



The promise and perils of staff/student publications in Australian journalism programmes

Martin, Jennifer, Smy, Lucy and Ricketson, Matthew. 2019. The promise and perils of staff/student publications in Australian journalism programmes, *Australian Journalism Review*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 211-224.

DOI: [10.1386/ajr_00007_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/ajr_00007_1)

©2019, Intellect Ltd.

Reproduced with permission.

Downloaded from DRO:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10536/DRO/DU:30133573>

Australian Journalism Review

Volume 41 Number 2

© 2019 Intellect Ltd Article. English language. doi: 10.1386/ajr_00007_1

JENNIFER MARTIN

Deakin University

LUCY SMY

University of Melbourne

MATTHEW RICKETSON

Deakin University

The promise and perils of staff/student publications in Australian journalism programmes

ABSTRACT

Once rare, staff-supervised, student-produced publications are now common in Australian journalism programmes. This trend owes something to the consolidation of journalism education, but also much to two intersecting developments: the decline in the scale of the mainstream news media has opened up reporting deserts that journalism programmes, their staffing complements bolstered by journalists who have taken redundancy packages from mainstream outlets, have stepped in to water. This article reports the results of a national survey of journalism educators responsible for staff/student publications and discusses the implications of these publications. The survey respondents report strongly favourable educational outcomes for their students. They also report universities' tardiness in adequately resourcing the editing and supervision time needed to transform student work submitted for assessment into publishable stories.

KEYWORDS

journalism
programmes
staff/student
publications
collaboration
media industry
standards
academic workload

Introduction

In 2015 the Journalism Education and Research Association of Australia (JERAA) celebrated the 40th anniversary of its founding. Discussion at the association's annual conference between founding and current members showed how much journalism education had developed – the word research had been added to the organization's title only recently – and how much the association needed to do to meet the challenges of preparing students for a rapidly, and seemingly continuously, changing media landscape. Among a range of topics, delegates focused on staff-supervised, student-generated publications in journalism programmes. There had been few, if any, in 1975, but four decades later they had become common across the 34 universities in Australia where journalism is taught. Significantly, at this conference – held at Charles Sturt University in Bathurst, New South Wales, the site of the original Australian journalism educators' conference – delegates agreed to support the association in becoming the publisher of a new national collaborative staff/student publication, known as UniPollWatch (2019b).

An initiative of Dr Andrew Dodd, a former journalist and then head of the journalism programme at Melbourne's Swinburne University of Technology, UniPollWatch both cemented the place of staff/student publications in Australian journalism programmes and marked a bold new direction for them. Much like the 'Panama Papers' global investigative journalism project, UniPollWatch took advantage of digital technologies and emphasized collaboration rather than competition. The range and expansion of staff/student publications in recent years gives rise to several issues that require research. What is the experience of students participating in them? Do they improve their journalism skills more than classroom work? Do they require more work from journalism academics and, if they do, is that being properly resourced by universities? It is these questions, among others, that are addressed in this article.

Literature review

Australia's journalism programmes are underpinned by the tertiary sector's turn towards a 'work integrated learning' (WIL) approach which, as the phrase implies, emphasizes students gaining 'real-world' experience in their area of study (Jones 2016; Gribble 2014; Gamble et al. 2010; Patrick et al. 2008). For many journalism programmes, this has required a re-imagining of classrooms not as smaller versions of conventional newsrooms – which are themselves smaller than they once were and no longer the primary destination for journalism graduates – but as something closer to the 'teaching hospital' model common in medical schools. They provide a place where students can learn and hone their journalistic skills and, when stories are ready, these can be published for an audience reaching beyond the university (Mensing and Ryfe 2013). An alternative approach is to encourage students to be entrepreneurs, by emphasizing innovative practice as well as collaborating with start-ups and traditional media (Anderson et al. 2011; Birnbauer et al. 2013: 3; Schudson and Downie 2009; Schaffer 2014).

Before outlining the complex, shifting relationship between Australian journalism programmes and the media industry, it is helpful to understand how the concept of the learning newsroom has been implemented world-wide. A 2017 study of six Nordic journalism programmes highlighted the differences between the 'liberal' model of the United States, where some universities produced journalism in collaboration with the media industry,

and Germany, where in-house training of journalists in a newsroom is more common (Jaakkola 2018). In her study, Jaakkola argued that journalism programmes in 'democratic corporatist' nations, that is, countries which have a high level of acceptance of state activities in the media as well as an established print tradition and sense of professionalism, favoured an integrated model that combined theory with practice (Jaakkola 2018: 183). Research investigating the characteristics of learning newsrooms has tended to categorize them into the teaching hospital and entrepreneurial models (Lemann 2009; Mensing and Ryfe 2013; Newton 2013; Parks 2015). A third concept proposed by Jaakkola to capture the complexity of what occurs in a journalism classroom is the 'pedagogical newsroom', which embraces the teaching hospital ethos and encourages the innovation of the entrepreneurial model, but has a further key goal of producing 'better journalism' than the current news media (Jaakkola 2018: 191).

