NEWSROOM TRAINING: WHERE’S THE INVESTMENT?

A study for the Council of Presidents of National Journalism Organizations
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‘I didn’t inherit a newspaper. I inherited an opportunity.’
— John S. Knight, American editor and publisher (1894-1981)

‘Freedom is nothing but an opportunity to be better.’
— Albert Camus, French author and philosopher (1913-1960)

The largest newspaper in Florida – the St. Petersburg Times, circulation 313,000 daily and 397,000 Sunday – is owned by a nonprofit organization. Not just any nonprofit, a nonprofit media school, The Poynter Institute.

The St. Pete Times has done well enough financially to send more than $55 million to Poynter to help train journalists nationwide, and put many millions more back into the newspaper’s products and its people.

Make you want to take another look at the power of professional development?

If you do, this is the reference book for you.

Newsroom Training: Where’s the Investment? is based on the biggest survey on the subject of journalism training ever done in the United States, and the first to cover all media. Under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates, 1,964 news executives and news staffers were interviewed by phone between January and March of 2002.

This volume’s consulting writer and editor is Beverly Kees, former Fresno Bee executive editor and co-founder of a national network of newsroom trainers. As Kees is fond of saying, what we found in 2002 is a news industry “inch ing toward greatness, but still below average.” According to the data, though more journalists today get midcareer training than got it a decade ago, the glass is still more than two-thirds empty.

Common sense says more will be done. It definitely should be. Journalists face an ever more complex world. They need more training just to stay in place, let alone catch up. But who will lead this next wave of professional development, and when, and where, and how? The Associated Press is doing more – “circumstances demand it,” says President and CEO Louis Boccardi. The New York Times Co. is doing more, swapping staffers between big and small papers in the group. So are folks at places like The Oregonian, Cox Academy, Community Newspaper Holdings Inc., and the Southern Newspaper Publishers Association.

Though heartening, these efforts don’t by themselves deal with the fact that most American journalists feel ill-equipped to cover the complexities of the modern world. Though welcome,
The goal is to improve market share in a down economy. Part of that is training people to do a better job.

— Andy Barnes
President, CEO,
Chairman and Editor
St. Petersburg Times

In a survey of 401 journalists commissioned by the Foundation for American Communications, a nonprofit journalism education organization, most say they’re poorly prepared to cover the most significant issues facing the country. “At a time when the media have been under increased scrutiny by the institutions it covers … this survey shows that journalists themselves believe they need to do a better and more thorough job of covering the news,” said FACS president John E. Cox Jr.

— News item

these initiatives are not enough to cover the estimated 85,000 journalists—some seven in 10—who say they get no regular training. Though substantial, these efforts can’t be portrayed as a $100 billion-a-year industry taking ownership of its own professional development.

The “credibility of journalism in recent years has been under attack, in part because inaccurate or incomplete stories have been rushed into print or onto the airwaves,” writes Ted Gist, president of the Council of Presidents of National Journalism Organizations. “Better training of journalists can help remedy at least some of those shortcomings.”

In 2002, Knight Foundation will invest at least $11 million in the training and education of journalists. Our programs help teach good journalists what they need to know to set higher standards for their own work, and, at times, within their newsrooms. Professional groups, universities and nonprofits are all playing increased and significant roles in this effort. Such can be the genesis of many a truth pursued, many a citizen informed, many a wrong righted, many a community and democracy served.

Even so, in this hydra-headed Information Age, with news and information sources proliferating, it’s doubtful that higher standards can be set by an elite cadre of well-trained journalists, let alone a handful of individual stars, though they can lead the way.

Accordingly, we join The Council of Presidents, a coalition of 40 organizations spanning the news community, in the hope and expectation that it will help the news industry embrace more fully the cause of professional training. That, we are convinced, is a clear way to journalism excellence.

— Eric Newton, Director of Journalism Initiatives, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Miami, Fla., September 2002

Lack of professional challenge is a key reason cited by journalists of color for leaving newsrooms, says a study commissioned by the American Society of Newspaper Editors and funded by The Freedom Forum. The study came after an ASNE survey found the number of journalists of color working at daily newspapers fell from 11.85 percent to 11.64 percent in 2000. “We can’t pretend that we don’t know why journalists of color are leaving the industry in large numbers. If the industry can implement an aggressive strategy to reverse the disturbing pattern, I think we will finally see progress,” said Jackie Greene, president of UNITY: Journalists of Color Inc., an alliance of minority journalist associations representing 7,000 journalists of color.

— News item
As the world changes daily, technologically advanced companies are investing in more employee training as a way to increase quality, retention, even profit.

“The focus … on developing people, in the light of the knowledge economy, is the key to competitive advantage,” states the American Society for Training and Development. “There is a new world of learning emerging – one that links people, learning and performance – and a new community growing around it.”

Curiously, news companies are exceptions to this trend, lagging behind other knowledge-based companies and generally failing to meet professional development needs. As one newsroom training editor put it, training in the news business “is still too often thought of as an isolated frill.”

That attitude is reflected in this book, which reports the largest-ever survey of newsroom training, funded by the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation and conducted by Princeton Survey Research Associates on behalf of the Council of Presidents of National Journalism Organizations.

The survey describes myriad ways in which the news industry is not yet a full-fledged citizen of the “new world of learning.” And, experts suggest, the large number of undertrained journalists is bad not only for the commercial future of the news industry, but for our society’s understanding of the world.

“The world is getting exponentially more complicated,” says Al Cross, immediate past president of the Society of Professional Journalists. “Complications in what we cover and how we do our jobs can make people feel they need more help.”

Here are some of the major findings from the PSRA training survey:

➢ The nation’s journalists say a lack of training is their No. 1 source of job dissatisfaction, ahead of pay and benefits;
➢ More than two-thirds of them receive no regular skills training;
➢ News companies overall have not increased their training budgets in the past decade;
➢ News executives admit they should provide more training for their employees, but say time and insufficient budgets are the main reasons they don’t.

The professional development situation worsened after Sept. 11, 2001, when terrorist attacks on the United States forced news companies to spend substantially on coverage. Within months, managers were looking for ways to cut costs. “There is a mind-set [that] when budgets are tight, marketing and training are the first to go,” says Bob Giles, curator of the Nieman Foundation.

The pinch has been felt throughout the news community. “We used to get 120 people for seminars. Now we get 30 or 40,” said David B. Gray, executive director, Society for News Design. “We’re getting more and more requests – ‘Why can’t you come to our shop and put on a daylong seminar so we don’t have to pay travel costs?’”
What other industries do

A study of 367 nonjournalism companies by the American Society for Training and Development says those firms managed to accomplish a training increase of 10 percent between 2000 and 2001, despite the economic recession.

On average, these companies offered 23.5 hours of training per employee in 2000, a figure that would appear excessive to a recession-pinched news manager.

On average, American companies spent an average of 2 percent of payroll on training. News industry figures, though sketchy, may be half that.

The ASTD also says training helps the bottom line. A second report showed that 575 U.S.-based, publicly traded companies that ranked high in training had much higher total shareholder return (TSR) than those ranking lower. “Firms in the top half had a TSR that was 86 percent higher than firms in the bottom half, and 45 percent higher than the market average,” said the study, Profiting From Learning: Do Firms’ Investments in Education and Training Pay Off?

On average, American companies spent an average of 2 percent of payroll on training. News industry figures, though sketchy, may be half that.

The ASTD also says training helps the bottom line. A second report showed that 575 U.S.-based, publicly traded companies that ranked high in training had much higher total shareholder return (TSR) than those ranking lower. “Firms in the top half had a TSR that was 86 percent higher than firms in the bottom half, and 45 percent higher than the market average,” said the study, Profiting From Learning: Do Firms’ Investments in Education and Training Pay Off?

The standard benchmark for comparing training is percentage of payroll. About 90 of our Impact Study for the Readership Institute papers also participated in Inland’s annual Cost & Revenue Survey, and an examination by circulation groupings shows that the average newspaper industry expenditure on formal training (as opposed to informal, on-the-job learning) is 0.7 percent of payroll. The industry range – from 0.3 percent to 2.5 percent – does not seem to have any pattern regarding size of newspaper.

(By comparison, the national average of ALL tracked companies in 1999 was 1.8 percent of payroll and in 2000 was 2 percent of payroll. While the ASTD doesn’t have a formal recommended standard on training budgets, the National Association of Manufacturers does. It recently said firms should spend 3 percent of payroll on training. Workforce magazine has said a general guideline for true learning organizations is to spend 3-6 percent.)

ASTD has done studies confirming that companies that spend 3 percent of payroll on training do achieve exemplary financial results, while adding that big budgets don’t ensure success and that such companies usually combine training with smart people practices in general.

— Richard Somerville, Research Associate People & Management Practices Readership Institute/Media Management Center Northwestern University

At the same time, Melinda Voss, executive director of the Association of Health Care Journalists, hears constantly from journalists “who are calling out for help in covering these complex and critical issues. They don’t understand statistics. They don’t know how to interpret medical research. They want more help understanding how things such as Medicaid and Medicare work.

“It seems to me that it is more important than ever that we as journalists really know how to do our jobs right, because so many critical policy decisions are being made that affect everyone. The ability to properly report medical studies and survey research and the ability to interpret statistics are all a part of doing the job right. We owe it to our audiences.”

Yet the ephemeral nature of the ever-changing $100 billion-a-year business of news works against the idea of systematic, organized professional development. That psychology is described by Michael Roberts, training editor at The Cincinnati Enquirer, as “yeah, yeah, that’s fine, now let’s do the real work.”

“I don’t think the problem will ever get resolved until corporate leaders and publishers make training a part of strengthening their franchise,” says Giles, former Detroit News editor and author of Newsroom Management. “If news organizations would invest significantly more in training, they would reduce their turnover significantly. Training would lead to higher levels of satisfaction. I don’t know why they don’t make that connection.”
The economic horizon looks brighter today than it did this time last year. The recession is lifting and, after 9-11, the public’s reliance on newspapers is revitalized. ... But recovery shouldn’t be taken lightly. There is much to be reconciled and rehabilitated in the wake of cutbacks in the nation’s newsrooms.

Now that the dust has settled, we have 2,000 fewer journalists covering our communities, while the debate over the appropriate measures of profit and public service ... I’ve picked a theme to focus our efforts in the coming year. That theme is “Sharing a Passion for Journalism.”

The pre-eminence of our journalism – journalism of the highest quality – should inform every conversation we have, whether it’s about the importance of diversity in ... results from an unerring belief on the part of the editor and publisher and CEO that what we sell is credibility.

Robert Levering, co-founder of A Great Place to Work Institute Inc., says professional development is singled out because “employees tell us it’s very important to them.” Levering has considered training to be a key element since 1984, when he and Milton Moskowitz developed the framework for the book The 100 Best Companies to Work for in America.

Just as companies have to do more...
Among the recommendations:

Leaders need to lead. Editors and middle managers must see themselves as teachers and acquire the skills for that role. They train the people who provide the content. They need to be trained as trainers and coaches.

Move the middle. Some news organizations already are creating “learning newsrooms.” Some never will. Most are in the middle, where they now do a little training and could do more.

Tailor plans. Newsrooms should be able to call on experts (such as the Committee of Concerned Journalists, the Poynter Institute, American Press Institute, the Maynard Institute and others) to help them develop training programs specific to their individual newsroom needs and goals.

Measure impact. There needs to be a multiyear, empirically based project to measure the impact of newsroom training internally and externally.

“Training editors and newsroom supervisors have to get better at marketing the results they get from training,” said Rene Kaluza, who doubles as day city editor and training editor for the St. Cloud (Minn.) Times. “We don’t say, ‘Gee, that was well done’ we got … is because of training.’ That’s what corporate is looking for – a return on investment. … We just have to work harder at it and convince the corporate side to give people like me the time to figure out what we need in training to get what we want in the end.”

Said The Cincinnati Enquirer’s Roberts: “Newsroom training has not matured within the industry. … It should work within larger frameworks of performance management, career development and organizational development.” In other words, professional development is part of a company’s regular operations, reflected in its strategic plans, job descriptions and annual employee reviews.

The beginnings of a movement

For the optimists, there is some good news in all this. True, there is not nearly enough newsroom training going on, but there is more going on today than there used to be. Compare the 1993 Freedom Forum study No Train, No Gain to this year’s Newsroom Training: Where’s the Investment? and you see that where one in 10 journalists said they got regular training a decade ago, that figure is now closer to three in 10. So those who claim that today’s journalists are absolutely right. Still ill-equipped to cover the complexity of modern life, but better equipped than before.

