieve a certain degree of independence, which was strengthened with radicalism of young people in the late 1960s. The journalism programmes held their autonomy until 1977 when they were integrated into the universities, a process that some members of the press organizations strongly opposed (Gardeström, 2011).

In Denmark the first three-month courses in journalism took place at Aarhus University in 1946, when the Aarhus University School of Journalism was founded as an independent institution in cooperation with the university and Danish press organizations (Gaunt, 1992: 53; Holm, 2013: 123). Courses were offered for young journalist apprentices, and subjects such as law and public administration were taught along with vocational courses. The school also offered continuing education courses for journalists with work experience. The initiative came from the university and Principal Troels Fink, who had in mind an academic journalism education (UNESCO, 1958: 54ff, 181f). Danish press organizations, the union and employers aligned, opposing the integration of journalism into the world of academia. In 1962 they succeeded in establishing the Danish School of Journalism, DSJ, as a private institution offering a six-month training course, which became a compulsory part of a three-year probationary period for new journalists. The press organizations helped finance DSJ until 1971, when it was taken over by the Danish government. It remained an independent institution, with representatives from the industry and the union on the school's board. The Danish School of Journalism dominated the field, as the sole provider of higher journalism education for many years. Discussions within DSJ were turbulent; the curriculum and institutional setup is described by Minke (2003) as a compromise between "professional hands-on supporters and educational reformists" (Minke, 2009: 112; Gaunt, 1992: 53f). In 1998 the monopoly on educating journalists in Denmark was broken, with Roskilde University and the University of Southern Denmark introducing their own programmes. Today the University of Southern Denmark has a bachelor's programme and two different master's programmes [kandidat-uddannelser], whereas Roskilde University has a programme at the master's level [kandidat-uddannelse].

In Finland, short courses for journalists were introduced in 1925 at the Civic College in Helsinki, from 1930 the School of Social Science, a semi-academic institution that primarily educated civil servants. The School offered three different degrees, one of them in newspaper journalism. A chair for a professor in journalism was established in 1947. In 1960 the School was upgraded and became the University of Tampere, and began offering an academic journalist programme and a vocational programme in 1966 (Salokangas, 2003: 8f). Courses in journalism in the Swedish language started in 1962 at the Swedish School of Social Science. All journalism programmes in Finland required a high school diploma, except the private initiative by the large newspaper

publisher Sanoma Company, which selected students for a practical course (Salokangas, 2009: 121f). The debate over journalism education took place within a number of state committees beginning in the late 1960s, when the political field engaged itself in how journalists were to be educated (Salokangas, 2003: 10f). Today in Finland, journalism programmes are located at three universities and a few polytechnics. Master degrees are offered in the Finnish language at two universities, the University of Tampere and the University of Jyväskylä. The journalism education in the Swedish language is offered within the Swedish School of Social Science (SSSS) at the University of Helsinki. Polytechnics in Helsinki (Haaga-Helia), Turku (the Turku University of Applied Sciences) and Oulu (the Oulu University of Applied Sciences) also have journalism programmes. (See Hujanen, Jaakkola, & Zilliacus-Tikkanen for more information on journalism education in Finland.)

In Norway, a ten-month course was established at the Journalist Academy in Oslo in 1951. This was an independent school founded by the press organizations. Despite its name, the course it offered was a highly practical training course for students with working experience, even though there was representation from the universities on its governing board. It was stated that journalism was not a science but rather a liberal profession which demanded general knowledge in a broad area, and teachers and lecturers were engaged from all sectors of society. Even the Norwegian Minister of Foreign Affairs held a lecture in foreign policy. The principal headmaster was Carl Just, formerly a teacher at the Norwegian School of Correspondence, where courses in journalism had been offered since 1943 (Just, 1958; UNESCO, 1958: 185ff; Gardeström, 2011: 140). The Journalist Academy was superseded in 1965 by the Norwegian School of Journalism, a state-financed school, independent from universities and in cooperation with the press organizations. In 1994 the school became an integrated part of Oslo University College. In 1971 a journalism programme was established at the Regional College of Volda (Katzen, 1975: 128; Gaut, 1992: 59). Bodø and Stavanger followed in 1987. A Christian Lutheran institution, Gimlekollen, established its school for journalism in 1981, and was approved as a full college in 1996. Later establishments include programmes at the old universities of Oslo and Bergen (the former in cooperation with its city's university college), one in Kautokeino for the indigenous Sami people, and others at a major business school and an international college – both of which later stopped offering their programmes (Bjørnsen, Hovden, & Ottosen 2009).