In comparison to this evangelical approach to journalism education, Australian journalism programmes value and foster strong connections with the media industry and promote these links to prospective students as proof of the value of their courses. A further important difference between Australian journalism programmes and their counterparts overseas, such as in the United States, is the absence in Australia of a strong tradition of philanthropically funded centres of journalism or on-campus newspapers. The practical outcome of this is that while many journalism programmes in Australia have embraced aspects of the 'teaching hospital' model, it is not as deeply anchored in students' experience of education nor as well supported financially as in the United States, although there are promising signs of improvement here, as will be discussed below.

Journalism educators around the world have long struggled for acceptance and status as they have pursued funds within their universities or credibility with the news media industry (Deuze 2006; O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 5). There is a wide variation between different countries and the establishment of a professional association of journalism educators: in the United States it was 1912, in Australia it was 1975 and in the United Kingdom it was 1997. A World Journalism Education Congress (WJEC) review found that most of these organizations began 'within a few years of the onset or expansion of tertiary journalism education in the host country' (O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 6). In Australia, a journalism programme existed at the University of Queensland in 1921, but it was not until the late 1960s and 1970s that journalism education really began to grow. By 1975 one university (Queensland) and ten colleges of advanced education offered courses or units in journalism (Stuart 1996 cited in O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 6). At the first WJEC in 2007, representatives of 28 national associations attended; just over a decade later, in 2019, this number had grown to 600 delegates from 70 countries (O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 6; WJEC Website).

In Australia throughout the 1970s and 1980s, journalism programmes faced opposition from the journalists' union, the Australian Journalists' Association (AJA), which argued that tertiary courses would 'adversely affect membership, the cadetship system and newsroom work arrangements' (O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 8). This position was tenable when newspapers earned healthy profits and editors had no need for student copy. Gradually, journalism programmes began developing their own staff-supervised, student-generated outlets. The University of Technology Sydney was a pioneer, offering a dedicated subject in investigative journalism. Since 1990 it has had

1. Examples of high-impact initiatives include the Media and Indigenous Australians Project (Eggerking 1996) and Response Ability (later Mindframe) (Skehan et al. 2009) as cited by O'Donnell and Van Heekeren (2015: 12).
2. *The Citizen's* first editor in 2013 was Simon Mann, a Walkley award-winning journalist and former foreign correspondent for Fairfax with more than 30 years' experience (The RMIT ABC Fact Check Website 2019). The current editor is Jo Chandler, whose award-winning journalism spans science, environment, health, human rights, women's and children's issues and aid and development (The Citizen Website 2019).

an affiliated body, the Australian Centre for Independent Journalism (ACIJ), which publishes *Reportage Online* (Birnbauer et al. 2013: 8). At the University of Queensland in the early 1990s, journalism staff set up their own newspaper, *The Weekend Independent*, while in Melbourne later in the decade RMIT's Journalism programme produced an e-zine named *The Fifth Estate* (well before the term became popular) that lasted into the late 2000s (Birnbauer et al. 2013: 4). During this period, journalism educators also produced research into the industry about practices and standards, which in turn led to a slow but steadily growing recognition in the 1990s and early 2000s, within academia and the media, of the value of journalism programmes (O'Donnell and Van Heekeren 2015: 12).¹ The recognition was not unqualified, but it was an improvement on the disdain and opposition voiced earlier (Ricketson 2001: 14–15).

The subsequent rise of the Internet from the mid-2000s saw the devastating decline of newspaper advertising revenue and a staggering loss of journalism jobs both in Australia and overseas (Ricketson et al. 2019). This led to the reformation of the relationship between the news media industry and journalism programmes; short-staffed publications with little money to invest in cadetships or training began to realize there was a pool of eager, university-educated journalism students seeking bylines. The digital age also provided the platform for universities to produce their own online publications, giving students the opportunity to hone their journalistic skills under close-to-real-world conditions. And as American academics have argued, when the Internet pushed legacy media into a downhill spiral, universities benefitted by employing experienced reporters who had lost their jobs.

These circumstances meant that journalism programmes also had to justify their relevance in educating students in an environment where there were fewer jobs in legacy media and almost anyone could be their own publisher (Francisco et al. 2012; see also Birnbauer et al. 2013: 2). This led to another seminal moment in the development of journalism programmes, with some Australian journalism academics declaring that 'recipients of public monies have a social responsibility in democracies to contribute to public discourse and the public's right to know' (Birnbauer et al. 2013: 1).