Another piece of good news is why the demand for training is growing. In the 1970s, it was a coin flip as to whether journalists had college degrees, but by 1992, the figure was eight in 10 and growing. It’s that better education that has given journalists a thirst for continued learning. During a professional’s career, University of Georgia Professor Lee B. Becker notes, there might be six or even more stages and that each involves finding a way to get the right kind of training. “A person seeking mid-career training is doing so at a point where such training would be most likely to yield the greatest rewards to her or
“Training is a key tool in our newsroom not only for recruiting, but for retention. We have set very high goals for excelling in our reporting, writing and presentation, and we can’t meet those goals if we don’t train folks and give them tools to meet our expectations,” says Maria De Varenne, managing editor of The Press-Enterprise in Riverside, Calif.

The newspaper does everything from brown-bag seminars to full ticket trips to the nation’s best trainers. Among other things, she says, “management training is tied to performance reviews.” Though her newspaper is a leader, she figures it spends “less than 3 percent of payroll on training – far too little.”

Her advice for news managers new to training: “Start with in-house programs where you can train dozens instead of sending one person to a specialty seminar. You’ll be surprised how many experts you have on your staff. Senior reporters can lead sessions on CAR [computer-assisted reporting], interviewing techniques and engaging leads. A senior copy editor can lead a session on headline writing, while a graphics editor can lead a session on layouts that work.”

Foundations have long helped educate journalists. Early efforts included the independent, free-form, yearlong midcareer programs such as the Nieman fellowships at Harvard and the John S. Knight fellowships at Stanford, which started because many journalists had little or no college experience. Today, most new programs are topic-based, helping journalists understand complex subject areas, though they are still supported primarily by the nonprofit sector, not by the industry itself.

By the 1990s, however, No Train, No Gain showed that the need for training among journalists was almost universal, far greater than what the relatively modest foundation efforts could meet. During that decade, an ad hoc group of newsrooms started its own informal national training movement. I was fortunate enough to see some of that, as the coordinator of this first coalition of newsroom training editors. In eight years, I saw the group grow from a few dozen to more than 200. They still meet, via cyberspace, and annually at the Poynter Institute in Florida. Because of their work, and the efforts of editors seeking excellence across the country, I see that even without budget increases these dedicated folks have helped regular newsroom training inch upward.

Quality news organizations, including most of the nation’s largest newspapers, know that training is important. Some of them are increasing their training budgets. It would be safe to say that many of the executives at quality news companies agree with Society of Professional Journalists President Al Cross when he reminds them “training is a good way to meet your public responsibilities.”

Quality news organizations probably would agree with Dori J. Maynard, president of Maynard Institute for Journalism Education, the nation’s leading organization for training journalists of color, when she says nearly all of her graduates are still in the business because “there is a direct and undeniable link between training and retention.”

Unfortunately, this study’s authors calculate that the quality news organizations – those with a high commitment to training – make up no more than 24 percent of the total.

The others, including great numbers in the broadcast industry, do not yet see that training is a path toward, not away from, business goals of job satisfaction, staff retention and company profits.

They are the ones who will need to be convinced if news companies are ever to give training priority status, track its expenses, and set a goal of reaching the national average for professional development of 2 percent of payroll.

The companies that can and do

Sprinkled throughout this essay and this book are sidebars featuring the stories and comments of news people who

American recessionary periods always have brought cutbacks in newspaper training budgets, and the end of a recession always has brought renewed funding for personnel development. In API’s 56-year history, we’ve seen this reflected time after time: When the economy is strong, attendance in our seminars is robust. When there’s a recession, attendance slumps.

With newsprint prices scheduled to rise and with the economy still in the dumpster as 2003 approaches, the next year doesn’t figure to be a great deal better for newsroom training budgets. Fortunately, many newsrooms are being creative these days in building effective in-house programs that utilize the expertise of hometown experts (judges, doctors, university professors and so forth) to build staff knowledge about specific topics related to ongoing news events.

These learning experiences are low in cost, build internal expertise, and show employees that newsroom leadership is dedicated to building a learning organization, even in bad times. Newsrooms that don’t have such programs need to get on the stick. Limited, low-cost, homegrown training is, after all, far superior to no training at all.

— William L. Winter, Ph.D.
President & Executive Director
American Press Institute
believe in training. They include stories from great national newspapers like The New York Times and great regional newspapers like The Oregonian. But training is not something that should be limited to big newspapers or even to newspapers.

The Associated Press, for example, has increased professional development. Despite the obvious constraints of being the world’s largest news service, one constantly on deadline, The AP has added training even during the down economy. “We do a lot more of it,” said President and Chief Executive Officer Louis Boccardi. “It’s a necessity. The nature of what we’re called on to do every day, what we’re called on to deal with every day, is much more complicated today.”

The old approach of “put someone in the job and glory in the way it unfolded” is much harder to make work in today’s newsroom, Boccardi says. “Sophisticated and complicated” technology and “handling people well in contemporary times” are training topics that get a lot of attention, he says, but “we haven’t forgotten bread and butter training.”

Michael E. Reed, president and chief executive officer of Community Newspaper Holdings Inc., also believes now is the time to increase training: “My thought was that, when times are tough, you need your best people performing at their best. Training is the key.”

Community Newspaper Holdings owns 108 daily and 100 weekly newspapers with 8,000 employees. Reed says he spends $2 million a year to train and educate “as many people as we can.” The company partners with the Media Management Center at Northwestern University and API in Reston, Va.

Reed’s mostly small newspapers have not followed the trend to cut training when profits go down. “It’s shortsighted to do that,” he says. “We can’t cut the things that have an impact that can be felt by the community. We can’t cut anything to jeopardize the quality and mission of that paper.”

Beverly Kees, consulting editor for Newsroom Training: Where’s the Investment?, is the former executive editor of The Fresno Bee and former editor and program director of The Freedom Forum Pacific Coast Center.
1
Training shortages concern journalists

One working journalists in three is dissatisfied with the opportunities for training and professional development now available at work. Complaints about training are more prevalent in newsrooms today than the perennial sources of employee discontent such as salary and chances for promotion. The typical news staff member who took part in this survey is a veteran journalist who has worked for three or more news organizations. While generally satisfied with their jobs overall, they see parts that could be improved and put training at the top of the list. The news staffers most likely to feel frustrated over inadequate training include those employed by local media in smaller markets and older women journalists.

---

Caesar Andrews, Editor, Gannett News Service, President, Associated Press Managing Editors
If news organizations would invest significantly more in training, they would reduce their turnover significantly. Training would lead to higher levels of satisfaction. I don’t know why they don’t make that connection.

— Bob Giles, curator, Nieman Fellowships

2

Executives agree more training is needed

More than eight in 10 news staff members feel a need for more training and professional development than they are now getting. And their bosses agree that current training is less than optimal. Roughly nine in 10 news executives acknowledge that all kinds of staff members — including news managers, assignment desk editors, copy editors, producers, artists, general assignment reporters, beat reporters and photographers — would benefit from more training.

Journalists differ on which of the three broad categories – skills training, beat training or training in journalism ethics, values and legal issues – is their No. 1 priority. The specific types of skills training most in demand are in writing, editing, news judgment and computer-assisted reporting. In terms of beat training, business/economics and government/politics are most desired.

Executives: Here’s Who Needs Training

Types of Staffers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Staffers</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>88%</th>
<th>84%</th>
<th>87%</th>
<th>86%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>89%</th>
<th>89%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>News Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Desk Editors</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy Editors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy, Layout, Design, Perc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographers, Photojournalists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Assignment Reporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beat Reporters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to see corporations state ‘we will invest X percent of our budget in training.’ Just doing that elevates it on the list. Corporations are in a position to benefit long term by keeping their people in the corporation.

— Al Cross, Immediate Past President, Society of Professional Journalists

Execs say budgets are a big problem …

News executives most often cite insufficient budget as the major obstacle to their delivering the kind of staff training they would like. Eight in 10 say lack of money limits training. Most news executives say that the maximum amount they can afford to spend per year to train a typical news staff member is $500. Ten percent admit they now spend nothing on training. The average news organization commits just 1 percent or less of their news budget for training. Only the national media tend to have larger training budgets. Training budgets are lowest at local radio stations, where one in three spends nothing.
If executives could budget for the time spent on training and put a premium on training, it’s not very expensive for the program itself. The problem is getting people to recognize that it’s worth letting a staff member off for a week.

— Andy Barnes, President, CEO, Chairman and Editor, St. Petersburg Times

It’s not just money, it’s time as well. Two in three news executives say the amount of time they can allow staffers to be away from their jobs limits training. On average, four or five days a year is the most time they feel they can reasonably allow. The national media and local radio are at opposite extremes on the time issue, as they are on training budgets. Four in 10 national media executives say their staffers can take off more than a month at a time, if necessary, for training. But the large majority of local radio news directors say they can’t let employees leave for more than a few days.
5
Training demand greatly exceeds supply

Demand for training by news staff members significantly outpaces what their employer provides in all three major categories of training activities. The gap is widest for beat coverage areas, where 51 percent think it is very important to have training, but only 14 percent say it is being provided, a difference of 37 percentage points. For journalism ethics and values training, the gap is 32 points (72 vs. 39 percent). For journalism skills, the gap is 28 points (58 vs. 30 percent).

Nearly half of news staffers say they don’t get training in any of the three broad categories – not in skills, not in beats, and not in ethics and values.

News executives’ reports about the training programs in place at their organizations suggest that more training is going on than staffers’ reports would indicate. Apparently, then, even when training exists, it does not always reach the staff members who need it.
Quality of news, especially local news, is at stake. Training in a variety of areas could help address the perceptions of declining quality among all our publics.

— Rosalind Stark,
Executive Director,
Radio-Television News Directors Foundation

6

Training gap is widest in TV newsrooms

The gap between supply and demand for training is widest for journalists employed by local TV stations. In particular, local TV efforts in ethics/values training and beat coverage training are found to be seriously lacking by staffers. There is a 48-point gap between the 81 percent of local TV staff members who think it is very important for them to have training in journalism ethics/values and the 33 percent who say they are getting it. There is a 41-point gap between the 54 percent of local TV staff members who think beat training is very important and the 13 percent who are getting it.

Local radio staffers are next on the list as a group where the supply of training now provided falls well short of the demand. In local radio, the gap is widest for skills training and ethics/values training.
Higher training budgets? Not for most

Despite the consensus that more training is needed, news executives’ reports suggest no clear trend toward higher training budgets. Instead, they present a mixed picture – 30 percent say spending has increased over the past 10 years, 25 percent say spending is down, and another 30 percent say it is about the same. (Just to keep up with inflation, budgets should have doubled.) The pattern varies by type of organization. The national media stand out as most likely to have increased budgets. Local newspapers are slightly more likely to have raised training budgets than to have cut back. But local TV and radio are headed in the opposite direction, with more saying they’ve trimmed budgets than added training.

Just over a third (36 percent) of all news executives say their training budget has been cut to some extent since the terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001. The cuts disproportionately affected those most likely to do significant amounts of training – 48 percent of the national media, 47 percent of the top 100 daily newspapers, and 43 percent of the news organizations with a staff size of 100 or more report post-Sept. 11 budget cuts.
Training coordinators: ‘The elite few’

Most news organizations don’t have anyone on staff assigned to develop and schedule editorial training activities. Only an elite few (less than one in 10) have people in the job devoting all or most of their time to it. Top 100 daily newspapers are the one type of media where training coordinators are the norm. About two-thirds of news executives in larger dailies say they have someone on staff to coordinate training, and four in 10 say the amount of time this person spends on the job has increased in the past five years.

Training coordinators seem to make a difference. News executives whose organizations have them are more pleased with the effectiveness of training programs, particularly in beat coverage areas and ethics/values training.
9

Basic skills training is more frequent

Training in basic journalism skills is most likely to be offered on a weekly or monthly basis. One in three news executives reports that training in reporting and writing is provided weekly or monthly. One in three broadcast news executives says training in producing is made available weekly or monthly. But training in beat coverage areas, ethics, values and legal issues are generally scheduled only few times a year, at most.
Almost more than any other profession, journalism depends on intellectually versatile practitioners – people skilled in the immediate tasks of the craft, to be sure, but also fluent in the purposes and function of civil society. Such nimbleness of mind and technique can only be achieved – with quality journalism as its result – through a process of continuous learning.

— Carroll D. Stevens, Associate Dean and Director, Knight Foundation Fellowship for Journalists in Law, Yale Law School

### 10

**Most training is done in-house**

Journalist training – whether in journalism skills, beat coverage areas, or ethics and values – is primarily done in-house. But outside training programs are more popular with staff members. In all three categories of training, staffers who mostly use outside programs find them more useful than those who rely on in-house sources. Based on executives’ reports, outside programs are most commonly used for training in certain beat coverage areas, including business, education, government and politics, court and police, and health and medicine.

