

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Day 2, April 5, 2014: Morning Session – 9:00-9:45 a.m.

Giving Good Advice: Reflections of an Academic on 25 Years of Advising Journalists and Media Companies

Chair: Paula Poindexter, President at **Association of Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC)**

Keynote Speaker: Jay Rosen, Associate Professor at **New York University** and Blogger at **PressThink.org**

Q & A: Paula Poindexter and Jay Rosen

Jay Rosen: Thank you, Rosental, Amy and the ISOJ team. Thank you for that gracious introduction. I have to correct one thing, which is incredibly rude. What I said was, I was one of the first people as a journalism *professor* to have a blog. And I don't want that to be misunderstood.

If you want to follow along in this presentation, you can go to GivingGoodAdvice.org. A couple of disclaimers before I begin. First, this is without a doubt the most self-centered presentation I've ever given. [*laughter*] It's all about my experiences over 25 years and attempting to give the American press good advice. So, let it not be said that he was unaware of how self-centered it is, because I am highly aware of it, but I think it's going to be great.

Second, in the spirit of media hacking and using tools for tasks that they weren't intended for, let me present GivingGoodAdvice.org. I wrote my presentation using outlining tools, because I wanted to try that and it fit the material. The software I used is Dave Winer's Fargo system, made by his company Small Picture. One of my students Blake Hunsaker helped me out with it. He's the producer. And I'm not making any grand claims for this method. It was just a cool thing to try. So, let's get to it.

Over the years, I've given different kinds of advice, and I wanted to organize all of those incidents into some sort of coherent scheme. So, here are the different kinds of advice that I've given over that time period. The first is, unrequested advice. *Unrequested advice*. And this is actually a big portion of what I do. It's like an advisory to the press that no one in the press specifically requested. And I say it's a big portion of what I do, because that's pretty much what my blog PressThink is. And my Twitter feed is daily advice on what to sit with and puzzle through if you're trying to track developments in online journalism. Unrequested advice.

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Then there's *collegial advice*. Collegial advice is horizontal. It's mutual. The advice goes both ways. When we work on something together and try to give shape to something a little different, that's collegial advice. Some examples for me: the civic journalism movement in the United States between around 1989 and 1999 was collegial advice. There was mutual investment by journalists, academics, foundations in moving this idea forward.

A couple of years ago, I collaborated with The New York Times on a hyperlocal site that covered the East Village in New York. It was published on NYTimes.com. It was produced at NYU. And that was advice.

My graduate program at NYU was called Studio 20. It teaches by plunging students into projects with media partners. We study the partner's business. We study their strategy. We study their problems. We look at best practices. And then we give them good advice. So, that's collegial advice: horizontal, mutual.

Then there's *requested, but not specifically paid-for advice*. Anybody who's a journalism professor does this. For example, helping a reporter with an assignment. The most useful interviews that I give with journalists are not actually for quotes. They are, "Let me tell you how I would approach this story." When someone asks you on Twitter, "What's your advice?" that's actually a very important advice moment, because not only should you reply but people are watching your reply. Of course, advising NYU students on careers and building their intellectual capital is basic to what I do. And startups reach out all the time with requests for advice, and I wish I had more time to meet with them.

This is a category that will be familiar to anybody who's had grants: *semi-compensated*; meaning, somebody wants you to be participating in an advice situation, and then they don't pay you, but they do pay your expenses or sometimes you get put up in very nice hotels, and there's frequently nice meals associated with it. So, it's not really paid, but it's semi-compensated.

And then finally, there's *paid and requested advice*, in which expenses are paid, but also kind of market compensation is paid. And currently, I'm a consultant to Post Media Network in Canada, which is the largest newspaper in Canada. I'm a member of the Digital Advisory Board for Digital First Media -- at least I think I am. [*laughter*] I'm on the Board of Directors of the Gazette Company in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, which is a small media company in Iowa. And I'm an advisor to Pierre Omidyar's startup First Look Media.