Iceland depended on other types of education for many years. Journalists could attend shorter courses at the Nordic Journalist Centre in Aarhus in Denmark, and university degrees in other subjects were considered adequate training. Journalism as a profession in need of education was not accepted until late in the twentieth century, due to the structure of Icelandic media whereby the journalistic field was connected to the political field for the longest period among the Nordic countries. At the end of 1970s the need for an education for journalists was discussed by the Icelandic Union of Journalists, which began supporting continuing education in the 1980s. A

university programme for journalists was developed at the University of Iceland in 1987, entitled “Practical Communication Studies”. This was a cooperation between the Icelandic Union of Journalists and the university, and vocational training at media companies was part of the programme. In Iceland, journalist training at the universities developed out of communication studies, which had been taught as part of the universities’ social studies programmes since 1970. In 2003 a mixed programme of journalism and communication studies was introduced at the University of Akureyri (Gudmundsson, 2009: 151-156).

## Comparing journalism education in the Nordic countries

### *When*

The question of when the first journalism education started in the Nordic countries poses in turn a second question: what can be considered a proper journalism education? In the beginning, political and economic interests could be involved in arranging courses aimed at influencing journalists. In the case of Sweden, there were courses for journalists run by different interests, for example political parties and an insurance company, which cannot be labelled journalism education (Gardeström, 2011: 50f). I initially argued that journalism education must be seen in the context of history, and we cannot rule out past educational efforts because they do not meet today’s standards. When comparing Nordic countries, if we disregard the length of the education, the workable premises chosen are: A) involvement of the press organizations, and B) involvement or founding of an academic or semi-academic institution.

Based on these premises, Finland was the first of the Nordic countries to establish an education. Organized courses began in 1925, at the College of Social Affairs. Denmark is second, with the joint initiative in Aarhus in 1946. Norway is third in 1951 and Sweden fourth, in 1959, even if it can be claimed that in 1946 the College of Gothenburg had integrated journalism education into an academic degree, in cooperation with local newspapers. Iceland is another story, establishing journalism education much later.

### *Who and how*

The respective developments of journalism education in the Nordic countries share some major features. Norwegian, Danish and Swedish press organizations had a major influence, founding independent institutes for journalist training. Finland’s journalist training started as part of the state-financed Civic College, which eventually became an academic institution. Iceland developed journalist training in the 1980s, in a different educational landscape, as part of a communication studies programme.

In Denmark and Sweden there was an ardent struggle over who was to rule over journalism education, the press or academia. In both countries, initiatives in the

1940s by universities to educate journalists backlashed; initiatives from a university were first accepted, then rejected. At first the battle was “won” by the press, as they managed to found their independent education institutes outside the university system while receiving government funding. As time went by and the educational systems developed and expanded in the post-war years, government agencies added journalist training to their responsibilities, and schools were nationalized. In Sweden the press organizations readily accepted the nationalization of journalism education in 1962, as they were having difficulty financing an independent institute for journalist training (Gardeström, 2011: 170). In Sweden, journalism education was integrated into the universities in 1977. The Norwegian Journalism School is part of the university system, but has a certain degree of autonomy. In Denmark in 2008 the oldest programme, at the Danish School of Journalism, became the Danish School of Media and Journalism, together with the Graphic School in Copenhagen. The new unit is an independent educational institution, but other university-based journalism programmes have developed.

