THE NEW GLOBAL J-SCHOOL: ISSUES ARISING FROM THE INTERNATIONALISATION AND MONETISATION OF JOURNALISM EDUCATION.

Megan Knight and Caroline Hawtin

University of Central Lancashire

Preston, United Kingdom

PR1 2HE

+44 1772 894732

maknight@uclan.ac.uk chawtin@uclan.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Over the last decade, universities across the Anglo-Saxon world have been looking to expand their income and their reach, selling their expertise (via franchise agreements with local universities, or by creating their own commercially-driven local campuses) to countries with expanding populations in search of education, but with limited infrastructure to provide this themselves (Universities UK 2009). Coupled with this are the increasing financial pressures on universities to find other sources of income from the traditional state funding and tuition fees: sources which are most likely to be found in agreements with foreign countries and in the recruitment of foreign students (Department for Business Innovation and Skills 2009), (Baty 2009). This is not an unproblematic scenario for a whole range of reasons, not least for the way in which it constitutes a new kind of intellectual colonialism, and for the largely commercial impetus behind these activities. As the subjects covered expand from more value-neutral areas such accounting and engineering to the social sciences, and especially media studies and journalism, problematic issues around ideology, ethics and culture are becoming apparent.

Through preliminary research and a series of semi-structured interviews, the researchers examined the curriculum, assessment and teaching practices of 14 institutions running linked

programmes between the UK, the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand on the one hand, and Egypt, the UAE, Qatar, Singapore and China on the other. The researchers examined the extent to which staff were free to teach what they would teach in the Anglo-Saxon universities, adhered to or adapted the curriculum for local constraints, and felt that they were being permitted to maintain the ideological stance that is inherent in the teaching and practice of journalism in that world. Respondents were surprisingly free to teach what they saw fit, but were subject to self-censorship, either through fear of repercussions, or concern that the students needed to be taught to function within their home country constraints. Although the feedback was generally positive, especially for the programmes with the closest links with the parent institution, the level of frustration with the programmes, and the significant number of respondents who felt that what they were doing was irrelevant to the students and their environment still raises questions about the long-term value of these projects.

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Over the last decade, universities across the Anglo-Saxon[i] world have been looking to expand their income and their reach, selling their expertise (via franchise agreements with local universities, or by creating their own commercially-driven local campuses) to countries with expanding populations in search of education, but with limited infrastructure to provide this themselves (Universities UK 2009). Coupled with this are the increasing financial pressures on universities to find other sources of income from the traditional state funding and tuition fees: sources which are most likely to be found in agreements with foreign countries and in the recruitment of foreign students (Department for Business Innovation and Skills 2009), (Baty 2009). This is not an unproblematic scenario for a whole range of reasons, not least for the way in which it constitutes a new kind of intellectual colonialism, and for the largely commercial impetus behind these activities. As the subjects covered expand from more value-neutral areas such accounting and engineering to the social sciences, and especially media studies and journalism, problematic issues around ideology, ethics and culture are becoming apparent.

Journalism, specifically, is subject to this tension. As it is taught in the United Kingdom and the United States of America, journalism is as much about the values of a society, its adherence to a set of understandings about the role of the media and its relationship to its audience and the state as it is about the technical and practical skills of writing and news production (Curran 2005). When journalism as an academic subject is transported wholesale from its own environment into another, the ideological frameworks of the pedagogy and the practice are placed under tension, and sometimes in open conflict with the prevailing legal, ethical and social systems in the new environment. (Martin 2010)

This paper seeks to understand these tensions, and to discover how these discrepancies are resolved, or not, by the individuals and institutions undertaking this practice. These issues have been raised elsewhere in the academy, specifically in the business schools (Dunfee & Cowton 1995), (McGowan & Potter 2008), but they have not as yet been extensively studied or formally discussed in the journalism schools that we can find.

This study is motivated in large part by the authors' own experiences as course leader and tutor on the University of Central Lancashire's International Journalism and Media Management undergraduate degrees, both of which are taught in collaboration with universities in China (Guangdong University of Foreign Studies, Shanghai Institute of Foreign Trade and the University of Shanghai for Science and Technology), and Megan Knight's experience as the programme leader for Media and Communication Studies at Middlesex University's campus in Dubai, from 2005 to 2008. As such, we have considerable insight into the issues, but there is the risk of bias in the interviews. We have tried as much as possible to have interviews conducted by the member of the team who knows the interviewee least, in order to minimise this. Although the format of the study is semi-structured interviews, there are aspects of participant observation included, of necessity, since the authors' own observations on their own experiences are included.