Now, another way of organizing this data is by advice situations. And I created a list, a partial list, which you can look at later. I'm not going to go into everything on here. But I tried to paraphrase the advice I was giving in these different situations.

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

So, in my initial speech to journalists in 1989, the advice was, "If people don't participate in public life, they don't really need journalism," which is probably the organizing idea for my career.

When I was an advisor for a few years to Knight-Ridder at the request of the then CEO, Jim Batten, and worked with some of their newspaper editors, it was, "Reconnect with citizens around conversations that need to happen in this community but aren't happening." That was my advice.

When I collaborated with Buzz Merritt, the Editor of the Wichita Eagle, for about eight years, the advice was, "Only if we make vivid a different role for the press in public life will people see the point of civic journalism."

Skipping down. As an advisor to the American Society of Newspaper Editor's Change Committee, the advice was, "The Metro Daily is close to losing its essential status in the community." That was 1995.

I was asked to write for Salon's Table [Talk] -- for Salon Magazine when it was originally born on the web. And I didn't do that, but I got very interested in their comments section, so I became a participant in the comments section for about two years at salon.com, and from that position, advised the editors, "You should really hook some of these smart people up in the comment threads with some of your reporters, because that could really work." Scott Rosenberg can verify this. Anyway, they ignored me. [*laughter*]

2007: Collaboration with Evan Hansen and wired.com: "You guys should try crowdsourcing a trend story. We could learn a lot from that." And that's exactly what we did.

2008: I collaborated with Amada Michel who's now at The Guardian and Arianna Huffington. My advice to Arianna was, "As you cover the campaign in 2008, you should create a part of your coverage where any Huffington Post reader can sign up and join your political coverage." That was the idea of the project. And that's exactly what we did.

Collaborating with The New York Times. I told you about that one.

This one is a little more interesting with Michelle McLennan and the Patterson Foundation. We advised a group of hyperlocal publishers across the United States, "Hey, you guys are doing the same thing in different communities. You should learn from each other. You should help each other." And today, there is a trade association for those organizations, which is pretty cool.

OK. Now to the heart of my presentation. I wanted to give names to the problems that I've been asked to advise upon. Now this wouldn't fit the category of unrequested advice. This is in requested advice. Here are the problems that journalists and news organizations asked for an academic to advise them upon:

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

"Our connection to the community is fraying. But my newsroom says: We're not community organizers, we're journalists!" What should we do?

Or, "I go out and I give my best journalism speech to the key civic groups in this town and they don't believe a word of it anymore." That's what Cole Campbell told me in 1992 or so. What should we do?

Or, "We would love to have more participation by regular people in our journalism. How do we do that and maintain credibility?" [That's] something I still get asked about.

"We want to change our role in the community, but it's not what we have traditionally done. How do we break out of that?"

Or, "Practically speaking, what can the people formerly known as the audience contribute to a quality news product?"

Or, "We're having trouble adapting to what digital is doing to us. We have some ideas for changing that. Do you have any better ideas?"

"You're watching newsrooms and companies try to adapt. To what — to whom — should we be paying more attention?" This is probably the advice I'm asked to give more than any other.

"Look—we're running out of time. We have to become a digital-first news engine with a print product. Can you help us explain it?"

Or, "We're starting over—a new company. We think there's a different way to do news, but we don't know if it's different enough."

Then, I wanted to draw some lessons from this ark of experience from 1989 to today. Here are my key lessons:

First, journalism schools allowed the teaching of practice and the making of academic knowledge by PhDs to diverge and evolve away from one another. It wasn't a deliberate decision. It was the result of many small decisions over time, but it was a mistake.

Second, advising companies and working with journalists on innovation projects helps me overcome that split. And I know a lot of people here work in the same way. We heard about some of that work at this conference.

