

**IAMCR**  
**(Journalism Research and Education Section).**

**Abstract for Stockholm Conference,  
July 20-25, 2008.**

**Title: Identifying and nurturing passion among journalism hopefuls: A case study in program entry procedures and design.**

*Professor Stephen Tanner, Head, School of Journalism and Creative Writing, University of Wollongong; Email: stanner@uow.edu.au*

*Mr Marcus O'Donnell, Program Coordinator, School of Journalism and Creative Writing, University of Wollongong;*

*Professor Kerry Green, Head, School of Communication, University of South Australia.*

**Overview:**

In a comprehensive review of the scholarship on global journalism education Mark Deuze concluded “that the education and training of journalists is a subject much debated - but only rarely researched”. (2006:19). He noted that the literature that does exist tends to focus almost exclusively on curricular matters and the “legitimacy issue”. He noted that the literature that does exist tends to focus almost exclusively on curricular matters and what he calls the “legitimacy issue” - “what is the position of journalism education vis-a-vis the profession and its publics?” (2006:23). Deuze identified an impressive ten point conceptual map for future research on journalism education. However the one point that he does not address is the question of student selection. This paper will argue that who we select and how we select prospective students is an important precursor to understanding other debates in journalism education and one that demands more thorough research. Journalism program coordinators are frequently advised by media industry representatives that while they want bright graduates, they also want people who have a passion for journalism. Experience shows that the two don't necessarily correspond. People coming into university programs with high entrance scores don't always have ‘the passion for journalism’ and vice versa. Today, many universities do not ‘test for’ such journalistic essentials as ‘passion’ among their prospective recruits, relying solely on academic achievements to allocate places in highly competitive programs.

However, Journalism staff at the University of Wollongong in NSW, Australia, decided to see if it is possible to attract students that satisfy both criteria, thereby meeting the traditional university mandate of producing high calibre graduates who also have the vocational skill set and passion for journalism that employers are seeking.

**Background to the University of Wollongong Journalism model.**

The University of Wollongong has taught Journalism since 1998. Originally established as a Graduate School, in 2003 it began to service teach into a Bachelor of

Communication and Media Studies (BCM) degree that was managed by the Faculty of Arts. The School of Journalism and Creative Writing, which is one of three schools within a Faculty of Creative Arts, designed four subjects for a Journalism stream within the BCM. These were relatively elementary subjects and comprised:

- JOUR 201 (Introduction to Print News Writing)
- JOUR 202 (Feature Writing);
- JOUR 301 (Investigative Journalism); and
- JOUR 302 (Internship or Project).

As the subject codes reveal, students did not commence their Journalism until second year. The subject choice was limited and did not include broadcast or convergent Journalism options – a mainstay of most contemporary Journalism programs. In part this was because the Graduate School of Journalism wanted to maintain its postgraduate focus and believed that the BCM could act as a feeder into its more comprehensive graduate program. The BCM was a highly popular program – one that attracted high calibre students because it imposed high entry standards (a University Admission Index score of 90+). While it easily attracted students into its program, many prospective students were seeking a program that either contained a higher proportion of Journalism or was badged as a genuine Journalism degree. Faced with low postgraduate numbers entering the MJ, the Faculty of Creative Arts took the strategic decision in 2005 to change focus. It decided to refocus the program by: (1) introducing a dedicated Bachelor of Journalism program; (2) offering an expanded suite of subjects for students enrolled in the BCM; and (3) revamping the suite of postgraduate degrees and subjects to more accurately reflect the needs of both potential students and their prospective employers. At the time of writing, (1) and (2) had been achieved, while a new suite of Journalism and Professional Writing programs had been submitted to the University Senate for approval. If approval is granted, the new degrees will be introduced in 2009.