While not quite as impressed with outside programs as their staffers, news executives generally find outside training to be at least as effective as what they do in house. In fact, executives rate outside training in beat coverage areas as superior to what they do on their own.
We launched Oregonian University at a staff meeting in January. We wanted something comprehensive and coordinated, tied to newsroom goals. For example, we wanted to improve our profiles so we created a training session on profile writing. Later in the year we’ll be doing trend stories. Training helps define the newsroom culture.

— George Rede, Director of Recruiting and Training, The Oregonian

News executives try to minimize costs and time away from the job in their choices about outside training forums they have used or would seriously consider using. In other words, most favor inexpensive training delivered close to home. Besides written materials and on-site instruction, programs sponsored by state, local or regional press associations are most popular with the bosses. Top additions to news executives’ wish lists for new training are distance-learning programs and seminars at local journalism schools. Most bosses give their news organizations A or B grades when it comes to training.

### 11
**Execs favor quicker, less costly training**

[Executive Use & Interest in Various Training Forums chart]

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Forum</th>
<th>% Executives Used Last Year</th>
<th>% Executives Would Seriously Consider Using</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guides or Other Written Materials</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house or Outside Consultants</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Workshop or Seminar</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk-ins or Lectures</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Workshop or Seminar</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line Distance-Learning Program</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearlong Fellowship</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonprofit Training Center</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Conference</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Staffers favor longer, off-site training

News staffers’ priorities for training are quite different from those of their bosses. They are more inclined to ask for training that would require significant time away from their job and travel to a distant location. At the top of staffers’ wish lists for the kind of training they would like, but aren’t now getting, are instruction at nonprofit training centers like The Poynter Institute and yearlong university scholarships. Most staff members give their news organization a grade of C, D or F for how they do on training.

Reporters are afraid to leave their jobs for training. They get no support. German, Japanese and French reporters almost always get their salaries paid and often get extra stipends. They list the training in their resumes as awards and honors. They get support from their editors. In the United States, reporters mostly have to take personal time for training and usually get no medical insurance from their employers on long fellowships.

— Whayne Dillehay, Vice President, International Center for Journalists
I speak as a proud member of the Old Media – specifically, of the print media, and in my case as a second-generation newspaperman and writer of books who has also spent much time over past decades crossing the line from print to the electronic fields of television and radio.

While that may qualify me as being among a rapidly vanishing species, I write now because I passionately reject the forecasts about the demise of print and even more of the news business. At best, they’re premature. At worst, they’re wrong. Not that they are entirely fanciful or improbable. The negative views widely held and loudly expressed among news business leaders reflect a prevailing sense of apprehension about their future, a future made even more uncertain as they face the greatest changes and challenges in journalistic history. As a result, we in the press find ourselves collectively wailing and writhing: Nobody loves us. Nobody reads us. Nobody watches us. Gloom and doom. Horrors, it’s over. EXTRA! Death of the Press!

Well, hardly. On the contrary, I believe there’s never been a better, or more needed, time for bright young people to become journalists in whatever new – or old – news form they choose to practice. Naysayers to the contrary, I also believe we have today the best educated, most sophisticated press corps in our history, filled with talented people, many of whom are doing superlative work in all forms of journalism: newspapers, magazines, television, radio and, yes, even on the World Wide Web. They and their successors have opportunities to carry the state of journalism to new heights of distinguished public service.

But let it also be said that fulfilling this promise requires the news business to change fundamentally.

We are entering an era in which the practice of journalism is rapidly becoming more accessible to the masses than at any time in human history. With the new ability to reach an almost infinite global audience, inseparably linked as never before, journalism finds itself with the potential to become more essential, and more influential, than ever.

It is not a dying news business we are witnessing but an expanding one. In the end, the news business is the information business, and in the new millennium of both stunning technological change and sobering new challenges the demand for information instantly and accurately delivered almost certainly will be greater. The package in which that information arrives is irrelevant. It’s the content of the news being delivered to the public that will count most. And therein lies the problem, and the challenge.

For the news business, the challenge is nothing less than to redefine our role, our mission, and our standards. Perhaps most important, it is to redefine news itself. What kinds of news, what types of stories, will tomorrow’s citizens most want to receive? What stories will people think most relevant to their lives? How should the news business respond to its multiple new challenges, and in what journalistic form will it be delivered?

With all this in mind, I will offer here an agenda for the new news business – in effect, what can best serve the public as news for the new millennium.
What a difference a year makes. Terrorism and an economic slump have changed everything. My hottest speaking topic for 2000 (and the first half of 2001) was how to \ldots Virtually no one is concerned about recruitment, and retention has taken a backseat to the bottom-line business issues.

Big mistake! The lessons learned about how to engage and motivate talented people are powerful and important, especially in a declining economy where we ... organizations must be ready to take advantage of it. That means they need to know how to hold onto their best people.

— Carol Kinsey Goman, Ph.D.
Speaker, Consultant, Author
Kinsey Consulting Services

These mergers alone are already changing the nature of the news business; even in an era of impeccable corporate ethics they would raise profound questions about the independence and the integrity of the press. As traditional general news outlets shrink, with stunning takeovers occurring even among some of the most powerful and profitable century-old newspaper companies such as the Chicago Tribune and the Los Angeles Times, smaller new media segments presenting topics of specialized information proliferate. One result is a fragmentation of the broad national audience that the national newspapers and major TV networks used to reach. That obviously raises the question of how well the news business will be able to provide the kind of essential information necessary for citizens to be informed about vital national issues affecting everyone’s life. Even more serious is the prospect that the new colossal media conglomerates, representing as they do massive entertainment entities more than news outfits, will accelerate what already exists as a major trend: the further blurring of the line between news and entertainment, with entertainment values already in the ascendancy and rapidly becoming even more dominant.

Major general-circulation newspapers are already adopting the techniques of advertising and entertainment by using market-research “focus groups” to determine what readers like about the newspaper—and what they want more of. By “giving the public what it wants,” the likelihood increases that important news could be either ignored or shortchanged in the general circulation news media. This already is happening—certainly before Sept. 11, 2001, but even now—in many international news reports. When the world is

more closely linked than ever, when “globalization” means not a slogan but a reality, when economic, social and political events abroad directly and powerfully affect those at home, foreign correspondence is sharply cut back, if not entirely eliminated, by most daily newspapers and TV networks.

Other troubling trends never seem to leave us—a great focus on scandal and celebrity; a “gotcha” philosophy of investigative reporting run amok; loose standards in mainstream publications about accuracy, gossip, rumor, plagiarism, privacy, fact-checking, using multiple sources, breaking confidences.

The examples are numerous. In recent years, they have been occurring with distressing frequency:

One national study of media trends, by the Committee of Concerned Journalists, shows that in the 20-year period from 1977 to 1997, coverage of hard news dropped by a third over that period while the percentage of covers featuring celebrities increased by the same amount.

But first some candor about the current condition of the news business is in order. No agenda for the news business of tomorrow can have much value unless the present state of journalism is examined and analyzed for its strengths and—most critically—its weaknesses. Only then can corrective steps be suggested to address problems that exist. So herewith one veteran journalist’s critique of his business as it warily proceeds, even while being propelled with warp speed, into its promising yet daunting interactive electronic future.

A veteran’s critique

There can be no doubt that increasing numbers of Americans view the performance of the news media not just with misgiving, but with deepening distrust and even disgust.

True, public confidence in news surged after the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, but then faded just as abruptly as budgets and the news reports they reflect returned to business as usual.

The evidence is all around us. You can hardly pick up any national survey, or read any journal of opinion, without finding dismal news of how the public views the news media—or how journalists critically view themselves as they address questions about further blurring of standards, disturbing new evidence of widespread ethical conflicts of interest, and diminishing audiences.

That critical attitude exists not only among print reporters but across the electronic spectrum as well where markets and outlets are changing profoundly amid the greatest wave of communications mergers in history.
I do believe news executives dramatically underestimate the value of training. They see it as a reward of an individual vs. an opportunity to improve one’s whole newspaper/TV/Internet site. They don’t understand the culture that an active training program creates and what it says about the value a company has in its employees.

One very frightening trend I’ve been hearing about across the country is the push towards corporate “compatibility.” For instance, if one division of a company is able to secure underwriting for staff training, while another division hasn’t, the executive only sees that one division is spending money on training and the other isn’t. I’m afraid they would rather have no training than have to deal with the inequities within the company. It’s far easier to say, “In 2002, there will be no money spent on outside training” versus “The reason this division is still sending staff for training is that they were smarter in their budgeting.”

Let’s be clear: I don’t believe in “compatibility.”

Gossip columnists like the feckless, if not clueless, Matt Drudge, the rat-a-tat-tat Walter Winchell imitator, are on the rise, most notably in electronic journalistic outlets. They offer daily doses of unsubstantiated scandalous details, with repeated dark allusions to alleged corruption and immorality of prominent public figures, especially political figures.

Let it be acknowledged that the problems confronting the press as the old millennium gave way to the new are not all of recent origin. For at least a generation, public attitudes toward the press have been turning increasingly negative. Take the newspaper business, my first and still greatest love, journalistically speaking. Evidence abounds of deep concern over the fate of newspapers, both within and without the industry.

Many as I dislike acknowledging it, I find the critical remarks of two admired colleagues squarely on target. Howard Kurtz, media critic of The Washington Post, probably the most respected and influential practitioner of that genre, writes: “There is a deep fear, even at the biggest papers, that much of the audience has tuned out, leaving us writing for a small, self-important elite.” Kurtz adds: “Why worry about saving what many see as an obnoxious, negative, parasitic business? Who truly likes newspapers anyway?”

Carl Sessions Stepp, my colleague at the University of Maryland’s College of Journalism, has also earned a national reputation for his thoughtful press criticisms and commentaries. Stepp, in words that surely evoke emotions among all lovers of newspapers, contrasts the past and present newspaper worlds this way: “For all the trials of poor pay, lousy hours, and grinding pace, the payoff was high: deference, entitlement, the buzz of recognition, the glory of it all. Readers grumbled but they paid attention.”

That was the way it was. Now, here’s the way it is: “These are different days. The newspaper person today is just one more harried molecule in the maligned Media Horde. Newspapers are old news, byte-sized cogs in giant information conglomerates.”

In Stepp’s view, this condition leaves newspaper people with “the gnawing feeling that the spotlight has moved on forever. The result: Angst and anxiety are pandemic across American newsrooms, as newspaper people collectively sense the end of an era.”

Speaking more personally, I would add the following disturbing example.

One of the brightest graduate students I have had during my two years as holder of the Knight Chair at Maryland expressed what I fear is a not untypical attitude about a newspaper career. She had been enamored of newspapers and believed they offered a “perfect fit” for her professional aspirations. “So why at 22 years old and preparing to take my first job at a wonderful newspaper [The Washington Post], am I already planning my second and third careers?” she wrote for a survey course paper I assigned students. “The truth is, the newspaper business is flawed in ways that are daunting to even the most Pollyannaish and ambitious of aspiring writers. Circulation is down, advertising pirated by other mediums. The system under which the business operates dismays many of my talented classmates and me because, despite this decline, those in a position to hire and promote still believe in the arcane night cops/hazing process.”

But it was her concluding thought that struck me most forcefully. “There is one more factor that makes my eventual departure from the newspaper business even more certain, a factor that affects me and all the others combined: outside of my journalism friends, no one I know reads the paper. My sister, an elementary school art teacher, refuses to read the paper. It’s boring, she says. Ditto for my brother, a CPA, and my little sister, a college junior, and my boyfriend, an attorney. Among my generation, not only is the newspaper no longer the comfortable, necessary routine it once was, it has morphed into some horrible, tedious chore.”

**The reality of decline**

You can dismiss her complaints as deriving either from youthful innocence or from inexperience, but you can’t ignore her larger point. The newspaper audience is declining.

At century’s end, for example, daily circulation of newspapers was about where it was in 1950, while the national population had increased by more than a third. More troubling, increasing numbers of younger Americans are not reading any newspapers daily, or watching any network newscasts regularly. Among adults, daily newspaper readership plummeted during the last three decades of the century from 78 percent in 1970 to 59 percent in 1997, with the erosion continuing at an even greater pace since then. At the millennium, only half of all Americans were reading daily newspapers. By 2002, more
Americans had the Internet at their fingertips than held newspapers in their hands. Changes in newspaper reading habits can be explained, in part, by the greater offerings of the electronic era and a newspaper product that, with notable exceptions, has become drab and undistinguished, lacking in originality and a sense of urgent mission in providing information of most relevance to people. And a journalism in which too many practitioners strike the public, fairly or not, as being either aloof, arrogant, or out of touch with the lives most people are leading.