Third, problems of practice in newsrooms around the world and the problems that get journalism scholars and PhDs excited should be the same problems. [laughter] That's my advice. [laughter]

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Philosophically, I am a pragmatist. Pragmatists believe that our knowledge advances when we try to improve things. And invariably, we run into problems. And solving those problems is what creates new knowledge. That's the pragmatist view.

So, when news organizations try to improve things, they invariably run into problems. As their adviser, I have to dig in and really go to school on moment and try to figure out how to help. Sometimes I can, sometimes I can't.

Often, my most useful advice involves re-describing their predicament using different terms or what I would call better press-think. In fact, most of what I do as a critic and scholar of journalism is re-description.

Unrequested advice sounds like a joke category. In fact, some of you were laughing at it earlier. I heard you. [*laughter*] But it's not. Without my independent platform, PressThink.org, no one would want my advice.

The maximum that *advice* should take up in a professor's life is one day a week or 20% time, but 10% time is really better/safer. The danger is in making their problems your problems. As soon as that becomes your work, you've lost the independent space from which people began to desire your advice in the first place. You see what I mean?

This is something I discovered this year. It's hard to talk publicly about the journalism when you are a paid adviser to it. Because you can't mention certain things that are confidential. And what I learned this year is that these "can't talk about it" zones tend to expand more than you think they will, which is another reason to keep it to 20% or 10%.

OK. We're coming in for landing here. In making these notes, I discovered that giving advice is a surprisingly personal and emotional subject for me. And you might be able to appreciate some of this in your own life. How many people do you know are really, really good at taking advice? [*laughter*] Would you say that describes a lot of people in your social circle? It's a very personal thing—giving advice. It's kind of threatening. And you can hear that tonally if I say to you, "Well, let me give you some advice." Right? That's tonally a threatening situation.

My students know I'm on leave this semester. And one thing I'm working on is First Look, which we can talk about later if you want to. And another thing I'm working on is a departure for me. It's a performance piece. The idea is to do PressThink with a live audience. Never done that before, but I'm going to try and do it. So, you're a live audience, right?

So, this is a first reading of a small part of the script. And as you will hear, it's all about giving advice. And I think you'll recognize some of the situations in it. So, here goes. It's only four minutes. I timed it.

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

It's one of my clearest and more potent memories from childhood. I am sitting on a hard wooden bench outside the office of a family therapist and child psychologist, Dr. Horowitz. Inside the office, my mother, my two older brothers, and my sister are trying to figure out why they keep fighting and making each other miserable. It's hard to believe now, but they used to call households like ours—single mom, raising five kids on a schoolteacher's salary—"broken homes." And there was something broken about it. The peace was broken. Everyone was constantly fighting!

All I wanted was some peace and green grass to play on. But at nine years old I had no power to make peace in my home. I had two options and I exercised both. First was I declined to participate in their warring. This made me invisible. But that's an advantage. When you're invisible, no one tries to throw an ashtray at you. Second, I took notes. Invisible notes. I saw exactly what he did to needle her, and how she overreacted, which then encouraged him. I felt the interlocking genius of their misery. I knew what co-dependence was 20 years before I knew the name for it. And I did feel a kind of awe at the efficiency and power of sheer human denial. It's all there in my notes at nine years old.

So there they were, around 1965, inside the consultation room with Dr. Horowitz. And there I was working on my pattern recognition skills, alone, on that hard wooden bench. And I remember feeling, "This is crazy! They're in there struggling with their problems. All I do every day is study their problems. Why aren't they asking me for my advice?"

Today, the answer is obvious: I was invisible to my own family. And from that, another writer was born.

I've asked a lot of questions of journalists over 25 years, and one of my favorites is: Why did you choose journalism as your life's work? When you ask that question, the answers fall into certain patterns: "I love to write." "Something new every day." "I wanted to tell stories, expose the bad guys and make a difference." Or my favorite: "I wanted to take that magic carpet ride and see the world." I love that.