### **The Bachelor of Journalism**

However it is the development of the new Bachelor of Journalism degree that is the focus of this paper. The new degree took 18 months to develop. It was driven by Professor Tanner, who was appointed from outside the University to head the new School of Journalism and Creative Writing, and Mr O'Donnell, who had extensive industry experience, and was employed to help design the new degree. Part of the process involved extensive consultation with industry and other academics, both during the preliminary stage and then when the package of subjects had been finalised and ready for submission to the University for approval. In fact the University requires that any new degree or major restructure of an existing degree needs to be submitted to an External Course Appraisal Committee (ECAC). The Committee is comprised of both industry and academic representatives and is chaired by a person external to the Faculty. Professor Green, who combines extensive industry experience with a long career as an academic, was asked to chair the Committee. It should be noted that Faculty staff are not members of the Committee: their role is to prepare the documentation in the lead-up to the Committee's formal meeting (subject outlines, reasons for the decision to proceed with

the new degree (or revamped degree), and to appear before the Committee and answer any questions it might have in relation to the proposal.

The Committee's terms of reference are determined centrally by the University. They are as follows:

- The need for the course;
  - The anticipated demand for the course (especially if similar courses are offered by other institutions) and ways of marketing it;
  - The mode of offering the course (ie on campus, flexible delivery etc);
  - The proposed length and content of the course;
  - The proposed entry requirements for the course;
  - The sequence of subjects for the course;
  - The learning objectives of the course;
  - The content and learning objectives for each subject and the appropriateness of proposed teaching and assessment methods to the learning objectives of the subject and of the course;
  - The resources required to present each subject effectively;
  - The Library and other information resources required to present the course and individual subjects
  - Laboratory and equipment requirements required to present the course and each individual subject;
  - In the case of fee-paying courses, the appropriateness of the course fees proposed to be charged and the effect the level of fees is likely to have on demand for the course; and
  - Any other aspect of the proposed course or individual subjects that appear relevant to the ECAC.
- 
- The report should conclude with an assessment of the academic and professional value of the proposed course.

The terms of reference stimulated considerable discussion among the five member committee, four of whom had extensive industry experience; four had experience teaching within a University environment; three of these teaching Journalism. Only one member did not have any professional or academic experience as a Journalist or Journalism educator. The discussions ranged across all terms of reference, but from the perspective of this paper, a number were particularly relevant, including: (1) the proposed entry requirements for the course; (2) the learning objectives for the course; (3) the content and learning objectives for each subject (and the appropriateness of proposed teaching and assessment methods to the learning objectives of both individual subjects and the course as a whole); and, finally, the academic and professional value of the proposed course. Obviously these are inextricably linked.

**Proposed entry requirements:**

In designing the program, we were conscious of the age-old debate regarding the role of universities in the education and/or training of Journalists. In Australia there had historically been a tense relationship between industry and universities regarding ownership of Journalism training. Traditionally Australian media organisations had adopted a cadetship system which involved trainees being employed straight from school. They would then be trained on-the-job, often learning by osmosis, rather than through participation in any formal courses. Australian universities began to offer Journalism courses beginning in the early 1920s (when the first program was established by the University of Qld). However it was not until the early 1980s that Australian media employers began to soften their attitudes towards universities – and university graduates – although many of the new journalists entering the industry did so with degrees in disciplines other than Journalism (Arts, Law, Business etc).

Over the years Australian universities have worked hard to disabuse employers of the belief that they are not able to play a significant role in the training of pre-career journalists. They have also sought to convince journalists (and employers) that they also have an important role to play in the ongoing professional development of journalists (through the introduction of targeted postgraduate programs and short courses). While employers rightly retain the right to employ people either straight out of school or with a range of discipline-based qualifications, they are increasingly recognising that University-based programs can play an important role in the training of journalists. In fact today, more than 30 universities teach some Journalism in Australia (note few teach a designated Bachelor of Journalism; the majority teaching either a major in Journalism within another degree (Arts, Communication etc).

This does not mean that the traditional tensions have disappeared. They still exist, and some media organisations have been quick to criticise graduates from Australian Journalism programs if they believe they are not up to speed, or require considerable on-the-job training. This has created some angst for Journalism educators, many of whom feel that criticism of them, their programs and their graduates is often misguided or even misdirected. Deuze has noted that this is a debate that has occurred along remarkably similar lines in a number of varied global locations. He concludes that the debate is rooted in a set of 'Platonic ideas' that seek to prioritise either the profession of journalism or the 'nature' of the University. But he rightly argues that the terms of the debate as it has been played out 'obscure the more complex and continuous character of the relationship between thinking and doing, reflection and action, theory and practice; these binary oppositions function extremely well to dig fictitious trenches to separate the social systems of journalism and the academe.' (2003: 21).