At the beginning of the 1900s, irregular courses lasting one to two weeks were organized by the press organizations in all Nordic countries. After the Second World War, ambitions and the need for educated journalists grew and the courses became longer. Courses were organized through joint effort, and lasted several months: three months in Aarhus in 1946, ten months in Oslo in 1951, and 12 months in Sweden in 1959. It is important to note that work experience was required to attend these courses. Even in Finland, where journalism education was offered at Tampere University in 1966, journalist apprenticeship was required along with a high school diploma (Salokangas, 2003: 9). In Denmark, an apprentice had to work for two years before having access to a journalist course (UNESCO, 1958: 181). During the 1960-70s when journalism education in the Nordic countries became part of the national higher education system and became state-funded, the education was prolonged, but work experience was often required in order to apply to a journalist programme. In Sweden, this requirement was replaced by an internship included in the programme in 1967 (Gardeström, 2011: 201, 230f).

Also of note is that journalist training and education were to be discussed within state-appointed committees in Finland, Denmark and Sweden. Finland had four committees discussing this issue between 1969 and 1984, each trying to balance the theoretical and vocational parts of journalist training. Discussions grew exceedingly vibrant during the 1970s. In Sweden, journalism education had been an issue for press organizations’ investigations and state committees almost incessantly since 1946 (Salokangas, 2003: 10f; Gardeström, 2011). Comparing Sweden and Finland, in 1921 plans were presented by a committee in Sweden to establish a journalism programme at the Swedish Civic School of Social Policy, an equivalent to the Finnish Civic College, where a journalism programme was established in 1925. If this had occurred, more than 30 years of Swedish discussions might have been spared (Gardeström, 2011: 47).

## Similar features and differences

Journalism education has historically emerged in similar patterns in the Nordic countries, which can be described as follows:

1. Apprentice system + short courses arranged by press organization or other interests (All Nordic countries).
2. Apprentice system, combined with three- to ten-month courses at independent schools founded by press organizations themselves (Norway, Sweden), or in cooperation with universities (Denmark), or at semi-academic institutions (Finland).
3. Nationalization or major state funding of journalism education, two- to four-year journalism programmes (all Nordic countries).
4. Integration into universities (Finland 1960, Sweden 1977, Iceland 1987, Norway 1994).

The mix of subjects in the journalist training curriculum has been discussed in all countries, centred on the balance between theoretical and vocational subjects. In Finland, Norway, Iceland and Sweden the journalism education is integrated into universities. The Finnish journalism education originated in a semi-academic environment, which became the University of Tampere. In Denmark and Norway major schools of journalism long remained independent institutions apart from universities, and the Danish School of Media and Journalism is still independent. Iceland's education of journalists was developed in a later historical context, and started within the university.

## Discussion – why journalism education originated

In the following I will discuss how we can understand why journalism education originated, proceeding mainly from the conclusions from my dissertation (2011) on the history in Sweden.

In earlier research on the subject, journalism education has been analysed on the basis of theories of professionalization, in relation to different nations' media systems, or in comparison with other higher educational programmes. The education of journalists has been viewed as a key factor for democracy (Pettersson, 2006; Teriz, 2009; Stuart, 2001: 2; Medsger, 2005: 205-226; Hume, 2007: 4, 8, 12f). The theory a researcher chooses to apply surely affects the result. Traditional answers to the question of why journalism education developed in these lines of research are: because education made journalism better, because journalists needed better general knowledge, because education liberated journalism from the party press system, and because education was an important step on the road to professionalization. This might be true – if the working premise is that education is always something intrinsically

good that develops a better society. In the research field of the history of education, “whig history” is a term applied to historiography that presents the rise of educational systems as an inevitable progression towards liberty and democracy (Cunningham, 1989; Jarausch, 1986). There is little doubt that the education of journalists played an important role when the party press system in the Nordic countries lost its grip. But in my perspective, professionalization is not a valid answer to the “why question”. Professionalization by education is only a concept used to describe the next stage in the long struggle over who is to define what a journalist should know. As my focus is on this struggle, my “why answers” differ.

Conclusions from Sweden are that the formal education of journalists was a forced solution when the apprentice system broke down, as mass media expanded and commercialized in the post-war years. The press wanted to train their own journalists, to socialize them into the regional or political culture of their specific newspaper. But this strategy simply did not work anymore, as they lost their apprentices to other newspapers paying higher wages when the media sector expanded and trained journalists became scarce. In Sweden, the press organizations wanted to maintain control over who was to become a journalist and what training they were to get, which in the end forced them – after years of discussion – to establish a formal journalism education in 1959, under the threat that other actors (read universities, Nordic Council, private entrepreneurs, etc.) would arrange the education according to their agenda. After the Second World War the educational systems expanded in Nordic countries towards the mass education of today, a line of development to which journalism education had to comply (Gardeström, 2011).