One thing you never hear when you ask journalists that question is: "I got into journalism because I have a passion for being objective!" [laughter] You don't hear that. Or, "Detachment is my thing. I'm kind of a detached guy, so I thought this would be a good field for me."

No one ever says that, but they do say: "We don't take sides, so we can't use the word 'torture.' To refer to torture, instead, it's brutal interrogation." Now calling torture something like 'enhanced interrogation' in the news pages of the New York Times is not why people decide to go into journalism. In many ways, it's the opposite of why people going into journalism. So, you might say their press-think gets in the way of what got them into the business in

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

the first place. Which is the kind of thing I might point out in my blog, [PressThink](#).

So in 1965, it was: "Why aren't they listening to my advice?" Today, it's different. It goes like this: "You want my advice?" "Not particularly." "Great! Well, here it is anyway." Because that's blogging. And blogging feels a lot better than that bench.

Thank you very much.

[Applause.]

Q & A Session:

Paula Poindexter: Let's see. In 1999, you asked, *What are journalists for?* And so, I guess my question to you in 2014 is, *Is that a relevant question? And why or why not?*

Jay Rosen: Hmm. Yeah, I think it's a hugely relevant question, because most people who go into journalism, most people who study it and teach it, understand that it's not just another business. And we can't treat it as simply another industry. So, my answer in 1999 to *What are journalists for?* was, *They help people participate in public life. That's the reason we need them.* And I still think that's a good place to start in understanding why journalism is special, different.

Paula Poindexter: The civic or public journalism that you are one of founders of—and I will tell you that I just love the idea of public or civic journalism—but the civic or public journalism movement was about journalists' responsibility to bring the public into journalism, to make journalism better and more responsible, and engage the public, of course. And so I guess my question to you [is], do you think that the emergence of bloggers and citizen journalists satisfied that need or the vision that you had for civic or public journalism?

Jay Rosen: Well, yes and no. Civic journalism started as I tried to suggest in my remarks with certain practical problems that basically newspaper editors were running into in the early 90's. And these problems included loss of influence, a kind of push-back from the community, a disconnection from the community. And I don't necessarily think we've solved those problems. So in that sense, no, but in another sense, yes. My own belief—and I tried to articulate this throughout the civic journalism movement and in my book—is that the more people who participate in it, the better the press is. The more people who participated, the better the journalism we get.

And in 1992, when I started some of that work, it was very hard to do that. You had to try, for example, to physically gather people in a town meeting

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

situation or you had to go out and meet with them in person. And of course, the number of people that you could gather information from for that was very limited. So, the tools we had then to involve people as participants in the improvement and doing of journalism were very crude. Now we have much better tools. And of course, now, it's taken for granted that participation by the users is a good thing. Another way to say it is, civic journalism was an early warning sign for what we now call the problem of engagement. Civic journalism was engagement 20 years ago, 15 years ago.

Paula Poindexter: And so the third question that I have for you is about online comments, so kind of similar in terms of an opportunity for engagement. Online comments offered a great opportunity to bring the public into journalism. And so, what do you think of online comments? And would you say that media organizations have managed or mismanaged this great democratic potential?

Jay Rosen: Oh, mismanaged for sure—in this sense: by the time newspaper websites started introducing comment sections—'95-'96—there was already a great deal of experience and wisdom online about online forums. We knew a lot about what works in those forums and what doesn't, not from the news industry, but from people who had been on the internet before the web. And when news organizations introduced their comment sections, they knew nothing about that, almost nothing about that history. They knew very little about the lessons learned, and it's taken years and we still aren't even there yet. To get across to journalists simple things that were known then, like, if the writer participates in the comment thread, it goes a lot better and you get a lot less violence, a lot less name calling, a lot less game playing. So, I think that's unfortunate, and I think it is characteristic of the news industry, which does have kind of a learning disability sometimes. But I think if people who started comment sections had steeped themselves in what was known about online comments, it would have been a lot easier.