A number of journalism educators took up this challenge, developing their own publications and collaborating with established media. Among them were Monash University's online student publications, including an investigative site, *Dangerous Ground*, and, more recently, the online *Mojo News*. In 2013, the University of Melbourne's Centre for Advancing Journalism created an online publication, *The Citizen*, that was primarily a showcase for a newly created Masters of Journalism course. *The Citizen* stands alone among university publications in two important ways: it has a charter of editorial independence, and it employs a full-time editor with extensive news media experience.² *The Citizen* has co-published with news organizations such as Fairfax Media (now part of the Nine Entertainment Company) and *Guardian Australia*, while Swinburne University of Technology's journalism programme has collaborated with online news site Crikey in reporting exercises drawing on the benefits of having a pool of student labour to forage through, for instance, the yearly dump of annual reports into Parliament. Nor were these developments confined to big-city journalism programmes. At the University of Canberra, journalism staff drew on student labour in group investigative projects that involved combing through submissions to Senate inquiries. By this stage, in 2013, cuts in newsrooms had robbed mainstream news organizations of resources to do the work themselves. The University of Canberra produced

stories reported by students and written under staff supervision; they were published in *The Weekend Australian* and *Guardian Australia* (Franklin et al. 2013; Mullins and Ricketson 2016).

These staff/student endeavours were important developments in providing a sound practice-driven learning platform in Australian journalism programmes. They provided a springboard for path-finding collaborative projects on a state and then a national scale. Chief among them was the first 'UniPollWatch' in 2014, in which 260 students from four Victorian universities – Swinburne, RMIT, La Trobe and Melbourne – covered the Victorian state election, in a project described as 'a unique exercise in cross-campus education' (The Junction 2019b; Dodd et al. 2015: 223). Each university covered eight key electorates, and the reports were compiled on a website. The project also partnered with *The Age* newspaper. When the project was repeated on a national scale for the 2016 federal election, it involved 75 staff from 28 universities and, with 1000 students, was 'arguably the largest newsroom in the country' (Dodd et al. 2015: 47). Two years later six Victorian universities united under the UniPollWatch banner to cover the 2018 state election.

Collaborative work was extended internationally through Swinburne University of Technology's 'Project Understanding' or 'Proyek Sepaham', a cross-cultural journalism education exercise with the Indonesian University of Universitas Nusantara (Dodd et al. 2017: 67–84).

In 2019, UniPollWatch became *The Junction*, with journalism programmes around Australia invited to be part of the country's first national platform showcasing the best university student journalism. *The Junction*, like UniPollWatch before it, is published by JERAA (The Junction 2019a). Its website declares that it 'improves the experience of learning the craft of journalism and seeks to serve the public good by producing and publishing public interest reporting'. With staff and students from 24 journalism programmes participating, *The Junction* asserts that it comprises 'the largest newsroom in the country' (The Junction 2019a). In a promising development, *The Junction's* coverage of the 2019 federal election was supported by a philanthropic donation from the newly established Judith Neilson Institute for Journalism and Ideas.

Overall, the emergence of a wide range of staff/student publications since the 1970s, combined with the decline of newspapers and the rise of the digital age, has led to an exciting synergy within Australian j-schools, as evidenced in the innovation of individual publications attached to universities as well as national and international collaborative projects.

Methodology

The Australian survey into best practice in staff/student collaborative publishing is an investigation into how academics teach journalism inside simulated newsrooms in higher education. It addresses the pedagogical and practical problems of publishing staff-supervised, student-generated journalism for public audiences, holding students to industry standards while keeping a firm, but educative, eye on the ethical and legal dimensions. This research was designed to survey the field and document the different ways that university journalism educators are approaching experiential education through student publications. It was motivated by an interest in examining the best practice among the different models of journalism education, and aims to produce an analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching models of public-facing student newsrooms. The methodology for the Australian survey conducted by the

authors draws inspiration from a preliminary European survey of 153 university-based student newsroom practices. That research, by Einar Thorsen and Sue Wallace at Bournemouth University, was presented at the 2012 conference of the United Kingdom's Association for Journalism Educators (Thorsen and Wallace 2012). The survey reported on the early staff and student experiences of the introduction of online journalism school newsrooms, briefly examining staff training and competence around the design and use of websites. Six years later, the use of news websites in universities has become much more common.