Network television faces similar problems. Though it can generate huge audiences for spectacles and scandals, affecting how people feel about their society, it generates smaller and smaller audiences for its predictable, fixed-in-time nightly news broadcasts. After rising steadily during the years of television’s rapid penetration into American homes—98 percent of all households had at least one TV set in 1999, while 40 percent of households had three or more—the hours people spent before the tube stood about where they did three decades earlier when the U.S. population numbered 75 million fewer people. The average American then spent 17 hours a week watching television. By the end of the Internet Decade of the 1990s, average weekly viewing time had actually dropped to 16 hours, 20 minutes.

None of this comes as a surprise to people in the business. They know their viewers are affected by a gathering public backlash against TV excesses. They also know that intense competitive pressures among proliferating cable channels scrambling to wrest market share from the traditional networks have created increasing demand to broadcast the latest, most sensational news breaks as they happen—and the more scandalous and lurid the better. As the 24-hour cable TV channels focus even more on the sensational and the scandalous, the old networks adapt by furnishing more of the same in an attempt to hold their declining viewers.

The disgraceful attack talk-radio programs, with their growing audience and increasing influence, at least in affecting national political attitudes, also powerfully affect the tone of media coverage. With their daily airing of ideological conspiracies and preoccupation with scandals, proof never necessary and rarely even a consideration, the talk radio shows demonstrate the impact, and the money, to be made by appealing to the worst in people. Traditional television, especially cable, has followed their lead; “Tabloid TV” joins attack radio in filling more of the nation’s airwaves, with “Trash TV” close behind.

Not that American television, that “cultural wasteland” of conformity, has suddenly experienced a crisis over its standards. “Quality” programming always has been in the minority. As far back as 1958, Edward R. Murrow, in a celebrated speech, warned against the growing trivialization of television. He urged the networks to “get up off our fat survivals and recognize that television … is being used to distract, delude, amuse, and insulate us.” I shudder to think what Murrow would feel about the 24/7 world of the news-soap opera.

So we reel from O.J. Simpson to Princess Di to JonBenét to JFK Jr. and back to JonBenét again … from “All O.J., All the Time” to “All Elián, All the Time.” And if a celebrity won’t create an around-the-clock coverage mass media spectacle, we just make up one of our own. Enter Reality TV.

The swinging -gates

All this takes place against a generation conditioned to expect the worst of the rich, powerful and famous, and a press with a penchant to turn any hints of wrongdoing into a full-fledged scandal, tagging all the political ones with the sobriquet, -gate. From Watergate, a genuine and extensive criminal conspiracy that led to a score of criminal convictions of White House aides and top administration officials, including an attorney general and a head of the FBI, have flowed a succession of supposed scandals in administration after administration: Billygate, Peanutgate, Koreagate, names that are today meaningless, but still they came, one after the other, and not only from the more sensational tabloid journals but sadly from the mainstream press as well. In the Clinton years we had nothing less than galloping -gates: Travelgate, Hairgate, Troopergate, Filegate, White-watergate and, of course, Monicagate. Soon the Bush administration is likely amass its own list, since the one true thing you can say about all these -gates is that they swing both ways.

The scandalmongers have polluted the process of the press, and by focusing more and more on the private lives of public officials have diverted coverage from far more significant matters affecting the nation’s future.
In the new millennium, the news industry is confronted with one of the greatest challenges in its history – the intersection of the technology revolution, fierce competition from nontraditional rivals and the merging multimedia marketplace, which is forcing changes in the media landscape and company cultures.

— Convergence: Fact or Fiction?  
World Association of Newspapers  
December 2001

Newspapers have reacted brilliantly to [Sept. 11] events throughout the fall, but the story ahead will require more initiation than reaction.

To tell the stories coming we will need to master the paradoxes of security under constitutional law, the intricacies of international banking, the threats of bioterrorism, the impossibility of "civil defense" and the politics of charity.

We'll have to step up coverage of government budgeting and administration as states cope with mounting deficits and declining services. All this will require training, not only for the reporters, but for the assigning editors as well.

— Newsroom coach  
Edward D. Miller  
The American Editor  
January-February 2002

I don’t want to be misunderstood. I am not suggesting that scandal should be ignored, that investigative reporting does not have its proper place, that public officials and other people of power should not be held accountable and examined most critically and rigorously by the media. The problem is not one of pulling punches; it is one of perspective and judgment. In short, it’s a question of determining what news is most significant for most people, and then delivering it in the most effective and reliable manner.

The means to do that already exist. The technological revolution that has produced the Internet is radically changing the delivery of information and will proceed to affect the news business even more dramatically. Today, for the first time, you can, from your own desktop, check a federal database (www.trac.syr.edu) with everything from budgets to court decisions, or a database (www.publicintegrity.org) on “soft-money” contributions to state political parties or one on contributions to federal races (www.opensecrets.org), or read about a host of recently released public policy documents under the Freedom of Information Act (www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/).

It is easy to see why many Internet practitioners view Old Media’s moribund hand-wringing as irrelevant. Look, they will say, the days of the traditional TV newscasts, to say nothing of the traditional newspapers rolling off massive outdated printing presses, belong to the past. The future – the Internet future – is theirs. Its power to reach and influence people has never been equaled, and its greatest period of influence is yet to come. Think what the power of electronic communication has demonstrated. By letting people everywhere see what is going on elsewhere, the new communications technology has already changed the course of history. You can argue, for example, that the American military kept the peace during the long Cold War period. But you cannot argue it was American military might that brought down the Berlin Wall, or the downfall of the Soviet Union, or the opening of China to the Western world. Much of the credit for those remarkable events must be given to the new ability of people, even in the most closed and repressive of societies, to see and learn how others live, and want to emulate them. The electronic news revolution enables information to soar literally through the ether, beyond all power of authorities to control or stop it.

Michael Bloomberg, who built a fabulously successful electronic financial data news service in the 1990s that became indispensable to traders operating in different time zones across the globe, sees the impact of the new communications technology on international events as being irreversible. “It’s hard to see anyone going back to closed societies,” the New York City mayor tells me. “You can’t put the genie back in the bottle. We can’t keep others from seeing what’s going on. I would argue that the Internet is, for the first time, a communications system that has one characteristic different from all previous ones. That is: the average person can spread ideas to lots of people, economically, quickly, without any government interference. That is a fundamental difference from anything that’s come before. I’m skeptical now that politicians can ever stop you from knowing what other people are saying, what other people are doing.”
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No doubt he’s right. And the power of the Internet to bring news instantly into homes around the globe promises to create even more bewildering change, not only in the news business, but in all of human society.

In the United States the spread of the new technology proceeds with astonishing rapidity. Consider these facts: By February 2002, the U.S. Commerce Department confidently announced that 143 million Americans – 54 percent of the nation’s households – are connected to the Internet. Among younger people, the report said, Internet usage is even higher. In other words, the numbers will continue to rise. And as they do, the news business will experience even greater changes and challenges.

There is no turning back the clock. The electronic revolution is here, and here to stay. With the push of a button, stories can now be posted on web sites before they can possibly make their way to printing presses or are produced for broadcast. On-line operations continue to sprout everywhere; the traditional news business is spending millions upon millions to create popular on-line services. A few years ago, most newspapers didn’t have web sites. Today, it’s almost impossible to find one that doesn’t have a site. Much more will be committed in years to come as the technology continues to improve, and more and more people are brought into the electronically linked network.

There, they will have – and already are having – immediate access to the broadest accumulation of sheer information ever available. Does that, therefore, signal the end of the news business as we know it?

Unequivocally, no. Just the reverse. Every technological innovation brings with it the common wisdom of the time about how this latest advance will fundamentally change everything. At times, reality lives up to hype. Yes, the horse and buggy did disappear; the kerosene lamp was overtaken; the passenger train was eclipsed by airplanes. But most of the time, the newest technological advance does not signify the dismantling of the old. For five hundred years, we’ve had printed books, and each year the world sells more than the last.

Newspapers are another good example. The advent of radio was heralded as a death knell for print. Even more definitive were the funeral orations preached about print when the Age of Television began more than half a century ago after World War II. Yet the papers survived and, circulation figures notwithstanding, entered their most profitable era. Of course, they achieved that fortunate position in part because America rapidly became a nation of one-newspaper towns, with the surviving ones enjoying the power and profits generated by their monopoly status. Yet (at least of this writing) the newspaper remains uniquely local and universally portable.

Age-old predictions

Sometimes, the bold historical predictions turned out not only to be wrong, but ludicrous. Thus, two generations ago, at a time when American newspaper people were wringing their hands over the dire threat of television, the American editor and scholar, Carl E. Lindstrom, pointed out the gloomy forecasts of half a millennia ago during the Middle Ages after Mr. Guttenberg invented his wondrous printing press and began printing Bibles. “The greatest threat journalism ever faced was invention of the printing press,” Lindstrom wrote then. “Every town crier, every king’s herald, every village gossip thought that he was out of a job. But the crying and the heralding and the gossiping went right on.”

Prophets of doom, of course, still abound. Dan Okrent, for instance, Time Inc.’s editor of New Media. In 1999, he predicted “all forms of print, are dead. Finished. Over …” Okrent even offered a more detailed time span for that collective death. “Twenty, 30, at the outside 40 years from now,” he told graduate students at Columbia University’s famous School of Journalism, “we will look back on the print media the way we look back on travel by horse and carriage, or by wind-powered ship. …”

That may prove to be so. But, Okrent added, though the need for newspaper may fade, the need to know will not: “My colleagues and I did not grow up wanting to be in the ink and paper and staples business; we wanted to be in – we are in – the business of words and sentences and pictures and ideas. Don’t worry about the future of newspapers or magazines or books any more than you would worry about corrugated boxes or shrink-wrap. They are containers; the substance resides elsewhere.”

Exactly. And journalistically the substance for the Age of the Internet as for the Age of Print, or Radio or Television, has changed not at all. It is timeless. Unless the new technologies actually change human nature, the human hunger to know what’s new, what’s important, what’s vital, what’s interesting, what’s
of conflicting, complicated information that daily descends upon the populace. Already the public is subjected to a bewildering barrage of information, a veritable overload of miscellaneous facts and figures to which they are told they should pay attention but cannot.

In the new millennium, the role of the news business will increasingly be to become the essential public source for accurate, analytical information, the place where people turn to sort out fact from fiction, the meaningful from the meaningless. In doing so, journalism will have to do a better job of determining how essential that information is to people, and then provide it in ways that makes it relevant and understandable.

Only well-trained journalists can do these things.

I suggest there are three general areas of news that are already affecting people profoundly and are destined to have ever-greater impact in the future. The first involves the revolution in science, technology and medicine that is rapidly, fatefully changing life on the planet. Here are the great stories for the present population of more than six billion will increase dramatically, posing a host of other societal problems, happening will not abate. If anything, the desire for information rises in proportion to the complexity of the period; unquestionably, the new millennium, whatever it brings, will present the most complicated range of issues humans have yet faced.

Which brings me to those promised thoughts about what the new news business will have to offer people in order not only to survive, but to be a more significant factor in the human story.

The primary task is not to devise a journalistic formula that people can agree defines the “new” news. The most urgent task is to take steps to remedy what’s wrong with the old ways of delivering the news. The problem is not failure to adopt new technology; the problem is to shed the stultifying mind-sets and ways of thinking into which the news business has fallen. Our journalism is not in trouble because it has failed to move rapidly enough into the cyberspace world. It is in trouble because of the way it has been performing in gathering, assessing and delivering the news.

American journalism, on the cusp of the new millennia, finds itself hampered by too many bad old habits: It still displays the “insider” perspective that is the continuing bane of today’s journalism – a tone and focus that leaves millions of ordinary citizens feeling they have been excluded from the conversation. It still relies too much on the official wisdom, still operates in a climate of negative sound bites and spin doctors without adequately challenging their misleading arguments, false analogies, and outright falsehoods. It still displays the same old herd mentality and “horse race” addiction when reporting on politics and government, allowing itself to remain entrapped in the old familiar game of gauging and guessing who will win, not exploring what the consequences might be for the country and for individual citizens. It still lets itself be driven by polls at the expense of original reporting – and worse, mishandling the very polls that so dominate much coverage. It still pretends to know more than it does and yet report less than it sees and hears. It still numbers too many in the business who act as if they are superior to those on whom they report. It still forgets the lesson the great Scotty Reston used to try to teach reporters: Beware of making the deadline but missing the point.