Paula Poindexter: So, do you think it's too late? Can you go back now knowing that some of these horrible things are happening with online comments?

Jay Rosen: It's not too late, but I think there has been a kind of strange cycle of neglect followed by contempt in comment sections. Neglect in the sense that we had these comments. We don't really think they are all that important. We don't make the writers engage. We don't draw much information from them. We don't learn from them. We have them, so we provide a way for you to sound off, right? But we don't actually do anything with that, so that's what I call neglect. So then when neglected, you get the predictable results, and then you exhibit contempt for it, so that's not what news should be about.

Now having said that, of course, there are lots of problems with comment sections and we don't know how to solve all of them. And there is an

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

instability there that, I think, becomes a real problem for a news organization. But on the other hand, it's always struck me that some people just can't get over the fact that anyone can say any damn thing they want on the internet. *[laughter]* You know? Some people just cannot get over that fact, and I can.

Paula Poindexter: OK. And on that note, we're going to, let's see, there's some....

Jay Rosen: Way in the back. Right.

Paula Poindexter: And so if you'll stand, introduce yourself, and that way we can all see you.

Ed Walsh: Good morning. Ed Walsh, UC-Berkeley. Jay, I'm a huge fan of your work. I've met you and always learn from you. Let me ask you kind of a big question. One of the motivating passions I found in your work, because your *[passion]* is bigger, *[is]* unification between the press and the public, and yet the signature failings of the press in our lifetime seem to have stemmed from the failure of the press to defy public sentiment. So, I'm wondering how you reconcile these two things.

Jay Rosen: Could you just elaborate what you mean by defy public sentiment? I think I know what you mean, but give me a....

Ed Walsh: We have herding, and your example about enhanced interrogation presumably came from an unwillingness of the press to incur public wrath.

Jay Rosen: Yeah. OK.

Ed Walsh: What you called torture.

Jay Rosen: Right. Right. Right. OK. This is a question I've been asked a lot, maybe in different forms, maybe hundreds of times. But that means it's a good question. And I figured around Episode 50 that maybe I should work out an answer to it. So, here's my answer. I think it addresses what you're saying. Maybe not, but I think it does. A lot of times journalists worry that if they go too far in consulting users, listening to audiences, responding to what people want, and other kinds of engagement that we frequently encourage of them, that they will then lose the ability to tell hard truths to those people. And I think that's a good question. It's a good problem.

Here's the way I think about it. As I said before, how many people do you know who are good at taking advice? Not many. And what causes people to take the advice of a journalist who says, "You may not be interested in this, but it's really important," or, "This might offend you, but it's happening, so you have to know," or, "This might sound really complicated, but it's the

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

future of our country," or, "This might actually feel like we're attacking your favorite politician, but you really need to know this." What causes people to accept that invitation when it is given? Well, if most of the time they feel you're listening to them, you know something about them, you engage with them, if most of the time that's what you're doing, then they may take your cue and be willing to listen to hard truths [that] you tell them, because you have that connection with them.

So, I think there's an important connection between what we call engagement on the one hand and truth telling on the other. And the connection is, we are most willing to hear hard truths from people who know something about us. See what I mean? And I think that connection we have to explore a little bit more.

But you are right, the failings of the press that stand out as most glaring are failures of performance in the fourth estate function of challenging the government and revealing what's going on. When the United States can go to war in Iraq behind a phony case, that's a failure.

Paula Poindexter: I think we have a question up in the....

Woman: Hi. I'm Alex Kramer with NPR. I was wondering how you balance putting reporters in comment sections with everything else that they are being asked to do. Everybody is short staffed or missing staff members. People are being asked to record their own video, audio, comment on Twitter, Facebook, report, and now you're adding comments to the mix. I have a lot of reporters in my newsroom who just don't have the time. So, how are we supposed to balance this with everything else?