Margaret Archer (1984) has compared the development of state educational systems in France, Russia, England and Denmark. She concludes that national education systems mirror the dominant interest groups in each country, interest groups wanting to influence what is to be considered a legitimate education. In some countries interest groups start their own schools, while in other countries negotiations take place within government, in committees and government agencies. When schools are nationalized, former interest groups lose their influence to an educational institution with state funding. Archer’s conclusions regarding the development of educational systems do comply with the development of journalism education. Through journalism education, groups in society can intervene to influence the development of journalism, as journalists are a key resource for groups of power to influence the public opinion. In Sweden the press organization slowly lost its grip over the education of journalists, which might also be the case in the other Nordic countries. At first the press organizations did open their own schools, but these schools often came to be nationalized. The struggle about how journalists should be educated took place within state committees, where different interest groups tried to influence governmental agencies regarding how journalism education should be organized. In Sweden, Denmark and Finland there are several state committees whose mission is to establish or change the national journalism education programme, which according to Archer can be understood as

a transition towards negotiations between interest groups over journalism education taking place within the government (Archer, 1984: 1-3, 68-76, 90-93, 109f; Gardeström, 2011: 28, 206, 240f, 260).

In the history of journalism education, government agencies became engaged in running and influencing the education rather late; this did not happen until the 1960s, and nearly the 1990s in Iceland. A tentative conclusion is that the media sector was left to itself for a long period, but as the importance of mass media became evident, and as the party press structures began to lose their hold, there had to be another way for the government to influence the press, for good or bad, namely through education. In Iceland the period of political party press lasted almost until the 1990s, followed by privatization and market views, which according to Gudmundsson (2009) forced political parties to communicate with the media in new ways. Evidently, at this point the education of journalists was a political priority (Gudmundsson, 2009: 156).

What other interest groups tried to intervene over journalism education? I have already mentioned political parties and the media sector itself, but the universities were also part of the game. Universities are one of the oldest still existing institutions in the world, and have an interest in ruling over what is to be considered legitimate knowledge (Gardeström, 2011: 39-43). French Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu discussed the relationship between the political, journalistic and social science fields in his late writings. For Bourdieu a “field” is a research tool to enable the scientific constructions of social spheres in society, which have shared interest and beliefs; “a universe of the tacit presuppositions that we accept as natives of a certain society” (Bourdieu, 2005: 37). A field does have a certain autonomy and internal logic; rules are inscribed in the field that agents inside it follow or fight to transform (Bourdieu, 1997: 127-134; 2005: 30f). I will not thoroughly explain more of Bourdieu’s theoretical tools in this article, but merely point out that he offers a complementary map of perspectives (besides Archer) from which conflicts over journalism education can be analysed. Bourdieu describes similar features in these three fields; they are interconnected, and they all lay claim to being able to present a legitimate vision of the social world (Bourdieu, 2005: 38f). Bourdieu comprehends it as a struggle over “symbolic royalty”, over how the social world should be understood. In the history of journalism education, I argue, all three of these fields have been present, wanting to inscribe their legitimate vision of the social world in the heads of young journalists. How journalists are trained to understand the world has been a key to trying to achieve symbolic royalty in the public sphere. As educational programmes emerged over time, these fields of forces migrated and continued to exist within journalism education institutions.

### To conclude the discussion

In the educational history of journalism there exists an interplay of interests (in Bourdieu’s term: fields of forces) that chronologically develops in four distinct steps:

1. Interest groups start their own courses for journalists.
2. Joint efforts of groups, usually press organizations and academic or semi-academic institutions, organize courses.
3. Government agencies are involved in shaping journalism programmes and initiate governmental investigations, whereby interest groups are represented. Accordingly, the discussion migrates into these committees.
4. Journalism education becomes an integrated part of the national education system with state funding, and an interplay of interest takes place within journalism education institutions.