Our Australian survey sought to tease out commonalities and differences in the ways that Australian academics teach in newsrooms and draw some conclusions about the strengths and weaknesses of staff/student collaborative publishing. By virtue of the passage of time, this Australian survey also records the way staff/student publications have evolved during this period. We gave a presentation about the planned survey at the annual conference of the Journalism Education and Research Association of Australia (JERAA) in December 2017 and in January 2018 we sent an e-mail survey request to the JERAA mailing list. We also e-mailed a survey request to the eighteen Australian universities that we had identified as having a staff/student publication (Ricketson et al. 2017). Of these eighteen e-mails, ten were addressed to individual academics who were known to work as editors of the publications. A further five e-mails were sent to addresses listed on the publications' websites and the remaining publications were contacted via their Twitter accounts. These two e-mail survey requests were repeated two months later, and a total of fifteen responses were collected in the four-month period between January and April 2018. Two more responses were collected after a further reminder to the academics in charge of publication in October 2018. A final respondent was surveyed in January 2019. This last respondent asked to take part in the survey after attending a presentation of the survey's preliminary findings at the 2018 JERAA conference (Ricketson et al. 2018). We are aware that this last respondent's answers might have been influenced by the presentation, but we are confident this consideration was outweighed by the benefit of gaining a wider sample of academic views. In any case, only one person was invited to respond from each university to guard against the domination of views from any one institution.

The data collection instrument was a self-administered online survey of 28 questions that was created and accessed using the cloud-based SurveyMonkey tool. In all, eighteen questions had multiple-choice answers, with the option to add a comment, and nine questions requested a qualitative response. The survey included thirteen questions about the type of publication being created and the workload it generated. Questions included when the publication was launched, the numbers of staff members involved, the numbers of students working on it and a breakdown of students by cohort, including by year group. The survey asked whether the publication was public-facing, web, print or broadcast. This set of questions aimed to discover what Australian staff/student collaborations looked like, how long they had been running, if and how they had changed over time, and how much staff work was required.

The next category of questions covered assessment, the standard of the publication and the perceived strengths and weaknesses of each publication model. These questions included a mix of multiple-choice answers and qualitative responses. The final two categories of questions covered learning outcomes for students, and staff perceptions of institutional support from their universities. The relatively small cohort of respondents and limited

multiple-choice options in survey answers made the use of sophisticated analytic software unnecessary for the quantitative questions. The qualitative answers were coded thematically for content, and occurrences of each code were counted, thereby enabling quantitative analysis of the content.

Findings

This research provides a systematic comparison of newsrooms established for teaching and learning journalism at universities in Australia. Australia's university newsrooms are a key part of the learning environment for practical journalism courses, but they come in different shapes, sizes and scopes. Earlier examinations of learning newsrooms have tended to categorize them into a teaching hospital model vs. entrepreneurial model (Lemann 2009; Mensing and Ryfe 2013; Newton 2013; Parks 2015), with these phrases being used to divide newsrooms by format, output and institution commitment. This early categorization, visualized below in a grid by Mensing and Ryfe (2013), may have become slightly overtaken by the evolution of the learning newsroom, but it is still useful as a basic sorting tool.

The following findings come from eighteen responses from educators who were directly involved with or in charge of a newsroom product. Only one respondent from each university was allowed to participate. The main findings were: 90 per cent of publications are online; 70 per cent of publications run during teaching periods, and 30 per cent of them run all year round. Only two universities create a printed product. Four create a broadcast and the rest (89 per cent) produce a website. All the surveyed publications include at least one public-facing product; student work is published directly to the public, which puts Australian university newsrooms in the 'teaching hospital' model of newsrooms. Exactly half the publications were founded in or before 2010, with those created since 2011 mostly before 2015, suggesting that academics have many years of experience to draw on for these productions. Academics reported that their news products had evolved since inception, with respondents pointing to increased use of video and audio storytelling and greater use of social media to promote articles.



Figure 1: Classrooms as newsroom, Columbia University (Mensing and Ryfe 2013).

Creating practical journalism products within a simulated newsroom in a higher education environment is seen as excellent workplace preparation by educators (Cullen 2015; Cullen et al. 2014) and tends to have high levels of student engagement (Steel et al. 2007; Matthews and Heathman 2014). Our findings support the literature, with 88 per cent of respondents reporting that they felt their publication improved prospects for future employment. A similar proportion said that working on a publication had improved student reporting and storytelling. More than four in five respondents reported increased student confidence, and two thirds reported increased student engagement.

Qualitatively, respondents commented on the increased employability of students with remarks such as:

Students are encouraged to understand they are working for a market. The deadlines are real and the demands for decent interviews and research can't be fudged. It's an invaluable stepping stone between working for assessment and working in the industry. (Respondent 13)

When asked about the high points of running a publication, respondents said: 'students getting excited about breaking news' (Respondent 7); 'seeing students take ownership and use the publication as a means to showcase their work to potential employers' (Respondent 8); 'Watching [students] grow. They really embrace the challenge. I love how much ambition they have and how they go about achieving it' (Respondent 13); and 'student satisfaction with participation and publication' (Respondent 15).