Jay Rosen: I don't reply to people who tell me, "I don't have the time. What should I do?" Because I can't make time. So, in the way that you stated it, I don't think there is a solution. I don't think there is an answer. However, I would point those people to the work of journalists who have kind of figured it out and know how to combine these things into stories. A good example used to be—now he switched jobs so I don't know if he still operates this way—but a good example used to be Brian Stelter of The New York Times, the media reporter, who was frequently on the front page. And if you watched the way Brian Stelter worked, here's how he operated: He'd get an assignment in the morning, and he'd say on Twitter, "I'm working on Letterman replacement today." And then he might ask a question or two that starts to get people flowing toward him. And a lot of what he might hear and reply is stuff he already thought about, but maybe some other things he didn't think about.

Then he'll say later in the day, "Interviewing CBS president. What should I ask him?" And again, [he] gets some more ideas. And it's not so much that people present so many original questions he never thought of, but it's more that he gets to go through his list and see if he's covered everything.

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Then about two o'clock or maybe one o'clock in the afternoon, you see an initial post go up at the New York Times media blog, which is sort of the bare bones of what he knows and what he's already found out. And then he Tweets that out, and then there's reactions to that.

And then around five o'clock he starts gathering everything he's learned from social media and his own reporting, and he starts putting together a story that's going to run in the paper, the print product, later. And then around eight or nine o'clock that story goes up online.

And throughout that process, Stelter is doing traditional journalism, but he's also consulting social media, and he's using what he's getting to make a better story. So, he doesn't say, "I don't have time for this." What he's done instead is integrate social into his work routine.

Paula Poindexter: Another question over here. Here's one.

Jacob: I'm Jacob. I've had people come to me, opinion writers, and say they want to be, you know, they consider themselves as journalists, who daily publish. For me, who is earning my degree through the practice of journalism, I think about it. I feel that somehow journalism is anybody who publishes something. That's the idea of what you call the social journalism or the people's journalism. Does that concept devalue the actual practice of journalism itself?

Jay Rosen: Mm-hmm.

Jacob: How do you see it?

Jay Rosen: Well, let me say a couple of things in response to that. When I started as a journalism professor in 1986, it was routine for faculty and deans at j-schools, probably happened here, to say to the new class of entering journalism students, "It's great that you decided upon journalism education, because journalism is the one profession mentioned in the 1st Amendment." This was something routinely taught. I'm sure there are people in this room who remember being taught that or maybe who remember teaching that.

Paula Poindexter: Mm-hmm. Yes. Yes. And proud of it! [*laughs/laughter*]

Jay Rosen: Exactly. And I would listen to that and I'd think, you know, that's really a weird thing to say. Journalism is the only profession mentioned in the 1st Amendment, because I've read the 1st Amendment.

Paula Poindexter: And it's not true.

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Jay Rosen: I've read the 1st Amendment, the whole thing, and it doesn't mention journalism anywhere in there. It does mention a free press. So, I think the first point is that freedom of the press belongs to everyone in the exact same way as freedom of speech belongs to everyone. It's just an aspect of freedom of speech. So, it's very important for journalists to realize that. And I think most of them do realize that; although, they still have this conflict of, "We are professionals and we know what we're doing."

Second thing is I think of journalism -- the practice of journalism as a heightened case of being a good citizen. *A heightened case of being a good citizen.* Meaning citizens should know how to get information from their government, but journalism knows a lot more, so it's a *heightened* case. Citizens should pay attention to the world and know what's going on, but journalists have to pay even more attention and know even more, because it's a *heightened* case. So, that's how I think of it is, journalism is a heightened case of skills and habits and practices that all people in democracy have to master—putting together an argument.