In designing the course we sought to bridge these trenches. The program seeks to offer a practical skills-based program that satisfies the needs of industry for job-ready journalists. But it is also based on a rigorous theoretical model that we call 'The Creative Curriculum' (O'Donnell, 2007) which links recent pedagogical research on learning space design (AMA 2006), assessment and learning through authentic tasks (Herrington et al., 2003) and students as reflective practitioners (Sheridan Burns 2002). This model is also influenced by theories of convergence which are currently driving media industries

and emphasizes multimodal communication and participatory producer/user engagement (Jenkins, 2006).

The range of subjects (see Appendix for full list) we offer reflect a belief that Journalism graduates are increasingly being expected to have an extensive skill set that will enable them to operate across a range of media. We believe we have a good mix, a view supported by the ECAC, although the subjects are under constant review.

### **Attracting the best candidates:**

During our discussions with employers (and drawing on our own anecdotal experiences as Journalists and Journalism educators who had both worked with recent graduates and been asked to provide references for them by prospective employers), we tried to ascertain if there was an ideal 'type'. One of the problems we encountered was that there was no perfect candidate as far as media organisations are concerned. There are generic skills that all graduates should have developed to a high level by the time they finish their degrees, but otherwise, different employers will have different needs, depending on their type (print, broadcast or online), size (national, state, regional or community-based), market share and frequency of output (daily, bi-weekly in the case of newspapers, weekly or monthly in the case of magazines; hourly, daily, weekly, etc in the case of radio or television; or on demand (online)); and obviously number and skill set of existing staff.

In this we could be partly guided by academic research conducted both within Australia and overseas. In an Australian context Henningham (1990, 1993) had developed a profile of Australian journalists. In doing this, he had built on the work of Gans (1985), Weaver and Wilhoit (1986) and Johnstone et al (1976) and others. While these studies provided an insight into the demographic backgrounds of journalists, they did nothing to indicate what set outstanding journalists apart from the merely good, or even the woeful. For that it was necessary to talk to the Journalists themselves. In a British study reported by de Burgh (2003) journalism employers expressed a clear preference for skills and a set of personal qualities over specific knowledge sets in assessing potential recruits:

Thirty percent considered skills something they would look for in recruiting new journalists and a mere 7 percent would value knowledge. Sixty percent, however, were wanting 'enthusiasm (can-do attitude), positiveness, curiosity, the ability to work under pressure, to learn quickly'. They did not particularly want thoughtfulness or a sense of public duty. (109)

One trait that regularly asserted itself, both in discussion and in the literature was 'passion'. For example, in conducting some research for this paper, we conducted a limited search of obituaries, biographies, autobiographies and commentaries written by journalists about journalists, or about themselves. One of the key traits of successful journalists was their 'passion' for their job. Take the following, for example, which are representative of what can be quickly located via an online search:

**Table 1: ‘Passion’ explained.**

‘What journalists do is truly special and wonderful and they owe their profession their passion. It takes passion to remain optimistic and hopeful while so many others trudge through the sludge of despair’ (Favre, 2003, p. 36).
‘We had a story to tell; it is one of passion and making a difference,’ (Moore, 2004, p. 2).
‘... a certain amount of passion was the reason many of us got into journalism in the first place’ (Thompson, 2008).
‘I have come to the conclusion that no matter how journalism is practiced, and no matter how the definition of the word ‘journalist’ is enlarged, a sense of passion is vital. You have to care – about the accuracy of what you report, about the necessity of this continuing conversation among citizens of a democracy about the way things should be’ (Thompson, 2008).
‘My passion ... is to tell the important story that hasn’t yet been told. To expose people who abuse power of the public trust. To introduce people in my community to the delights and surprises that exist all around them – interesting people, the arts, history and culture. To explain events that often confuse and confound. To bust open the news that someone doesn’t want told’ (Sill, 2003).