The most urgent challenge facing the news business is not how to use the remarkable new technology. New technology, no matter how remarkable, is not a panacea for the problems of the news business. The Internet is merely a tool, no more, no less. The greatest challenge for the news business is to restore public trust in the profession of journalism. That requires taking back the business from the celebrity-seekers, the scandalmongers and the market research gurus. It means insisting on setting the highest ethical and professional standards for those who are privileged to practice serious journalism. It means investing not just in new technology but in greater training for the journalists of tomorrow.

The essential public source

Journalists need to know much more than how best to use that technology; they must be far better educated in order to make sense for the public out of the mass
among them how the mass of people will be adequately housed, fed and clothed. At the same time there are alarms about the spread of new diseases, questions about the Earth’s environment, and specifically the very real – or so say distinguished scientists – threat of global warming. Then there’s the exploding world of the electronic and computer technology that both brings people closer together than ever before and yet also tends to separate and isolate them. The new linkage, wonderful though it is, also raises the most serious kinds of questions about invasion of privacy, about potential abuses of power from those who control the technology.

This will require reporters and editors trained to understand the complicated scientific/technological/medical terminology, and then be able to explain and present it clearly and concisely in ways that people can understand its relevance to them.

Under the second broad general area of news, I would place economic news – but not just the obvious up-and-down tracking of the markets and the recounting of daily or weekly winners and losers. Far more important is an understanding of how the economic currents are flowing, in which direction and why, and with what possible consequences. Increasingly important to analyze and understand is the impact of the growing concentration of great blocs of power through the greatest wave of global mergers ever. They are creating new entities reshaping the basic economic and social structures of the nation and the world, and directly affecting lives literally everywhere.

The third general grouping I place under the heading of reporting on society. By that I do not mean reporting by simply relaying the unintelligible jargon too often employed by government officials and academics, but reporting in ways that bring to vivid life the entire range of activities that most affect most people. That means shining a journalistic light on the worlds that exist outside of every newsroom and government pressroom: the have-and-have-not worlds; the changing nature of race and gender; the rapidly changing demographic nature of the United States – a revolution in itself – in which whites are moving toward minority status and the composition of the country is evolving before our very eyes.

What news is made of

In sum, I mean reporting far more creatively, and regularly, on health care; on entitlements; on environmental degradation and global warming; on the revolutions of science, health and technology that are changing life as never before, presenting grave risks as well as great promise; on the have-and-have-not society in which we, and far more the world, exist; on the blocs of economic power expanding almost daily into vast conglomerates; on the often-fragile fabric that forms our society and world.

This is what news is made of, the real stuff of journalism, far more significant than anyone’s 15 minutes of scandal, celebrity or fame. Are we in the press doing as well as we should in making sense of all this? Of course not. Are we doing better than we used to? Of course. Should we be doing better than we are? Even to raise that question is to answer it.

There’s no need to bemoan the death of the news business – or urge the need to invent some new form of journalism to deal with the cyberspace world of our ever-more-interconnected future. We don’t need new forms. We need to go back to basics. And the basics are that journalism is an art form, maybe the most difficult of the arts because it takes place amidst the most intense daily pressures, with insufficient time to determine the entire truth amid so many conflicting complexities.

We don’t need a New Journalism or a Millennial Journalism to forge our future. We need to employ the best of the old, wedded to the new delivery techniques of the present, to fulfill our role. That role was, and remains, the same: to reconnect the ever-more disconnected strands of contemporary American life that are leaving more and more groups removed from each other; to provide serious solid information that helps people form reasoned judgments on what course they want their elected officials to pursue; to tell the story of the people around us so that others can understand the stresses and pressures of the times – and to tell it memorably, with style and grace, with perspective and context and meaning, in a way that touches the core of the people reading or watching our reporting.

Finally, it is to pursue our jobs with an appreciation of our own shortcomings. We have, as they say, a need for more modesty, because we have much to be modest about.

Haynes Johnson is the Knight Chair in Journalism in Public Policy at the University of Maryland’s Philip Merrill College of Journalism.
ollowing are the questions asked of editors and news executives from Jan. 3 to March 12, 2001.

Q.1 To begin, what letter grade would you give your news organization for its overall performance in providing journalist training and professional development for your news staff? (“A” means excellent, “B” good, “C” average, “D” poor, “F” means fail.)

Q.2 Please tell me how much, if at all, each of the following limits your news organization's ability to provide your news staff with the kind of training and professional development you would like.

a. The amount of money your news budget allows for training
b. The amount of time you can allow staffers to be away from their jobs for training
c. Difficulty finding an in-house person to develop and coordinate training
d. The availability of good outside training programs

Does this limit your ability to provide the kind of training you would like a lot, somewhat, only a little, or not at all?

Q.3 [Asked of respondents who answered “a lot” to two or more items in Question 2.] Which one of the following does most to limit staff training?

1) The amount of money your news budget allows for training
2) The amount of time you can allow staffers to be away from their jobs for training
3) Difficulty finding an in-house person to develop and coordinate training
4) The availability of good outside training programs

Q.4 Is someone at your organization now formally assigned to develop and schedule staff training and professional development activities?

Q.5 [Asked if organization had a training coordinator.] How much of this person's time is spent dealing with staff training?

1) All of their time
2) Most of their time
3) About half
4) At least a quarter
5) Less than a quarter of their time

Q.6 As far as you know, does this person devote more time or less time to training than the person in this same job five years ago – or about the same amount?

Q.7 As best you can recall, for the last fiscal year your organization completed, about what percent of your news budget was actually spent for training and professional development of news staff?

Q.8 Now thinking about your training budget for the current fiscal year, how much, if at all, has it been cut since Sept. 11 due to costs associated with terrorism-related coverage?
Q.9 Regardless of the impact of Sept. 11, is your organization now spending a higher or a lower percentage of your news budget for training and professional development than it did 10 years ago – or about the same percentage?

Q.10 We’re interested in whether or not you provide news staff members with any regular training or professional development activities in three broad areas. In answering, please think about both in-house training and outside training – including sending staffers to workshops, conferences or seminars.

First, do you now provide any kind of regular training in...

a. Journalism skills, such as writing, reporting, producing, storytelling or graphic design
b. Content or beat areas, such as politics, business, or health
c. Journalism ethics, values and legal issues, such as privacy, libel law and the First Amendment

Q.11 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 10.] Is training in this area mostly done in-house, or through outside training programs?

Q.12 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 10.] In general, do you think staff training in this area is very effective, somewhat effective, not too effective, or not at all effective?

Q.13 Whether or not your organization is able to provide any training, please tell me how important you think it is for your news staff to have regular training in each of the following areas.

Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important (for them to have regular training in this area)?

a. Journalism skills such as writing, reporting, producing, storytelling or graphic design
b. Content or beat areas, such as politics, business, or health
c. Journalism ethics, values, and legal issues, such as privacy, libel law and the First Amendment

d. Reporting

e. Writing

Q.14 As I read you some different groups on your news staff, please tell me how much, if at all, you think each would benefit from additional training or professional development.

Do they benefit a lot, somewhat, only a little, or not at all (from additional training or professional development)?

Q.15 For each group you think would benefit from more training, please tell me in which area you think they would benefit most.

Q.16 When you think about content or beat coverage areas where your news staff would benefit from more training, what specific area first comes to mind?

Q.17 Now I’m going to read you some specific areas for journalist training and professional development. Please tell me whether or not your organization now provides any regular training for staff in each one.

Do you think they would benefit a lot, somewhat, only a little, or not at all (from additional training or professional development)?

a. News managers
b. Assignment desk editors
c. Producers
d. Copy editors
e. Graphics, layout or design personnel
f. Photographers or photojournalists
g. General assignment reporters
h. Beat reporters

Would they benefit most from more training in journalism skills, content or beat areas, or journalism ethics, values and legal issues?

---

The greatest challenge facing the newspaper industry . . . is finding good people, developing them, retaining them and keeping them happy. Nowhere is that challenge greater – or more important – than in the ranks of newsroom middle management.

These women and men are the workhorses who make the assignments, direct the coverage and see that the paper comes out every day. They are entrusted with the care and feeding of the rest of the staff – all those reporters, photographers, copy editors, designers and artists – who also need to be recruited, developed and kept happy.

— Sharon L. Peters, Ph.D.
Northwestern University
Media Management Center
Q.21 [Asked if training is provided in ethics/values/legal issues.] You mentioned earlier that your organization provides some staff training or professional development in this area. Is training in this area made available weekly, monthly, at least twice a year, once a year, or less than once a year?

Q.22 [Asked if any training is provided.] Now please think about all the training and professional development activities your organization now provides for your staff members. Are news staff members expected to attend these training sessions mostly on their own time, or mostly on company time?

Q.23 Are your news staff members required to attend certain training or professional development sessions, or is attendance always voluntary?

Q.24 How much influence do your news staff members now have over decisions about their own training?

1) A lot of influence
2) Some influence
3) Not much influence
4) No influence at all

Q.25 Is your organization’s staff training part of a larger training effort developed by a parent company or group ownership?

Q.26 As I read you some different training forums, please tell me which of these – if any – your organization or staff used for training or professional development last year – that is, in 2001.

a. A national conference of a journalism organization
b. A regional conference of a journalism organization
c. A national workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
d. A regional workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
e. A seminar by a journalism school
f. A yearlong university fellowship to explore larger issues and ideas
g. In-house or outside consultants speaking in your newsroom or at your organization’s headquarters
h. A nonprofit training center such as the American Press Institute or Poynter Institute
i. An on-line distance learning program
j. Guides or other written materials from journalism organizations or schools
k. Web sites or listservs of journalism organizations

Q.27 [Asked if no forum was used.] Keeping in mind your training needs and budget limitations, which of the following training forums, if any, would you seriously consider using for staff training or professional development in the future?
a. A national conference of a journalism organization
b. A regional conference of a journalism organization
c. A national workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
d. A regional workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
e. A seminar by a journalism school
f. A yearlong university fellowship to explore larger issues and ideas
g. In-house or outside consultants speaking in your newsroom or at your organization’s headquarters
h. A nonprofit training center such as the American Press Institute or Poynter Institute
i. An on-line distance learning program
j. Guides or other written materials from journalism organizations or schools
k. Web sites or listservs of journalism organizations

Q.27 Considering the size of your news budget and other priorities, what is the most money your organization is able to spend per year toward the training and professional development of a typical news staff member?

Q.28 How many days per year can you reasonably allow a typical news staff member to be away from work to attend training?

Q.29 Different types of training take different lengths of time. What’s the longest you can reasonably allow a typical staff member to be away from work to attend training?

1) A day or less
2) A few days
3) Up to a week
4) Up to a month
5) More than a month
6) Whatever time is necessary

Q.30 In general, what day of the week is best for scheduling staff training sessions?

a. American Press Institute
b. The Poynter Institute
c. Investigative Reporters and Editors
d. Foundation for American Communications
e. The Freedom Forum
f. Radio-Television News Directors Association and Foundation
g. Society of Professional Journalists
h. National Press Foundation
i. Journalist organizations that specialize in a subject, like business, crime, health or religion; or a skill, like copy editing or news design
j. Local, state or regional press associations
k. Knight Foundation’s university fellowship programs

l. Knight Foundation’s weeklong seminar programs
m. Other college- or university-based programs

Q.32 Please tell me whether or not your organization has ever sent news staff members to training or professional development sessions offered by each of the following groups.
a. American Press Institute
b. The Poynter Institute
c. Investigative Reporters and Editors
d. Foundation for American Communications
e. The Freedom Forum
f. Radio-Television News Directors Association and Foundation
g. Society of Professional Journalists
h. National Press Foundation
i. Journalist organizations that specialize in a subject, like business, crime, health or religion; or a skill, like copy editing or news design
j. Local, state or regional press associations
k. Knight Foundation’s university fellowship programs

1. Invest in your people. Look for people who want to spend their lifetime learning and growing and then help them.
2. New editors often have little or no training in editing or management. They need both and in large amounts.
3. Ask yourself: Who coaches the editors?
4. Grow good editors. The mid-level editors have the best potential to influence the work, growth and outlook of staffers.
5. Too many newsrooms let cultural divides between disciplines separate people who should be working together. When that happens, mediocrity results and talented people grow discouraged.
6. Look at new career paths. Not everyone has to get his or her ticket punched in the same way.
7. Get race out on the table. Talk about it. Let people who can bring a racial or ethnic perspective to journalism do so in full comfort.
8. Go out of your way to create opportunities for bright, young, nontraditional talent who don’t want to wait 10 to 20 years to have an impact.
9. Value differences and embrace them. Evaluate managers on their success in identifying and developing people of color for leadership positions in the industry.
10. Create mentoring, apprenticeship and job-shadowing programs.
11. Do you have eyes, ears, sensitivities and language skills in your newsroom to cover your changing community?
The New York Times is establishing two-month fellowships that will bring staff members from its regional papers to The Times and The Boston Globe, starting in the fall of 2002.