But the benefits of student engagement, satisfaction and employability come at a cost. One of the most interesting and important findings concerned the toll that running a publication takes on staff and whether that is adequately recognized by universities within standard workload formats. Some student publications demand up to 30 hours a week of staff editing time. Close to one in five respondents reported that their publication took 15–20 hours a week to edit, while 50 per cent of respondents said their publication demanded up to nine hours a week editing. Crucially, nearly three in four respondents reported that their university had not allocated sufficient hours for editing work. More than 40 per cent of respondents said staff were working up to six hours per week above their scheduled workload; 13 per cent are working six to nine hours above their workload and a further 13 per cent are working nine to fifteen hours a week above their workload. Two unfortunate respondents reported staff working more than twenty hours a week above their standard workload.

In their comments, respondents said: '[t]here are a lot of unpaid hours that go into editing stories for a university website. There does not seem to be a great understanding of how much time and effort a website takes to run. Each story takes a long time to get to publishable standard. This is not factored into workloads' (Respondent 16); 'It is a lot of extra work for me' (Respondent 11); 'It is a massive commitment and time is in short supply' (Respondent 8); 'Co-ordinating the sheer scale of what we do with a one-semester deadline. Convincing the University of just how much work is involved in making this happen' (Respondent 3). Specifically, respondents pointed to the difference in standard required between the work students produce for assessment and the work they produce for publication, with 95 per cent of respondents agreeing that there was a difference, and that it revolves around the professional standard of the work (83 per cent agreed), as well as legal (28 per cent) and ethical (22 per cent) considerations.

Respondents were keen to discuss these issues further:

It takes a lot of time and effort to work with students to ensure a story is of publishable standard. This can require multiple drafts, multiple checks, multiple feedback between the tutor and the students for every story. If the story was simply for assessment (not publication) then the story is simply marked and one lot of feedback is give. (Respondent 16)

'[It is] the editing, re-editing and checking information that should have been checked already' (Respondent 2); 'It is very rare for a story to only get a light edit. Even work that is assessed with high grades generally requires significant additional editing, refining, fact checking and updating to get to publication standard' (Respondent 17); 'The dilemma of how much to fix a bad article so it can run, when students are doing "just-enough" to scrape a pass. This eats my time and I agonize over whether to spike or fix the shoddy ones' (Respondent 7).

Support from faculty was a contentious subject, with many academics reporting that they felt under-supported in their endeavours. In some cases, lobbying faculty managers had resulted in a higher allocation of teaching hours (31 per cent), better IT support (38 per cent) and improved facilities (50 per cent). But nearly 70 per cent of respondents felt they still needed more teaching hours, 44 per cent wanted more IT support and 32 per cent wanted investment in better facilities.

The squeeze on staff time also manifested in concerns that legal problems might slip past editors. This study did not set out to solicit the number of legal threats attracted by student publications from journalism departments and did not ask a specific question about legal risk. However, the survey found that half of respondents volunteered concerns around legal threats: '[w]e also need to do some fact-checking and be wary from a legal and ethical perspective' (Respondent 9) and '[t]here's an ongoing concern over unresolved commitment to legal indemnity' (Respondent 6). One-third of respondents reported facing legal threats: 'threatened with legal action' (Respondent 4) and 'threats of legal action – all averted' (Respondent 15).

Discussion

The survey findings raise several issues relevant to journalism education. The survey reveals the extent and diversity of staff-supervised, student-run publications. This partly mirrors the diversity of the organization of journalism subjects and courses in Australian universities, some of which offer a journalism major in a broader degree such as Communication, while for others the degree is named Journalism with up to two-thirds of the subjects focused on journalism. It also goes to questions of university culture and resources. The University of Melbourne's Centre for Advancing Journalism is, to the best of our knowledge, the only journalism programme in Australia able to employ a full-time former senior journalist to edit its staff/student publication. Conversely, when Deakin University's journalism staff set up a staff/student publication in 2016, there was a concern from university management about the risk of defamation and a desire for the publication not to be public-facing.

Overall, though, it is clear from the survey that journalism academics working on staff/student publications believe such publications are an important element of students' education and are vital for sharpening reporting, writing, editing and accuracy skills. Even as journalism academics have become more actively engaged in researching journalism and more successful in

winning Australian Research Council grants, they remain committed to ensuring students learn the skills and methods of journalism by practising them in real-world environments and by reflecting on their practice. Indeed, the two activities – teaching journalism and researching it – are seen not as sitting in separate silos but as connected and inter-dependent. This is evident in the work of journalism academics who took part in the UniPollWatch project and then examined its implications (The Junction 2019b; Davies et al. 2017; Dodd et al. 2015, 2017, 2018), which have in turn been fed back into the development of *The Junction*. Building on UniPollWatch, *The Junction* aims, first, to provide a showcase of the best student journalism in the country and, second, to foster collaboration between universities on particular journalistic projects, such as a multi-university collaboration on the issue of climate change (underway at the time of writing this article).