The message is clear: passion is an essential ingredient of Journalism. But how do you define it, and identify it in prospective employee? With experienced journalists, it is not that difficult; you need only look at the stories they have written or produced over time to determine whether they have the passion (synonyms = excitement, commitment and enthusiasm) for Journalism. But how do you seek to identify it among prospective young hopefuls who have had few opportunities in a functioning newsroom environment to prove that they have it?

This was the dilemma we faced when seeking to fill the places in UoW’s first and second BJ cohorts. Our discussions with the Committee, as well as separate discussions with other media professionals, found that while Journalism naturally attracted bright and inquisitive people, the brightest did not necessarily make the best journalists because they did not always possess the so-called ‘people skills’ required to extract information from reluctant sources. They could write and research, but when it came to asking difficult questions, particularly of people who were known for their capacity to be intimidating, the reporter’s passion for the job dissipated.

**The different approaches adopted.**

***Cohort 1 (2007 intake):***

With that in mind, we decided to adopt a multi-focused entry procedure which took into account:

- their UAI score;
- their responses to questions on the application form; and
- their performance in an examination we had devised.

In Year 1, there were 38 places on offer. The University had worked hard to promote the new program, even though it was still in a development stage as students were considering their post high school options. Our marketing paid off and by the close of applications, we'd received almost 140 applications. From an academic perspective, the applications ranged from a UAI high of 100 to a low of 18.3. Most applications were clustered in the range from the low 80s upwards (see chart 1). Only 3 scored lower than 50. We could comfortably have offered the 38 places to students in the range 85 plus (57 applicants exceeded this threshold), and spared ourselves considerable effort in trying to identify passion. However, as a niche program, we believed it was important to produce students whose chances of finding employment upon graduation with employers who would come back to us again in the future when seeking additional staff, than establishing a production line of graduates who would be 'on their own' after graduation.

Accordingly, we included three questions on the application form which were designed to ascertain (a) their community mindedness; and (b) their understanding of Journalism and their own role therein. We believed that community mindedness may provide a clue to Journalistic passion. The question was straight-forward:

- 'Please provide examples of community involvement and roles you have undertaken.'

The other two questions were likewise focused. They were:

- 'Explain in no more than 250 words why you want to be a journalist and what skills you would bring to the profession'; and
- 'Explain in no more than 400 words the main problems facing Journalism today.'

Students then sat a two-hour exam which was made up of two parts:

- 100 multiple choice general knowledge questions; and
- a series of Journalism specific questions, framed along the lines of: 'If you were faced with the following scenario, how would you respond?'

The responses were interesting, as table 2 (below) reveals. Students tended to perform poorly on the multiple choice questions – confirming anecdotal evidence that they do not engage as willingly with traditional news and current affairs as their parents and grandparents. However this does not account for the fact that they still performed poorly on questions we anticipated they would do well at (those relating to contemporary music and films).

<b>Table 2: General knowledge revealed</b>				
Score	<b>0-20</b>	<b>21-40</b>	<b>41-60</b>	<b>61+</b>
	0	17	77	12
n= 106				

Interestingly, students did perform well when answering the hypotheticals – a task that required either some knowledge of Journalism practices or at the minimum a capacity for problem solving. At least one of the scenarios required candidates to choose between a safe option that suggested they were not particularly passionate about their Journalism, and a riskier option (albeit not life threatening) that would suggest a high level of passion for, or commitment to, Journalism. Students were not asked to answer these questions cold. They had previously been able to access a trial exam which was accessible on the School of Journalism and Creative Writing web site. The answers were also posted online a month before the formal exam (see appendix 2).

Journalism staff were asked to grade the applications across the three criteria. To these were added the results from the multiple choice component of the exam, and then the results for the extended written component were added separately. This produced the following formula: A + (B + C). To these were added the student's UAI result. Previously students had been asked to provide an indicative UAI. At the time applications closed, students had not sat their final Higher School Certificate (HSC) examinations – the major determinant in calculating their UAI.