The fellows will work in the metro newsrooms for the two months to improve their skills. Their own newspapers will pay their salaries; The Times will pay for housing during the fellowship, said Dennis Stern, vice president for human resources at The Times.

At the same time, editors from The Times and The Globe will visit regional papers for three-day stints doing critiques, workshops and one-on-one training sessions. The Times also plans to bring in summer interns who worked one year at the regional papers to work at The Times and The Globe the following summer.

D2. Now, I have just a few questions so we can describe the journalists and organizations who took part in our survey. In total, what is the size of your organization’s news staff—that is, how many people who work in news are now on your organization’s payroll?

D3a. We have your title in your organization listed as …Is this correct?

D3b. [Asked if incorrect.] What is your correct job title?

D4. What is your age?

D5. What is the last grade or class that you completed in school?

D6. [Asked if a college graduate.] Were you a journalism major as a college undergraduate?

D7. [Asked if not a journalism major.] Did you take any courses in journalism or media studies as an undergraduate?

D8. [Asked of respondents with postgraduate training.] What was your primary subject area of graduate study?

D9. Have you completed a graduate degree?

D10. [Asked if graduate degree completed.] What kind of graduate degree do you have?
Following are the questions asked of news staffers from Jan. 23 to March 12, 2002.

Q.1 To begin, I have a few questions about your career as a journalist. Since completing your education, how many years have you spent working in journalism?

Q.2 How many different news organizations have you worked for during your career in journalism?

Q.3 How many years have you worked for your current news organization?

Q.4 Overall, how satisfied are you with your current job?
   1) Very satisfied
   2) Mostly satisfied
   3) Mostly dissatisfied
   4) Very dissatisfied

Q.5 Please tell me how satisfied you are with your current job in each of the following areas.

   Are you very satisfied, mostly satisfied, mostly dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied with your job in this area?

   a. Pay and benefits
   b. Job security
   c. Chances for promotion
   d. Opportunities to make a contribution to society
   e. Your ability to influence decisions affecting your work life
   f. Opportunities for journalist training and professional development

Q.6 Thinking again about your current job in journalism … what letter grade would you give your news organization for its overall performance in providing journalist training and professional development for news staff members? (“A” means excellent, “B” good, “C” average, “D” poor and “F” means fail.)

Q.7 We’re interested in whether or not your organization now provides you with any regular training or professional development activities in three broad areas. In answering, please think about both in-house and outside training your organization provides – including sending you to workshops, conferences or seminars.

   First, are you now provided with any kind of regular training in …
   a. Journalism skills, such as writing, reporting, producing, storytelling or graphic design
   b. Content or beat areas, such as politics, business or health
   c. Journalism ethics, values and legal issues, such as privacy, libel law and the First Amendment

Q.8 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 7] Is training in this area mostly done in-house, or through outside training programs?

Q.9 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 7] How useful is this training for someone in your job – is it very useful, somewhat useful, not too useful, or not at all useful?
Q.10 Whether or not your organization now provides you with training, please tell me how important you think it is for someone in your job to have regular training in each of the following areas.

Is it very important, somewhat important, not too important, or not at all important?

a. Journalism skills such as writing, reporting, producing, storytelling or graphic design
b. Content or beat areas, such as politics, business or health
c. Journalism ethics, values and legal issues, such as privacy, libel law and the First Amendment

Q.11 In your current job, how much do you think you would personally benefit from additional training or professional development?

1) A lot
2) Somewhat
3) Only a little
4) Not at all?

Q.12 [Asked if respondent felt he/she would benefit] In general, would you benefit most from more training in ...

1) Journalism skills
2) Content or beat areas
3) Journalism ethics, values and legal issues

Q.13 [Asked if respondent thought he/she was most in need of beat training] Which specific content or beat area in particular?

Q.14 Now, please tell me whether or not your organization now provides you with any regular training in each of the following specific areas for journalist training and professional development.

a. Writing
b. Editing
c. Reporting
d. Computer-assisted reporting
e. News judgment and decision-making
f. Producing [asked of broadcast media only]
g. Storytelling [asked of broadcast media only]
h. Photography or photojournalism [TV and print only]
i. Graphics, layout, or design [print media only]

Q.15 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 14.] Is training in this area made available weekly, monthly, at least twice a year, once a year or less than once a year?

Q.16 [Asked if respondent felt he/she was most in need of journalism skills training.] You mentioned previously that you could benefit from more training in journalism skills. In which one of the following skills areas do you feel you would benefit most from more training?

1) Writing
2) Editing
3) Reporting
4) Computer-assisted reporting
5) News judgment and decision-making
6) Producing [broadcast only]
7) Storytelling [broadcast only]
8) Photography [TV, print only]

Q.17 [Asked if respondent was provided with content/beat area training.] Next, please tell me whether or not your organization now provides you with any regular training in each of the following specific content or beat coverage areas.

a. Arts and entertainment
b. Business and economics
c. Courts and police
d. Diversity
e. Education
f. Environment
g. Government and politics
h. Health and medicine
i. International or foreign affairs
j. The media
k. Military and defense
l. Numbers and statistics
m. Polls and surveys
n. Religion
o. Science and technology
p. Sports
q. Urban affairs

Q.18 [Asked for each “yes” response in Question 17.] Is training in this area made available weekly, monthly, at least twice a year, once a year or less than once a year?

Q.19 [Asked if training in ethics/values/legal issues was provided] You mentioned earlier that your organization provides you with regular training or professional development in journalism ethics, values or legal issues. Is training in this area made available weekly, monthly, at least twice a year, once a year, or less than once a year?
Legions of journalists are promoted to management positions without sufficient preparation and training, a condition endemic in a field where the traditional assumption has been that the best reporters – or those with the most seniority – will be successful editors and managers.

Says Linda Grist Cunningham, executive editor of the Rockford (Ill.) Register Star: “Most of us got into this business because we wanted to write. It never occurred to us that we would become managers. God forbid. Management is not part of our education, it’s not part of our thinking, it’s not part of our psyche. But then we assume that if you were a good reporter or photographer, then, ipso facto, you’ll be a good editor.”

— Bonnie Bressers
Quill Magazine
March 2002

To create a higher quality workforce ... in terms of cultural, gender or ethnic diversity or in terms of education and training, one has to recognize that control of entry rests disproportionately with the smaller daily newspapers.

— Lee B. Becker and Tudor Vlad,
University of Georgia

Q.20 [Asked if any training was provided] For my next questions, please think about all the training and professional development activities your organization now provides for you, either in-house or through outside programs. Are you expected to attend these training sessions mostly on your own time, or mostly on company time?

Q.21 [Asked if any training was provided] Are you required to attend certain training or professional development sessions, or is attendance always voluntary?

Q.22 [Asked if any training was provided] How much influence do news staff members like yourself have over decisions about your own training?
1) A lot of influence
2) Some influence
3) Not much influence
4) No influence at all

Q.23 [Asked if any training was provided] How recently have you taken part in any training or professional development activities in [insert relevant items] provided by your organization? Within the last month, within the last three months, within the last six months, within the last 12 months, or more than 12 months ago?

Q.24 [Asked if respondent had training in past year.] Which of the following best describes your immediate supervisor’s reaction to this training? Did he or she want you to use it, or go further and ask you to also share it with others in the newsroom, or feel it wasn’t useful, or did he or she say nothing about it?

Q.25 In the past 12 months, did you ever pay for any journalist training or professional development activities out of your own pocket?

Q.26 [Asked if respondent paid for training.] In which of the following areas did you pay for training or professional development activities out of your own pocket over the past 12 months?

a. Journalism skills
b. Content or beat areas
c. Journalism ethics, values or legal issues

d. A national conference of a journalism organization

Q.27 As I read you some different training forums, please tell me which of these, if any, you personally used for training or professional development activities you got on your own.

a. A national conference of a journalism organization
b. A regional conference of a journalism organization
c. A national workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
d. A regional workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
e. A seminar by a journalism school
f. A yearlong university fellowship to explore larger issues and ideas

g. In-house or outside consultants speaking in your newsroom or at your organization’s headquarters
h. A nonprofit training center such as the American Press Institute or Poynter Institute
i. An on-line distance learning program
j. Guides or other written materials from journalism organizations or schools
k. Web sites or listservs of journalism organizations

Q.28 Next, regardless of what kinds of training forums you now have access to, please tell me how interested you are in having access to training or professional development through each of the following forums.

In general, are you very interested, somewhat interested, not too interested, or not at all interested?

a. A national conference of a journalism organization
b. A regional conference of a journalism organization
c. A national workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
d. A regional workshop or seminar by a journalism organization
e. A seminar by a journalism school
f. A yearlong university fellowship to explore larger issues and ideas

g. In-house or outside consultants speaking in your newsroom or at your organization’s headquarters
h. A nonprofit training center such as the American Press Institute or Poynter Institute
An on-line distance learning program
Guides or other written materials from journalism organizations or schools
Web sites or listservs of journalism organizations

Q.29 Please tell me whether or not you have ever attended training or professional development sessions sponsored by each of the following groups. This would include any training you got on your own, without support from your organization.

a. American Press Institute
b. The Poynter Institute
c. Investigative Reporters and Editors
d. Foundation for American Communications
e. The Freedom Forum
f. Radio-Television News Directors Association and Foundation
g. Society of Professional Journalists
h. National Press Foundation
i. Journalist organizations that specialize in a subject, like business, crime, health or religion; or a skill, like copy editing or news design
j. Local, state, or regional press associations
k. Knight Foundation’s university fellowship programs
l. Knight Foundation’s weeklong seminar programs
m. Other college- or university-based programs

Q.30 [Asked if respondent attended any sessions in Question 29] Based on your experience, please tell me how you would rate each of the following groups as a resource for journalist training.

Are they one of the best resources for journalist training, above average, average or below average?

a. American Press Institute
b. The Poynter Institute
c. Investigative Reporters and Editors
d. Foundation for American Communications
e. The Freedom Forum
f. Radio-Television News Directors Association and Foundation
g. Society of Professional Journalists
h. National Press Foundation
i. Journalist organizations that specialize in a subject, like business, crime, health or religion; or a skill, like copy editing or news design
j. Local, state or regional press associations
k. Knight Foundation’s university fellowship programs
l. Knight Foundation’s weeklong seminar programs
m. Other college- or university-based programs

D2. Now, I have just a few questions so we can describe the journalists who took part in our survey. In your current job, do you supervise any news staff members?

D3a. As part of your current job, do you cover any specific beats or content areas?

D3b. [Asked of beat reporters] Which specific content or beat area in particular?

D4. What is your position or main area of responsibility in your news organization?

D5. What is your age?

D6. What is the last grade or class that you completed in school?

D7. [Asked of college graduates] Were you a journalism major as a college undergraduate?

D8. [Asked of nonjournalism majors.] Did you take any courses in journalism or media studies as an undergraduate?

D9. [Asked of respondents with postgraduate training.] What was your primary subject area of graduate study?

D10. Have you completed a graduate degree?

D11. [Asked of those with a graduate degree] What kind of graduate degree do you have?
he Journalists Training Survey, sponsored by the Council of Presidents of National Journalism Organizations and the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, is based on telephone interviews with 1,964 news executives and news staffers and was conducted under the direction of Princeton Survey Research Associates (PSRA).

Specifically, PSRA interviewed 786 news executives from 11 different media categories: daily newspapers, weekly newspapers, ethnic newspapers, national television networks, cable TV networks, local television stations, national radio networks, local radio stations, news magazines, wire services and Internet news web sites. PSRA also interviewed 1,178 news staffers in these same media categories. Interviewing for executives was conducted Jan. 3, 2002, through March 13, 2002, and interviewing for staffers was conducted Jan. 23, 2002, through March 13, 2002. Results based on the sample of news executives have a margin of error of plus or minus 4 percentage points, while results based on the sample of news staffers have a margin of error of plus or minus 3 percentage points.

Interviewers trained by PSRA conducted the interviews. Respondents were sent advance letters explaining the purpose of the study and encouraging their participation. Interviewers made as many as 15 calls each to respondents in the executive sample, and as many as 17 calls each to respondents in the staffer sample to attempt to complete an interview. Interviewers were available to conduct interviews during the regular workday or in the evening and on weekends as necessary. Interviewers accommodated respondents’ schedules and arranged appointments. In addition, respondents were given toll-free numbers to call to schedule an appointment or complete an interview at their convenience.

The specific sampling procedures for each sub-sample are outlined below.