Perhaps the most important finding of the survey, though, is an explicit and strong recognition that there is a clear step for students to take between submitting work for assessment and submitting work for publication. Survey respondents affirm that this extra step offers rich educational results for students; theories and invocations of the value of good practice are baked for students in the oven of publication. Equally important, for students to take this step requires intensive, extensive editing work by staff members. This raises the question of whether universities that have staff/student publications, and energetically promote them to prospective students on Open Days, are including these additional hours in the responsible journalism academics' workloads. Nearly three in four respondents reported that they felt their university had not allocated sufficient hours for the additional editing work and that they did not feel adequately supported.

The issue of how universities are being staffed, including an over-reliance on sessional staff, has become increasingly prominent (Anonymous 2019; Wardale et al. 2019). Journalism programmes are not immune from these sector-wide developments, and the issue is intensified in a field where specific, time-intensive professional production practices are integral to what is otherwise a strongly positive educational outcome. According to the survey respondents, most universities have not yet recognized how much additional work is required. Around one in three respondents said their university had allocated additional teaching time, and that is welcome, but the majority of universities have not allocated additional teaching time. Equally to the point, it would be more helpful if universities allocated time for what the additional work actually is – editing and sub-editing. In any case, more than two in three respondents argued that more time and resources were needed for this work.

Conclusion

This survey of staff-supervised, student-generated publications is a step on a path rather than the end of a journey. There are limitations in the survey: it does not include the voices of journalism students, for example, and those voices would enrich the picture and probably suggest ways to improve publications. It also does not dwell on the legal issues that arise in any publication. To date, perhaps by dint of the publications' relatively low public profiles and the supervising journalism academics' media law savvy, no staff/student publication (as distinct from student newspaper) has been taken to court, but if staff/student publications continue to grow, as looks likely, such a flare-up is on the cards. This also merits further study.

Limitations and potential future studies aside, we conclude that this survey of staff-supervised, student-generated publications has thrown up findings that are both gratifying and disconcerting. Gratifying because they underscore a widespread and deeply felt view among journalism educators that these publications are important for journalism programmes and lead to clear improvements in students' learning of journalism skills and methods. Disconcerting because the hefty amount of additional work required by journalism educators (and the mostly former journalist sessional staff members working on these publications) is being at best only partly resourced by universities. This is in spite of the store universities explicitly put in the value of such publications by the weight their marketing teams put on them at Open Days and when they publicize publications that win the annual national Ossie Awards and other awards for student journalism. It is to be hoped, then, that those running journalism programmes in Australia can draw on the findings of this survey not just in developing their own staff/student publications, but also in presenting them to their managers in support of bids for more resources, for if academics in management roles are sometimes blind to the value of professional practice skills in teaching journalism, they may be more open to empirical data and academic argument.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, C. W., Glaisyer, T., Smith, J. and Rothfeld, M. (2011), 'Shaping 21st century journalism: Leveraging a "teaching hospital model" in journalism education', *New America Foundation*, October, http://www.academia.edu/1220873/Shaping_21st_Century_Journalism_Leveraging_a_Teaching_Hospital_Model_in_Journalism_Education. Accessed 15 August 2019.
- Anonymous (2019), 'Casualisation of academic work', *The Saturday Paper*, 27 July, <https://www.thesaturdaypaper.com.au/opinion/topic/2019/07/27/casualisation-academic-teaching/15641496008514>. Accessed 13 August 2019.
- Birnbauer, B., Dodd, A. and Ricketson, M. (2013), 'We have the means, but what's the model? A better way for universities and industry to produce investigative journalism', *ANZCA 2013: Proceedings of the 2013 Australian and New Zealand Communication Association Conference on Global Networks-Global Divides: Bridging New and Traditional Communication Challenges*, Australian and New Zealand Communication Conference, Perth, Western Australia, 3–5 July.
- The Citizen Website (2019), 'Our people: Jo Chandler', <https://www.thecitizen.org.au/people/jo-chandler>. Accessed 26 July 2019.
- Cullen, T. (2015), 'A capstone unit for tertiary journalism programmes that aims to facilitate the demonstration of graduate capabilities', *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 25:2, pp. 297–304.
- Cullen, T., Tanner, S. J., O'Donnell, M. and Green, K. (2014), 'Industry needs and tertiary journalism education: Views from news editors', *Transformative, Innovative and Engaging: Proceedings of the 23rd Annual Teaching Learning Forum*, University of Western Australia, Perth, 30–31 January.
- Dangerous Ground: The EPA's Toxic Legacy Website (2011), 'Dangerous ground: the EPA's toxic legacy', Archived website, <https://trove.nla.gov.au/work/195567392?selectedversion=NBD55101970>. Accessed 26 July 2019.
- Davies, K., Dodd, A., Kremmer, C. and Van Heekeren, M. (2017), 'The pedagogy of the UniPollWatch pop-up journalism project', *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 27:2, pp. 219–32.