And sometimes we can appreciate this through everyday acts of journalism that we ask people to undertake, but we don't even think of as journalism. Like, "You were at the party? I missed it. How was it?" In that situation, you're simply being asked to give a report. Or as I put in one of the posts I wrote, which you can look up, "The essence of reporting starts with, *I'm there. You're not. Let me tell you about it, or, I was there at the party. You didn't make it. Let me tell you about it.*"

And I think there's a continuity between these everyday situations that are journalistic and professional journalism, but I think it's entirely appropriate for professional journalists to say, "We're just a heightened case of skills that any citizen needs, but we are *really* good at it. And if *you* want to be really good at it, these are the things that you have to do." I think that's completely appropriate for journalists to say, and I'm glad they do.

Paula Poindexter: And so while we could have a long debate about our differences and what you just said, I'm going to go to the next question. Is there another one? Right there.

Man: I appreciate being here for your presentation. I wanted to go back to the lesson, area three, where you said, "Problems of practice in the newsrooms of the world and problems that journalism scholars and PhDs are all excited about should be the same set." I wonder if you might be able to elaborate on that and then possibly propose what you might consider a proper resolution to that challenge.

Jay Rosen: Hmm. Well, thanks for that question, Steph. In fact, this whole presentation was kind of written for you. [*laughter*] I had you and Mark in mind when I wrote this. You know how you sometimes have a person you're writing to? So, you happened to be [that person]. [*laughter*]

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

Jay Rosen: There is no denying that. Here's what I mean. I believe that the journalism school as an institution is misaligned -- has been misaligned to both the practice of journalism on one side and the university on the other. I don't think that we have it right, and we haven't had it right for a long time. Although, it's changing and it's getting better. And a lot of the research that I've heard about at this conference is testimony to that. So, it's getting better. We're on the right side. But it's misaligned in this sense: What the industry wanted from the j-school for a very long time was, "Send us people we can plug into our production routine tomorrow." Tomorrow! In the phone sex industry, if you are hired, you have to undergo training for three weeks before they will let you on a call. [*laughter*] In the news industry, you have one day to find out where the bathroom is and the next day you are asked to produce a story. [*laughter*] Am I wrong?

Severall: No.

Jay Rosen: The next day you are asked to produce a story. So, that's the residue of, "Send us people we can plug into our production routine tomorrow," which was the news industry off-loading the training class onto the university. Right? And that's the j-school model. That's boot camp. That's, "Practice!" And it worked for everybody, because the students got jobs, the parents got, "Ahh," relief, "He chose something practical." Right? The university got not only their graduates employed, but they had this connection to the media, which is an important institution for them, right? And the industry could spend almost *nothing* on training and professional development and get the people it needed. So, it worked for a long time, right?

But what happens when "Send us people we can plug into our production routine tomorrow" meets up with "The internet broke our production routine. Can you help?" Obviously, the journalism school is not going to be able to help, because it was never asked to do that in the first place. And so, the news industry made, in my opinion, a grave error by not expecting of the journalism school a kind of research and development wing that could start solving some of the problems that it confronted and was going to confront even more dramatically. The industry couldn't turn to the journalism school in 2003 and say, "Help us adapt to digital," because it wasn't set up for that. Then on the other side, the purpose of the university is to produce new knowledge. That's what we heard about today when you guys gave your paper. It's the production of new knowledge. That is the mission of the university that goes along with its teaching mission. So, the production of new knowledge in journalism schools tended to enter into an academic field in mass communication research that was essentially sociology of the media and address itself to other scholars in sociology of the media, right?

And what I'm trying to say is that division was a mistake. "Send us people we can plug into our production routine tomorrow" was a mistake, because it

15th Annual International Symposium on Online Journalism

wasn't actually a valuable enough thing for the j-school to do. And "PhD's should address other scholars of mass communication in their work," that was a mistake.

So, how do we overcome that mistake? By putting everybody to work on the problems of practice. That's what I meant. Does that make sense?

Man: Yes.

Paula Poindexter: And on that note, let's thank Jay Rosen for an excellent presentation. Thank you.

[Applause.]