**News Executives Survey**

**Daily Newspapers**. A total of 346 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top 350 daily newspapers, ranked by highest circulation in Bacon’s Media Source. Ten news executives at the top 12 daily newspapers were interviewed. These papers, by rank, are Wall Street Journal, USA Today, The New York Times, Los Angeles Times, The Washington Post, (New York) Daily News, Chicago Tribune, Newsday, Houston Chronicle, San Francisco Chronicle, Dallas Morning News, and Chicago Sun-Times. Eighty-eight news executives at the top 13 through 100 daily newspapers and 248 news executives at the top 101 through 350 daily newspapers were interviewed. The top 12 daily newspapers were considered part of the national sample, while the top 13 through 100 and 101 through 350 were considered part of the local sample.

News executives were defined by the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**Weekly Newspapers**. Fifty-six news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included all weekly news-

---

1 Specific media categories, for example, daily newspapers, local TV stations, and local radio stations were further stratified to represent the differences in organization size.

2 Two separate 800 numbers were allocated for the executive and staff samples.
papers with 15,000+ circulation. Specialty papers, such as ethnic, religious, military and alternative weeklies were excluded from the sampling frame. News executives were defined by the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

Ethnic Newspapers. Twenty-eight news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included weekly and daily ethnic papers with 15,000+ circulation. News executives were defined by the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

National TV Networks. Nine news executives were interviewed from the news departments of the six major television networks based on size. The sampling frame included ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS, Telemundo and Univision. News executives were defined by the following titles: executive or senior producer, news or program director, general manager and bureau chief. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source. We included the staffs of news broadcasts as well as regularly scheduled public affairs programming (e.g., Nightline, Frontline). The sampling frame included only the networks’ own news operations, not independent newsrooms or news programs operated by affiliate stations.

Cable TV Networks. Eleven news executives were interviewed from the five major cable networks based on size. The sampling frame included CNBC, CNN, CNN Headline News, Fox News Channel and MSNBC. News executives were defined by the following titles: executive or senior producer, news or program director, general manager and bureau chief. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

Local TV Stations. A total of 211 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). Thirty-nine executives from the Top 50 MSA and 172 executives from the Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

News Magazines. Four executives were interviewed at the major weekly news-magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Wire Services. Five executives were interviewed at the major wire services: The Associated Press, Bloomberg and Reuters. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Internet News Web Sites. Nine news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001). Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

News Staffers Survey

For this study, news staffers include reporters, correspondents, writers, columnists, anchors, hosts, beat/content editors, producers, assignment desk editors and graphics/web designers.

Local Radio Stations. A total of 105 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news or news/talk format and with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). Sixty-one executives from the Top 50 MSA and 44 executives from Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

News Magazines. Four executives were interviewed at the major weekly news-magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Wire Services. Five executives were interviewed at the major wire services: The Associated Press, Bloomberg and Reuters. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Internet News Web Sites. Nine news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001). Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

News Staffers Survey

For this study, news staffers include reporters, correspondents, writers, columnists, anchors, hosts, beat/content editors, producers, assignment desk editors and graphics/web designers.

Local Radio Stations. A total of 105 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news or news/talk format and with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). Sixty-one executives from the Top 50 MSA and 44 executives from Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

News Magazines. Four executives were interviewed at the major weekly news-magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Wire Services. Five executives were interviewed at the major wire services: The Associated Press, Bloomberg and Reuters. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Internet News Web Sites. Nine news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001). Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

News Staffers Survey

For this study, news staffers include reporters, correspondents, writers, columnists, anchors, hosts, beat/content editors, producers, assignment desk editors and graphics/web designers.

Local Radio Stations. A total of 105 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news or news/talk format and with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). Sixty-one executives from the Top 50 MSA and 44 executives from Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

News Magazines. Four executives were interviewed at the major weekly news-magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Wire Services. Five executives were interviewed at the major wire services: The Associated Press, Bloomberg and Reuters. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Internet News Web Sites. Nine news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001). Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

News Staffers Survey

For this study, news staffers include reporters, correspondents, writers, columnists, anchors, hosts, beat/content editors, producers, assignment desk editors and graphics/web designers.

Local Radio Stations. A total of 105 news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news or news/talk format and with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). Sixty-one executives from the Top 50 MSA and 44 executives from Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

News Magazines. Four executives were interviewed at the major weekly news-magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Wire Services. Five executives were interviewed at the major wire services: The Associated Press, Bloomberg and Reuters. Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

Internet News Web Sites. Nine news executives were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001). Executives were defined as the following titles: managing editor, editor and executive editor.

News Staffers Survey

For this study, news staffers include reporters, correspondents, writers, columnists, anchors, hosts, beat/content editors, producers, assignment desk editors and graphics/web designers.
newspapers were interviewed. The top 12 daily newspapers were considered part of the national sample, while the top 13-100 and 101-350 were considered part of the local sample. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**Weekly Newspapers.** Fifty-two news staffers were interviewed. The sampling frame included all weekly newspapers with 15,000+ circulation. Specialty papers, such as ethnic, religious, military and alternative weeklies were excluded from the sampling frame. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**Ethnic Newspapers.** Twenty-four news staffers were interviewed. The sampling frame included weekly and daily ethnic papers with 15,000+ circulation. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**National TV Networks.** Twenty-seven news staffers were interviewed from the news departments of the six major television networks based on size. The sampling frame included ABC, CBS, NBC, PBS, Telemundo and Univision. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source. We included the staffs of news broadcasts as well as regularly scheduled public affairs programming (e.g., *Nightline*, *Frontline*). The sampling frame included only the networks’ own news operations, not independent newsrooms or news programs operated by affiliate stations.

**Local Radio Stations.** A total of 151 news staffers were interviewed. The sampling frame included only those organizations with a news or news/talk format and with a news director listed. The sample was stratified based on MSA (Metropolitan Statistical Area). A total of 111 staffers from the Top 50 MSA and 40 staffers from Non-top 50 MSA were interviewed. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**News Magazines.** Seven staffers were interviewed at the major weekly news magazines: Newsweek, Time and U.S. News and World Report.

**Cable TV Networks.** Twenty-six news staffers were interviewed from the five major cable networks based on size. The sampling frame included CNBC, CNN, CNN Headline News, Fox News Channel and MSNBC. The sample was drawn from Bacon’s Media Source.

**Internet News Web Sites.** Ten news staffers were interviewed. The sampling frame included the top newspaper and news source web sites, as ranked by www.top9.com (March 2001).

**Response Rate.** Table 1 reports the disposition of all sampled telephone numbers dialed. The response rate estimates the fraction of all eligible respondents in the sample that were ultimately interviewed. At PSRA it is calculated by taking the product of three component rates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Rate (Number)</th>
<th>Response Rate (Rate)</th>
<th>Response Rate Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers dialed</td>
<td>1,159</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>2,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in sample</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonworking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonbusiness</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Numbers</td>
<td>1,140</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>1,635 99.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No final contact</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted numbers</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>1,322 81.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refusals</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
<td>1,212 91.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>1,203 99.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrupted</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
<td>1,201 99.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>70.1%</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Completion rate – the proportion of initially cooperating and eligible interviews that were completed – of 99.5 percent for the executive sample, 99.8 percent for the staff sample and 99.7 for the entire sample overall.

Thus the response rate for this survey was 70.1 percent for the news executives sample, 74.1 percent for the news staffers sample, and 72.4 percent for the overall sample.

Data were weighted to make the final staffer and executive samples more representative and comparable. The staffer sample was weighted so that the 15 different media types sampled would be represented in their proper proportions. As a first step, universe staff sizes were computed for each of the media types by multiplying the average staff size in each category by the number of organizations. The universe staff size distribution was used as the weighting target. See Table 2.

Table 2: Target Weighting Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type Categories</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Universe</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - Top 12</td>
<td>6,168</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - 13-100</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - 101-350</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Newspapers</td>
<td>16,500</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Newspapers</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National TV Networks</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV Networks</td>
<td>3,240</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TV Stations - Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TV Stations - Non-Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Radio Networks</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio Stations - Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio Stations - Non-Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet News</td>
<td>1,620</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Magazines</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Services</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Final Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media Type Categories</th>
<th>Executive Interviews</th>
<th>Executive Weights</th>
<th>Staffer Interviews</th>
<th>Staffer Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - Top 12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.84</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - 13-100</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Newspapers - 101-350</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Newspapers</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Newspapers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National TV Networks</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV Networks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TV Stations - Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local TV Stations - Non-Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Radio Networks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio Stations - Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Radio Stations - Non-Top 50 MSA</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet News</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News Magazines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wire Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Average staff size for all but one media category based on News Executives responses. Average staff size for wire services based on outside research.

Effects of Sample Design on Statistical Inference. Post-data collection statistical adjustments require analysis procedures that reflect departures from simple random sampling. PSRA calculates the effects of these design features so that an appropriate adjustment can be incorporated into tests of statistical significance when using these data. The so-called “design effect” or deft represents the loss in statistical efficiency that results from a disproportional sample design and systematic non-response. PSRA calculates the composite design effect for a sample of size n, with each case having a weight, w, as:

\[ \text{deft} = \left( \frac{\sum w_i^2}{\sum w_i^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} - 1 \]
In a wide range of situations, the adjusted standard error of a statistic should be calculated by multiplying the usual formula by the square root of the design effect (\(\sqrt{deff}\)). Thus, the formula for computing the 95 percent confidence interval around a percentage is:

\[
\hat{p} \pm \left( \sqrt{deff} \times 1.96 \sqrt{\frac{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})}{n}} \right)
\]

where \(\hat{p}\) is the sample estimate and \(n\) is the unweighted number of sample cases in the group being considered.

The survey’s margin of error is the largest 95 percent confidence interval for any estimated proportion based on the total sample – one around 50 percent. For example, the margin of error for the entire staffer sample is plus or minus 3 percent. This means that in 95 out every 100 samples drawn using the same methodology, estimated proportions based on the entire sample will be no more than 3 percentage points away from their true values in the population. The margin of error for the executive sample is plus or minus 4 percent. It is important to remember that sampling fluctuations are only one possible source of error in a survey estimate. Other sources, such as respondent selection bias, questionnaire wording and reporting inaccuracy, may contribute additional error of greater or lesser magnitude.

To use the data from this study, log on to the following URL and search under the title “Journalists Training Survey”:

www.irss.unc.edu/data_archive/catsearch.html
This list was compiled to help you find training organizations, fellowships and web resources to assist in training. Our thanks to the American Press Institute (www.americanpressinstitute.org) and the Society of Professional Journalists (www.spj.org), major contributors of the following information.

Organizations

Accrediting Council on Education in Journalism & Mass Communication
234 Outlet Pointe Blvd.
Columbia, S.C. 29210-5667
803-798-0271; fax 803-772-3509
aejmcm@aejmcm.org
www.aejmcm.org

Advertising Research Foundation
641 Lexington Ave.
New York, N.Y. 10022
212-751-5656
www.arfsite.org

Alabama Press Association
Felicia Mason, Executive Director
3324 Independence Drive, Suite 200
Birmingham, Ala. 35209
205-871-7737; fax: 205-871-7740
www.alabamapress.org

American Copy Editors Society
John McIntyre, President
The Sun
P.O. Box 1377
Baltimore, Md. 21278-0001
800-829-8000 x 6206
JohnMcIntyre@copydesk.org
www.copydesk.org

American Jewish Press Association
Aaron Cohen, President
1828 L St. N.W., Suite 720
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-785-2282; fax 202-785-2307
info@ajpa.org
www.ajpa.org

American Journalism Historians Association
Carol Sue Humphrey, Administrative Secretary
OBU Box 61201
500 W. University
Shawnee, Okla. 74804
www.ajha.org

American Journalism Historians Association
Carol Sue Humphrey, Administrative Secretary
OBU Box 61201
500 W. University
Shawnee, Okla. 74804
www.ajha.org

American Journalism Historians Association
Carol Sue Humphrey, Administrative Secretary
OBU Box 61201
500 W. University
Shawnee, Okla. 74804
www.ajha.org

American Journalism Historians Association
Carol Sue Humphrey, Administrative Secretary
OBU Box 61201
500 W. University
Shawnee, Okla. 74804
www.ajha.org
Everyone wants training, but few people have figured out how to get it, and how to encourage upper management to commit to it, by allowing employees time to attend training programs, supporting their attendance with finances to cover the training, etc.

— Rosalind Stark, Executive Director
Radio-Television News Directors Foundation

I have absolutely no budget but we’re still training. We do a lot on basic skills – how do we make headlines better, how to write livelier stories, how do we get more... system better. How can we make life a little less stressful for people – how to ease the little tensions in the room.

— Dick Hughes, Editorial Page Editor and Training Editor
Statesman Journal, Salem, Ore.

Newsroom culture is the key to everything. Word gets around very fast, which newsrooms are the good ones for diversity, for training, for quality. That’s at the core.