***Cohort 2 (2008 intake):***

In 2007 we decided to increase (and cap) the 2008 intake for the Bachelor of Journalism to 54 students. This equates with three newsroom classes of 18 students (see photos of newsroom and Convergent Journalism Lab). Again, our decision to introduce the course continued to be vindicated, with nearly 140 applicants applying. Not only had the number of applicants remained constant from years 1 to 2, but the quality of applicants (as measured by the UAI results, had also increased slightly. The highest applicant had a UAI of 100, again sufficient to secure a place in any degree of their choice. The average UAI was 79.79, although again this was indicative, as a number of students do not have UAIs. While the average UAI was slightly lower than for 2007, there was a higher proportion of students with UAIs in the 90s. In fact 34 of 108 students who submitted their UAIs were in this band. An additional 15 students had UAIs in the band 85-89.

Given the number of high UAI applicants, we decided to conduct an experiment to further test 'the passion' versus intelligence argument. This involved creating a third cohort of students who would be invited into the program on the basis of their UAI alone. We felt we could do this without compromising the integrity of our entry procedures, or the marketing blurb we had been employing to attract potential candidates. We offered early entry to a small group of twelve applicants who had a UAI of 90 and above. These

students became our third cohort. Their progress throughout the program will be monitored and compared with those from cohorts (1) and (2).

All prospective students (including those allowed in via direct entry based on their UAI alone) were still required to submit a formal application which included the community and Journalism questions identified above. However, based on our experiences with the 2007 entry procedures (and informal discussions we'd had with the successful students), we decided to experiment with a different process in an effort to seek first-hand evidence of that great unknown quality – 'passion'. We were not convinced that the general knowledge test was effective in helping to identify suitable students, even though we were aware that this approach formed a central plank of most entry procedures adopted by Australian media organisations when seeking to cull applicants for the small number of cadetships on offer. We believed that a better approach was to interview candidates (another strategy favoured by media organisations). However, rather than conduct individual interviews (a process that would be time consuming for staff and potentially daunting to individual applicants), we decided to opt for group interviews that replicated an editorial conference. Prospective students were asked to come along to the interview armed with three or four story ideas from their local community that they would be asked to discuss with Journalism staff and other applicants. They were also advised that they would be asked to write a small news story based on their ideas and the discussions that had taken place within the editorial conference. Applicants were advised as to the format of the editorial conference and what to bring along at a series of marketing events, on-campus Discovery Days (where prospective students have the opportunity to sit in on a program overview and to talk to staff). They were also invited to contact staff (by phone or email) if they had any follow-up questions in the lead-up to the interview. A number took advantage of that offer to talk directly to staff about potential story ideas and news conference procedures. Applicants were also briefed when they arrived for the interviews.

Unlike the first cohort, all of whom were invited to sit the exam, in this case we conducted a preliminary cull of applicants (based on their written applications) prior to the interview stage. Approximately two thirds of applicants were invited to the interview stage. The majority accepted. Interviews were conducted over three days, with three staff participating in the editorial conference. Interviews usually involved six applicants with two members of staff acting as Editor and Chief of Staff. Mr O'Donnell assumed the role of editor, with Professor Tanner taking on an observational role.

The editorial conference normally lasted for one hour, with all applicants being invited to present their main story idea. Those applicants who had front, or were not self conscious, tended to volunteer their story ideas up front. They were also more likely to respond to ideas offered by other applicants. While this situation was obviously competitive, applicants did not treat it as such (that is they were not dismissive of another person's ideas, tending instead to offer constructive comments, such as: 'did you think about interviewing x?' or 'what about asking such and such a question?') Applicants quickly overcame any initial reluctance they may have had to engage (due to shyness, uncertainty etc) and by the time they were invited to rank all story ideas (would they publish them and where in the daily newspaper?) they were totally involved.

The second stage of the interview process involved students moving over to one of the computers in the newsroom and then writing up the first few parts of their main story. These were then saved to disc and printed off for staff to have a look at. Applicants were also asked to take a photo of themselves and to include that with their story (this was straight-forward as the newsroom runs iMacs. Finally, applicants were invited to talk with staff before leaving.

### **Discussion:**

Staff believed that the entry procedures adopted to select the second cohort were more effective than those employed for the first cohort. To test this we conducted a series of focus groups with the students who were successful in gaining places in the Journalism program in years 1 and 2.