- Deuze, M. (2006), 'Global journalism education: A conceptual approach', *Journalism Studies*, 7:1, pp. 19–34.
- Dodd, A., Buller, B., Castillo, A., Clarke, P., Martin, H., Schwartz, L., Simons, M. and Zion, L. (2015), 'UniPollWatch', *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 25:2, pp. 222–37.
- Dodd, A., Davies, K., Snowdon, C. and Ricketson, M. (2018), 'Collaboration on a national scale: Journalism educators, students and the 2016 Australian federal election', *Australian Journalism Review*, 40:1, pp. 35–49.
- Dodd, A., Pasandaran, C. C., Green, S., Octavianto, A. W. and Mardjianto, F. X. L. D. (2017), 'Proyek Sepaham: An experiment in cross-cultural and collaborative journalism education', *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 27:1, pp. 67–84.
- Francisco, T., Lenhoff, A. and Schudson, M. (2012), 'The classroom as newsroom: Leveraging university resources for public affairs reporting', *International Journal of Communication*, 6, 15 November, pp. 2677–97, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=edsclr&AN=edsclr.317781177&authtype=sso&custid=deakin&site=eds-live&scope=site>. Accessed 22 October 2019.
- Franklin, M., Ricketson, M. and Stevens, J. (2013), 'Discrimination laws still flawed', *The Weekend Australian*, Inquirer, 25 May, <https://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/discrimination-laws-still-flawed/news-story/f35b77dffe68e39611e4b593e5a1240>. Accessed 22 October 2019.
- Gamble, N., Patrick, C. and Peach, D. (2010), 'Internationalising work-integrated learning: Creating global citizens to meet the economic crisis and the skills shortage', *Higher Education Research & Development*, 29:5, pp. 535–46.
- Gribble, C. (2014), 'Employment, work placements & work integrated learning of international students in Australia', International Education Association of Australia, Research Digest 2, June, <https://www.ieaa.org.au/documents/item/257>. Accessed 27 July 2019.
- Jaakkola, M. (2018), 'S(t)imulating journalism in the classroom: A structured comparison of the design of pedagogical newsroom in Nordic academic journalism training', *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 73:2, pp. 182–99.
- Jones, D. (2016), 'Learning in and by the community: A work-integrated approach to teaching journalism', *Asia Pacific Media Educator*, 26:2, pp. 202–13.
- The Junction Website (2019a), 'The Junction home page', <http://junctionjournalism.com>. Accessed 26 July 2019.
- (2019b), 'UniPollWatch home page', <http://junctionjournalism.com/2018/10/10/unipollwatch-victoria-2018/>. Accessed 13 August 2019.
- Lemann, N. (2009), 'Journalism schools can push coverage beyond breaking news', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 15 November, <http://chronicle.com/article/Journalism-Schools-Can-Push/49115/>. Accessed 20 November 2018.
- Matthews, J. and Heathman, K. (2014), 'Workplace not workshop: Student reflections on the introduction of a work-based approach to the final year of Journalism', *Journalism Education*, 3:1, pp. 28–44.
- Mensing, D. and Ryfe, D. (2013), 'Blueprint for change: From the teaching hospital to the entrepreneurial model of journalism education', *#ISOJ The Official Research Journal of the International Symposium on Online Journalism*, 3:2, pp. 26–44.
- MOJO Website Monash University (2013), 'About Mojo', <https://www.mojo-news.com.au/page/about>. Accessed 26 July 2019.