— Richard Kipling
METPRO Director
Tribune Publishing

If it’s done well, outside training will have multiple effects when [the trainees] return – they share what they’ve learned as well as show improvement themselves.

— Karen Dunlap
Dean of Faculty
Poynter Institute
In most, but not all, businesses, people believe that if you put out a better product, you’ll be successful. Most but not all: Fast food companies believe it’s better advertising. I’m not sure that people at newspapers believe if they put out a better paper, they’ll sell more papers. It’s obvious from the erosion that occurs to make higher profits. All it takes is leadership believing it’s important and giving somebody responsibility for making it happen.

— Bruce DeSilva, News/features Editor The Associated Press

The last time I was in a newsroom coping with tightened news hole, there were unexpected benefits that increased excellence:

1. It forced us to be very clear about our coverage priorities.
2. It forced us to be way more disciplined about writing. Our writing coach did workshops on compression and writing short, and the quality of writing actually improved.
3. We adopted a long-short philosophy. The stories we cared about got space and display. The stories not high on the priority list were briefed.

The result, in many cases, was better looking pages: One properly displayed, complete story — versus three or four eight-paragraph stories.

— Sharon Burnside, AME Training and Personnel The Toronto Star
138 Neff Annex
Missouri School of Journalism
Columbia, Mo. 65211
info@ire.org
www.nicar.org

National Lesbian and Gay Journalists Association
Robert Dodge, President
Pamela Strother, Executive Director
1420 K St. N.W., Suite 910
Washington, D.C. 20005
202-588-9888; fax 202-588-1818
pstrother@nlgja.org
www.nlgja.org

National Press Foundation
Bob Meyers, President
1211 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Suite 310
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-663-7280; fax 202-530-2855
bob@nationalpress.org
www.nationalpress.org

National Press Photographers Association
Clyde Mueller, President
Greg Garneau, Executive Director
3200 Croasdaile Drive, Suite 306
Durham, N.C. 27705-2588
919-383-7246; fax 919-383-7261
director@nppa.org
www.nppa.org

National Union of Journalists
Jeremy Dear, General Secretary
308 Grays Inn Road
London, England WC1X 8DP
44-020-7278-7916; fax 44-020-7837-8143
jeremyd@nunj.org.uk
www.nunj.org.uk

National Writers Union
Jonathan Tasini, President
113 University Place, Sixth Floor
New York, N.Y. 10003
212-254-0279; fax 212-254-0673
nww@nww.org
www.nww.org

Native American Journalists Association
Mary Annette Pember, President
3359 36th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, Minn. 55406
612-729-9244; fax 612-729-9373
info@naja.com
www.naja.com

Nebraska Press Association
Allen Beermann, Executive Director
845 S St.
Lincoln, Neb. 68508
402-476-2851; 800-369-2850; fax 402-476-2942
nebpress@nebpress.com
www.nebpress.com

New England Newspaper Association
George Geers
70 Washington St.
Salem, Mass. 01970
978-744-8940; fax 978-744-0333
NENA@nenews.org
www.nenews.org

Newslab
1900 M St. N.W., Suite 210
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-969-2536; fax 202-969-2543
mail@newslab.org
www.newslab.org

Newspaper Association of America
David Brown, Vice President
1921 Gallows Road, Suite 600
Vienna, Va. 22182
703-902-1600; fax 703-917-0636
Webmaster@nnaa.org
www.naa.org
In any economic climate, finding useful and affordable seminars for mid-career journalists is rare if not impossible. But in these difficult financial times, editors confront the challenge of keeping their newsrooms whole. Training programs to Poynter, API and other noted journalist-training centers are cut out of budgets early. The Annenberg seminar ("Covering Police in Times of Crisis," Dec. 5-8, 2001) was top-notch with any standard, but it carried a special value. Annie-Laurie Blair of The Enquirer not only returned with a better editor, but she also returned to spread the wealth of newsroom staff at The Enquirer the impact she learned at the University of Southern California. . . . It was valuable learning for everybody.

— Ward Bushee
Editor and Vice President
The Cincinnati Enquirer

Doug Birch was always one of The Baltimore Sun’s best reporters, but it took a fellowship at MIT to lift him (or, more precisely, to help him lift himself) to his full potential as a science writer. After he returned to The Sun, he undertook a wildly ambitious project to explain the revolution in genetics. To do so, he told the life story of an eccentric and brilliant scientist, Hamilton Smith. As a human tale, it was fascinating and poignant. And in the course of telling it, Birch gave his readers a clear, memorable explanation of the human genome project and the science that led to it. I’ve never read a more impressive story on the subject, and I doubt that Doug would have undertaken it without the opportunity to go to MIT and catch his second wind as a science writer.

— John Carroll
Editor, Los Angeles Times
(former editor of The Sun, Baltimore)
Dictionary of Computing Terms
Denis Howe
foldoc.doc.ic.ac.uk/foldoc/index.html

Editor & Publisher Interactive
770 Broadway
New York, N.Y. 10003-9595
Editorial Phone: 646-654-5270
Editorial Fax: 646-654-5370
Online Editorial Phone: 646-654-5274
www.editorandpublisher.com

Electronic Media
Weekly newspaper of broadcast, cable and interactive media
6500 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 2300
Los Angeles, Calif. 90048
Editorial 323-370-2432;
fax 323-653-4425
Sales 323-370-2412; fax 323-655-8157
rwray@crain.com
www.emonline.com

Elements of Style
webmaster@bartleby.com
www.bartleby.com/141/strunk3.html

E-Media Tidbits
1067 Marble Court
Boulder, Colo. 80303
303-543-7810; fax: 720-294-1095
steve@content-exchange.com
www.content-exchange.com/weblog/weblog.htm

Eurasia Research Center
The Balkans, Baltic States, Central Europe, the Caucasus, formerly Soviet Central Asia, Russia, Belarus, Ukraine, Moldova, Iran, Turkey, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.
contact@eurasianews.com
eurasianews.com/erc/homepage.htm

European Journalism Centre
EJC Secretariat
Postal address:
Sonneville-lunet 10
6221 KT Maastricht, Netherlands
Visiting address:
Avenue Ceramique 50
Maastricht, Netherlands
31-43-325-40-30; fax 31-43-321–26-26
secr@ejc.nl
www.ejc.nl/default.asp

FindLaw
Legal information for journalists doing research.
Steve Noel
650-210-1940
snoel@findlaw.com
www.findlaw.com

First Amendment
(Constitution of the United States complete text)
www.law.cornell.edu/constitution/constitution.table.html

First Amendment Center
info@fac.org
www.freedomforum.org/first/default.asp

First Amendment Cyber-Tribune
Information on all the liberties guaranteed by the amendment.
levendos@trib.com
w3.trib.com/FACT

Freedom of Expression Links
Lists of censorship resources.
Sandra Bernstein
sandra@sbernstein.on.ca
insight.mcmaster.ca/org/efc/pages/chronicle/censor.html

Freedom of Information Center
Access to government documents and information.
127 Neff Annex
University of Missouri
Columbia, Mo. 65211
573-882-4856; fax 573-882-9002
edwardsm@missouri.edu
web.missouri.edu/~foiwww/

Freedom of the Press: A Bibliography
dkoch@lib.siu.edu (David Koch, Director of Special Collections & Development)

slogue@lib.siu.edu (Susan Logue, Project Director)
jdunn@lib.siu.edu (JP Dunn, Project Specialist)

Freek JobsPage (Joe Grimm)
Answers about newspaper careers.
grimm@freepress.com
www.freep.com/jobspage/index.htm

Hartford Community College, Conn., Guide to Grammar & Writing
webster.commnet.edu/grammar/index.htm

Headwaters News
Rocky Mountain region of North America
takes@montana.com
www.headwatersnews.org/

Highschooljournalism.org
ASNE
11690B Sunrise Valley Drive
Reston, Va. 20191-1409
Diana Mitsu Klos, Senior Project Director
703-453-1125
dmk@asne.org
highschooljournalism.org

HR Online (HR Information)
Searchable job database
mark@inet1.com
www.hr2000.com/

HR-esource (HR resources)
Provides legal and regulatory information to legal, human resource, business and other professionals
800-328-4880 ext. 66470
customer.service@westgroup.com
www.hr-esource.com

Insert Text Here
A collection of Web sites to aid journa-
Feb. 21 Copy-editing crash course
Feb. 26 Open records, open meeting
Feb. 28 Libel/invasion of privacy
Apr. 16 Tone up (Photoshop tips)
Apr. 18 Take note of this (note taking)
Apr. 25 Scalpel, please (tight writing)
Apr. 30 Coaching
May 7 ArchiText power user
May 13 Writing for ajc.com
May 14 Cracking nonprofits
May 20 Leave the laptop; pick up a Palm
May 21 Craft of writing
May 23 Clocks, boxes and martini glasses (organizing stories)
May 29 May the source be with you
May 6-27 Distance learning program for six newsroom managers from six Cox newspapers on managing the relationship with your boss; interviewing and hiring, and motivation.

Contact: Michael Schwartz, Cox Newspapers training manager, mschwartz@ajc.com
Presstime
Selected articles from Presstime, the magazine of the Newspaper Association of America. Also supplementary material.
Terry Poltrack
poltt@naa.org
www.naa.org/presstime

PressWise Trust
Assistance to those with complaints about inaccurate, intrusive or sensational coverage in UK.
mandychops@ukonline.co.uk
www.presswise.org.uk

Project for Excellence in Journalism Pew Charitable Trusts
1900 M St. N.W., Suite 210
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-293-7394; fax 202-293-6946
mail@journalism.org
www.journalism.org/

Quill
Society of Professional Journalists
3909 N. Meridian St.
Indianapolis, Ind. 46208
317-927-8000; fax 317-920-4789
quill@spj.org
spj.org/quill

Reliable Sources – Transcripts
Transcripts of every episode of CNN’s Reliable Sources, dating back to January 2000.
800-CNN-NEWS
www.cnn.com/TRANSCRIPTS/

Repetitive Stress Injury
Information on RSIs and how to avoid them.
amara@amara.com
www.amara.com/aboutme/rsi.html

Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press
First Amendment Handbook
www.rcfp.org/handbook/viewpage.cgi

Statistics Every Writer Should Know
Statistical information for journalists.
nilesonline.com/stats/

Scoop Cybersleuth
Search the internet for keywords.
scoop.evansville.net/getaclue.html

Seminar Information Service
Comprehensive guide to business and technical seminars worldwide.
17752 Skypark Circle, Suite 210
Irvine, Calif. 92614
949-261-9104; fax 949-261-1963
info@seminarinformation.com
www.seminarinformation.com

Shorenstein Center
Research center dedicated to exploring the intersection of press, politics and public policy.
79 JFK St.
2nd Floor Taubman
Cambridge, Mass. 02138
617-495-8269
www.ksg.harvard.edu/shorenstein

Sources and Experts
Kitty Bennett
bennett@sptimes.com
www.ibiblio.org/slanews/internet/experts.html

SportsPages.com
Links to the sports sections of the major U.S. papers, broadcast sites.
webmaster@sportspages.com
www.sportspages.com

sree.net
A journalist’s resource guide.
www.sree.net

Star Archive
Contact information of thousands of celebrities.
stars2000@stararchive.com
www.stararchive.com

Stateline.org
Development of major issues on the public agenda in a number of states.
c/o Pew Center on the States
1101 30th St. N.W.
Suite 301
Washington, D.C. 20007
202-965-5035; fax 202-339-6153
editor@stateline.org
www.stateline.org

Statistics About the Media
Media Awareness Network
1500 Merivale Road, Third Floor
Ottawa, Ont. K2E 6Z5
613-224-7721 or 800-896-3342; fax 613-224-1958
info@media-awareness.ca
www.media-awareness.ca/eng/issues/stats/index.htm

Statistics Every Writer Should Know
Statistical information for journalists.
nilesonline.com/stats/

Stop the Presses
Report on the status of interactive media, especially the Internet.
Steve Outing
steve@planetarynews.com
www.medainfo.com/editorandpublisher/features_columns/index.jsp

Student Press Law Center
Legal-assistance agency devoted exclusively to educating high school and college journalists about the rights and responsibilities embodied in the First Amendment.
WWW Resources
Journalist resources
Hal Doran Associates
hdoran@synapse.net
www.synapse.net/~radio/welcome.html

WWW Virtual Library: Journalism
A research tool for journalists.
John Makulowich
john@journalist.com
vlib.org/Communication.html

Yearbook of Experts,
Authorities and Spokespersons
Search engine of experts on a variety
of topics, designed for journalists
looking for sources.
davis@yearbook.com
www.expertclick.com