#### ***Cohort 1 (2007 intake):***

Students from the 2007 intake generally believed that the multiple choice component of the examination did not work. They argued strongly that the examination did not test knowledge and that there was little they could do to prepare for it. Also, a number indicated that the examination was too close to their HSC exams and that they were exhausted after completing their school requirements and did not want to build up again for another exam, particularly at a time when their colleagues were beginning to celebrate the end of their high school experience.

Applicants were, however, supportive of the hypotheticals, believing that these related more closely to their expectations of what Journalism would be about. Most believed that the questions contained in the written application were designed to identify the passion of applicants and their understanding of Journalism. A small number were intimidated by the achievements question in the written application, pointing out that it made them feel like a failure. Overwhelmingly, students in the first cohort did not support entry by UAI score alone. However they believed that a better approach than the one they were asked to apply through would have involved a combination of written application and interview. As one student said in the focus group session: 'My strength is my verbal communication ... I was frustrated that I could not stand before a panel and showcase those skills.'

#### ***Cohort 2 (2008 intake)***

The second cohort was relieved that they did not have to sit the examination they had been told about by their colleagues from the previous year. Speaking during the focus group session, most felt that the examination did not give them an opportunity to showcase the skills they believed helped them obtain a place in the program: namely their ability to engage with people, to ask questions and to write journalistically. While indicating that they were initially concerned at having to front a mock news conference with other applicants, they argued that they quickly settled into this task, helped in part by the staff running the session and the other applicants who were also in their session. A

number indicated that they did not feel as if they were competing against other people in their group, rather, they were ‘feeding off’ and ‘helping’ each other. The majority argued that this session – and the news story writing exercise that followed – helped them showcase their abilities, including passion for Journalism. It is interesting that this term was used by members of both focus groups, independently of the staff running the sessions.

Students in cohort 2 were asked how they prepared for the news conference sessions. Their responses varied, with a number indicating that they read their local newspaper or listened to local radio and television bulletins so as to gain a sense of what was happening in their local community. Others conducted web searches, spoke to family and friends, and even followed up with stories that had run, but they believed could be improved with a different angle.

Thus the interview process can be seen to be working as a pre-course orientation as well as a selection process. A number of the students also said the practical, journalism-story focus of the interview also shaped their notion of what they thought the course would be like:

Sitting in the interview actually shaped my perception of what the course was going to be like, I thought it was maybe going to be a more theory based course... but the way the interview was...you are in the room with all the computers and you have the little glass box and it looks like a news room... and the way we were sitting around in a conference I thought maybe this is what class is going to be like – hands on working as a team.

Therefore the interview/workshop structure can be seen to be a more valuable selection process on a number of levels:

- It allows students to display personal qualities which include passion, team work and communicative abilities
- It models the interactive “real newsroom” pedagogical context and allows staff to display methods of teaching and learning
- It provides students with an initiation into journalism through exposing them to ideas of story selection and development
- It is multi-layered and allows students with different temperaments and talents to shine in different aspects of the process ie group work or private writing assignment
- It challenges students and takes them out of their comfort zone while at the same time providing a supportive environment for this challenge.

This multi-layered selection process is therefore in keeping with the key pedagogical principles that underline the development of the course and its focus on focused professional training, passion for journalism and authentic tasks.

It is difficult to assess differences in cohorts chosen by different methods. Both cohorts (1) and (2) have included students of varying abilities and the spread of marks in the initial subjects does not seem to indicate any major differences in abilities to successfully complete the course materials. However one objective measure is the continuation rate at the end of second semester. Both groups have good retention rates but the first group had 4 (of 38) students leave, transfer or defer while the second group (54 students) had no one leave at this stage. This is one indicator that would seem to suggest that students selected for the second intake had a more focused passion for journalism. While there could be a range of factors affecting these figures staff who have taught both cohorts have noted that on the whole the second cohort seem to be a more vibrant and determined group and that this is demonstrated by lively class discussions and a tendency for many students in this group to produce work that goes beyond the “must-do” elements of class assignments.

### ***Cohort 3 (2008 intake – UAI only).***

This small group of students were asked whether they supported the use of entry based on UAI only. While most said that they did support such an approach, all were prepared to sit the examination to to front an interview panel if that would ensure them a place in the program. Some of the students in this group believed that the whole program should not be selected on this basis, agreeing with the convenors that it does not necessarily identify passion among prospective journalists.