- Mullins, P. and Ricketson, M. (2016), '“Feral” Senate accusations reflect Coalition’s frustration at not getting its own way’, *Guardian Australia*, 28 June, <https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2016/jun/28/feral-senate-accusations-reflect-coalitions-frustration-at-not-getting-its-own-way>. Accessed 13 August 2019.
- Newton, E. (2013), 'The “teaching hospital” – A goal for journalism education', *The Knight Foundation*, 20 November, <https://www.knightfoundation.org/speeches/teaching-hospital-goal-journalism-education>. Accessed 7 October 2018.
- O'Donnell, P. and Van Heekeren, M. (2015), 'Towards a history of the professional association of Australian journalism academics', *Australian Journalism Review*, 37:2, pp. 3–20.
- Parks, P. (2015), 'A collaborative approach to experiential learning in university newswriting and editing classes: A case study', *Journalism and Mass Communication Educator*, 70:2, pp. 125–40.
- Patrick, C., Peach, D., Pockknee, C., Webb, F., Fletcher, M. and Pretto, G. (2008), *The WIL (Work Integrated Learning) Report: A National Scoping Study, (Australian Learning and Teaching Council [ALTC] Final Report)*, December, Brisbane: Queensland University of Technology, www.altc.edu.au. Accessed 22 October 2019.
- Ricketson, M. (2001), 'How to school a scribe', *The Australian*, Media supplement, 31 May, pp. 14–15.
- Ricketson, M., Dodd, A., Zion, L. and Winarnita, M. (2019), '“Like being shot in the face” or “I’m glad I’m out”: Journalists’ experiences of job loss in the Australian media industry 2012–2014', *Journalism Studies*, 17 June, <https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats?doi=10.1080%2F1461670X.2019.1627899>. Accessed 22 October 2019.
- Ricketson, M., Martin, J. and Smy, L. (2017), 'Best practices in Australian staff-student collaborative publishing: An overview', unpublished conference paper, Journalism Education and Research Association of Australia Conference, University of Newcastle, New South Wales, 4–6 December.
- (2018), 'Best practices in Australian staff-student collaborative publishing: The survey results', *Journalism Education and Research Association of Australia Conference*, University of Tasmania, Hobart, 3–5 December.
- The RMIT ABC Fact Check Website (2019), 'RMIT ABC Fact Check team', <https://www.abc.net.au/news/factcheck/about/>. Accessed 26 July 2019.
- Schaffer, J. (2014), 'Journalism education: It’s time to craft the gateway degree', *J-Lab Website*, 31 October, <http://www.j-lab.org/2014/10/31/journalism-education-time-craft-gateway-degree/>. Accessed 15 August 2019.
- Schudson, M. and Downie, L. (2009), 'University-based reporting could keep journalism alive', *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 15 November, <http://chronicle.com/article/University-Based-Reporting/49113/>. Accessed 15 August 2019.
- Steel, J., Carmichael, B., Holmes, D., Kinse, M. and Sanders, K. (2007), 'Experiential learning and journalism education', *Education + Training*, 49:4, pp. 325–34.
- Stuart, C. (1996), 'Our judges’ credentials: Development of journalism education and training in Australia to 1987', Ph.D. thesis, Wollongong: University of Wollongong.
- Thorsen, E. and Wallace, S. (2012), 'News websites in journalism education: An international survey of staff and student experiences', unpublished conference paper, *Annual Association for Journalism Educators Conference: Innovation in Journalism Education*, University of Central Lancashire, June.

Wardale, D., Richardson, J. and Suseno, Y. (2019), 'Casual academics aren't going anywhere so what can universities do to ensure learning isn't affected?', *The Conversation*, 8 April, <https://theconversation.com/casual-academics-arent-going-anywhere-so-what-can-universities-do-to-ensure-learning-isnt-affected-113567>. Accessed 8 April 2019.

World Journalism Education Council (2019), '5th WJEC in Paris – A huge success', 24 July, <https://wjec.net/2019/07/24/5th-wjec-in-paris-a-huge-success/#more-345>. Accessed 22 October 2019.

SUGGESTED CITATION

Martin, J., Smy, L. and Ricketson, M. (2019), 'The promise and perils of staff/student publications in Australian journalism programmes', *Australian Journalism Review*, 41:2, pp. 211–224, doi: 10.1386/ajr_00007_1

CONTRIBUTOR DETAILS

Jennifer Martin is the Edward Wilson Research Fellow for the Women, Leadership and the Media Project at Deakin University, Melbourne. Before this Jennifer was the editorial assistant for *The Citizen*, the online publication for the Centre for Advancing Journalism Masters students at the University of Melbourne.

Contact: 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, Victoria, 3125, Australia.

E-mail: jennifer.m@deakin.edu.au

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7400-8916>

Lucy Smy is a lecturer in the Centre for Advancing Journalism at the University of Melbourne. Smy is studying for a Ph.D. which examines the role of objectivity in the business reporting of Chinese foreign investment in Australia. She has run staff–student publications in the United Kingdom and Australia for more than ten years.

Contact: University of Melbourne, Victoria, 3010, Australia.

E-mail: lucy.smy@unimelb.edu.au

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4704-951X>

Matthew Ricketson is professor of communication at Deakin University. Before that he was professor of journalism at the University of Canberra where he worked with final year undergraduate students to develop group investigative projects that were published in the news media.

Contact: 221 Burwood Hwy, Burwood, Victoria, 3125, Australia.

E-mail: matthew.ricketson@deakin.edu.au

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8742-5946>

Jennifer Martin, Lucy Smy and Matthew Ricketson have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work in the format that was submitted to Intellect Ltd.