Theoretically, Archer can be used in analysing the macro system of the interplay of forces in the development of a national educational system. Bourdieu can help in analysing the micro system of interest, or the representation of interest that continues to struggle to inscribe its rules into journalism education.

The perspective I present and discuss is one of several ways to understand the history of journalism education. There are many interesting questions yet to be asked and perspectives to be applied to a history that in many countries is sleeping in archives, or has mainly been the subject of historiography, in which the history of one journalism school has been documented. I believe this could be an interesting emerging field of research. There are numerous archives full of history, waiting to be opened to shed new light on journalism education.

## References

- Archer, Margaret Scotford (1984). *Social origins of educational systems: university edition*. London: Sage.
- Becker, Lee B. (2003). Introduction. Developing a sociology of journalism education. In Romy Fröhlich, & Christina Holtz-Bacha (eds.) *Journalism education in Europe and North America: an international comparison*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1997). Några egenskaper hos fältet, *Kultur och kritik: anföranden*. (2. omarb. uppl.) Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2005). The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In Rodney Benson, & Erik Neveu (eds.) *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*. Oxford: Polity.
- Carey, James (2000). Some personal notes on journalist education, *Journalism*, 1(1), 12-23.
- Cunningham, Peter (1989). Educational History and Educational Change: The Past Decade of English Historiography. *History of Education Quarterly*, 29(1), 77-94.
- Desmond, Robert W. (1949). *Professional training of journalists*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Gardeström, Elin (2011). *Att fostra journalister: journalistutbildningens formering i Sverige 1944-1970*. Diss. Stockholm: Stockholms universitet.
- Gaunt, Philip (1992). *Making the Newsmakers. International Handbook of Journalism Training*. Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood press, sponsored by UNESCO.
- Gudmundsson, Birgir (2009). The Icelandic Journalism Education Landscape. In Georgios Terzis (ed.) *European journalism education*. Bristol: Intellect.
- Fink, Troels (1958). *The training of journalists: a world-wide survey on the training of personnel for the mass media*. Paris: UNESCO.

- Holm, Hans-Erik (2013). Journalism Education in Denmark: The Challenges of the Markets and Politics. In Romy Fröhlich, & Christina Holtz-Bacha (eds.) *Journalism education in Europe and North America: an international comparison*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Hume, Ellen (2007). University journalism education, www.ellenhume.com, access 8/3 2010
- Jarausch, Konrad H. (1986). The Old 'New History of Education': A German reconsideration, *History of Education Quarterly*, 26(2): 225-241.
- Just, Carl (1958). *The training of journalists: a world-wide survey on the training of personnel for the mass media*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Katzen, May (1975). *Mass communication: teaching and studies at universities: a world-wide survey on the role of universities in the study of the mass media and mass communication*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Magnusson, Gerhard (1939). *Hjalmar Branting i närbild*. Stockholm: Axel Holmström.
- Medsker, Betty (2005). Evolution of journalism education in the US. In Hugo de Burgh (eds.) *Making journalists: diverse models, global issues*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Minke, Kim (2009). The Danish Journalism Education Landscape. In Georgios Terzis (ed.) *European journalism education*. Bristol: Intellect
- Petersson, Birgit (2006). *Från journalist till murvel: journalistyrkets professionalisering från 1900 till 1960-talet*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Salokangas, Raimo (2003). Finland: The Road to Consensus in Journalism Education. In Romy Fröhlich, & Christina Holtz-Bacha (eds.) *Journalism education in Europe and North America: an international comparison*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press
- Salokangas, Raimo (2009). The Finnish Educational Landscape, Terzis, Georgios, (ed.) *European journalism education*. Bristol: Intellect
- Stuart, Adam G. (2001). The education of journalists. In *Journalism: Theory, Practice, and Criticism*, 2(3), 315-339.
- Terzis, Georgios (ed.) (2009). *European journalism education*. Bristol: Intellect.
- UNESCO: *The training of journalists: a world-wide survey on the training of personnel for the mass media*. (1958). Paris: UNESCO.