### **Conclusion:**

The purpose of this paper was to identify whether there is an ideal model to help identify passion for journalism among prospective students. A preliminary study based on Bachelor of Journalism students at the University of Wollongong in New South Wales, Australia, has looked at two models in an attempt to identify students who show a passion for the profession they are hoping to make a career of. To date it is too early to state whether there are likely to be any differences based on the three models trialled:

- examination and written entry;
- mock news conference participation, partial story and written application; and
- UAI entry and written application.

As part of this study we did conduct an online inquiry of other journalism programs, using discussion sites hosted by the IAMCR, AEJMC and JEA. There were only a handful of responses to our call for information regarding entry procedures adopted elsewhere. The sense we gained was that entry based on UAI (or national equivalent) was the fall-back position adopted by most universities. Student preferences is for an entry procedure that seeks to replicate a working Journalism environment, arguing that such an approach is the best way of identifying passion. Whether that is the case or not is yet to be seen. The answer perhaps depends on your response to the question: is passion inherent or can it be developed?

## References:

AMA Alexi Marmott and Associates, 2006, Spaces for Learning: a review of learning spaces in further and higher education, Scottish Funding Council. Available at: [http://www.sfc.ac.uk/information/information\\_learning/Spaces\\_for\\_Learning\\_report.pdf](http://www.sfc.ac.uk/information/information_learning/Spaces_for_Learning_report.pdf) accessed 17/04/06.

Barnett, Ronald, Gareth Parry & Kelly Coate, 2001, "Conceptualising Curriculum Change" *Teaching in Higher Education*, Vol. 6, No. 4 p.437

de Burgh, Hugo, 2003, "Skills are not enough: The case for journalism as an academic discipline," *Journalism*, Vol. 4(1): 95–112

Deuze, Mark, 2006, "Global Journalism Education: A Conceptual Approach," *Journalism Studies*, 7:1, pp.19-34

Favre, Gregory, 2003, 'It Takes Passion, *American Editor*, Issue 832, May/June, p. 36.

Gans, H. 1985. 'Are US Journalists dangerously Liberal?' *Columbia Journalism Review*, Nov-Dec. 29-33. Henningham, J. 1990. 'Is Journalism a profession?' In *Issues in Australian Journalism*, ed. J. Henningham. Melbourne, Longman Cheshire.

Henningham, J. 1993. 'Characteristics and attitudes of Australian Journalists,' *Electronic Journal of Communication*, vol. 4(3).

Herrington, J., Oliver R., and T. C. Reeves, "Patterns of Engagement in Authentic Online Learning Environments," *Australian Journal of Educational Technology*, Vol. 19, No. 1, 2003, pp. 59–71.

Jenkins, Henry, 2006, *Convergence Culture*, New York University Press, New York, New York.

Johnstone, J. Slawski, E and Bowman, W. 1976. *The News People*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

McWilliam, Erica, 2007, "Is Creativity teachable? Conceptualising the Creativity/Pedagogy Relationship in Higher Education," in *Enhancing Higher Education, Theory and Scholarship*, Proceedings of the 30th HERDSA Annual Conference [CD-ROM], Adelaide, 8-11 July.

Moore, Gregory L. 'The Passionate Editor,' American Society of Newspaper Editors Diversity Committee, April 2004, p. 2.

O'Donnell, M., 2007, "Student Journalists as Reflective Practitioners" National Roundtable: Assessing student learning: Using interdisciplinary synergies to develop good teaching and assessment practice, Masonic Centre, Sydney, 4 September 2007.

Sword, Helen, 2007, "Teaching in Color: Multiple Intelligences in the Literature Classroom," *Pedagogy: Critical Approaches to Teaching Literature, Language, Composition, and Culture*, 7:2, pp 223-250.

Thompson, Tracy, 2007. 'Passion for Journalism,' Committee of Concerned Journalists. Accessed from <http://www.concernedjournalists.org/print/941> on June 18, 2008.

Weaver, D. and Wilhoit, G. 1986. *The American Journalist: A Portrait of US News People and Their Work*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.