SCOPE AND METHOD

This study examines the practices of journalism teaching in journalism programmes in Asia and the Middle East that are explicitly linked to programmes validated or accredited in the Anglo-Saxon world. This includes franchise agreements, in which the parent campus provides teaching materials and some oversight, but the material is taught by local staff, and day to day management and administration issues are handled by the local autonomous campus; full local campuses in which the parent institution sets up an autonomous private

institution (often locally accredited) in the host country, with the explicit branding of the parent institution; validation agreements in which pre-existing local university programmes are recognised and validated by host institutions, but in which there is little direct oversight of teaching, and institutional validation; and situations where an entire institution is validated by a foreign (usually United States) validation body. The range of programmes and arrangements is immense, with most programmes studied being the only specific example of their kind in the sample, so it has not proven possible to analyse or generalise across programme types.

The study is limited to purely commercial ventures, undertaken for financial gain, although the parent institutions are a range of public and privately-funded universities. Programmes undertaken for developmental or philanthropic reasons, such as those funded by the Open Society Institute, UNESCO and the like are excluded, for obvious reasons.

The study includes programmes running in China, Singapore, Oman, the United Arab Emirates, Egypt and Qatar[ii]. Although there is substantial difference between these countries, they all rank below 85 on the World Press Freedom Index of 2009, out of 175 rankings. This makes them all countries in which freedom of the press is constrained, and in which the practice of journalism is not permitted to function as it does in the parent countries studied: the UK, the USA, Australia, New Zealand and Canada[iii], all of which rank in the top 20 on the same list. (Reporters Sans Frontières 2009).

The constraints on the practice of journalism in these countries vary considerably, but there are a few common practices:

- most of the countries on the list criminalise or censor criticism of the government or the state (in the case of many of the Arabian countries, these limits are

expressed as prohibiting attacks on the ruling family, which by extension includes all of the apparatuses of state)

- many of the Islamic countries criminalise or otherwise penalise criticism of Islam and/or other religions

- two of the countries listed are cited by RSF as 'enemies of the Internet', countries which severely restrict access to websites, and which criminalise activities such as blogging. One other is listed as 'under surveillance' in the same report, having similar restrictions on freedom of expression on and access to the Internet

- many of the countries require journalists and/or news outlets to register in order to publish, and these registration mechanisms are used to silence critics or dissenting opinions

(Reporters Sans Frontières 2009)

The study examines both the teaching of journalism specifically either as an entire degree, or as components within a broader degree course in media studies or similar, and the design and management of courses in journalism, media and communications (where journalism is a key component of the course).

After initial research (web-based searching, correspondence and conversations with contacts, and some brief interviews with relevant people), lines of questions were developed along five key areas (programme management, curriculum design, use of textbooks, classroom experience and assessment processes) and in-depth semi-structured interviews were conducted with 14 people in a range of roles and from a number of countries and institutions. Additional documents (handbooks, outlines, franchise agreements formal and informal reports and the like) were examined where possible. Although not all interviewees requested anonymity, the number of programmes and the specificity of circumstances made it more

likely that those people who wished not to be identified could be if others were identified, so all responses have been anonymised, and some specifics (such as specific parent and host countries) have been elided.

Although the number of interviewees is small, we are confident that they represent a substantial percentage of existing programmes. Aside from three institutions whose staff were unable to participate in the research for logistical reasons, and one organisation who denied having any links despite evidence to the contrary, we are not aware of any relevant or applicable programmes with which we did not make contact. We were not able, however, to speak to multiple people within individual programmes, which is frustrating, primarily again for logistical reasons (people agreed to interviews and then were unable to commit to an appropriate time).

PROGRAMME MANAGEMENT AND ADMINISTRATION

All institutions studied offered undergraduate degrees only (in the host country). One offered a full named journalism degree , the rest combinations of media studies/communication studies, public relations, media production/practice and journalism. The US and Canada linked programmes were four years and offered students a flexible programme in which the students choose a major and a range of options and electives, the UK, Australia and New Zealand programmes were three years, and were named degrees in which the students were offered much less flexibility.

All programmes were taught entirely in English, although at several institutions students took additional journalism and media modules in their home language and with no oversight by the parent institution.

The programmes examined ranged from consultancy arrangements to franchise programmes to programmes fully accredited, administered and taught by the host university.

We have ordered these arrangements in order from the least involvement on the part of the parent institution to the most.

Three of the universities examined (all in the UAE) had programmes that had been initially designed by consultants from the parent country (two from the USA and one from Canada), but with no further involvement on their part. In two of these instances it was not clear whether these consultants had been attached to a specific institution in the parent country, or were 'freelance' educational consultants. All of these institutions were accredited in the UAE and in the USA[iv]. All of these institutions, however, continue to hire parent-country trained teaching staff, and maintain some level of identification with the parent country, albeit mostly in marketing terms.

Two other universities studied (in Oman and Egypt) were simple bought programmes in which the parent institution had been approached to design a complete programme to be delivered at the host institution. Agreements differ as to the specific terms, but the usual arrangement is that the parent institution develops the curriculum, course materials and assessments, which are handed over to the host institution for implementation and delivery. The parent institution may make an initial visit or two in the development process, but once the material has been handed over their role remains advisory only and they have no further oversight, and in the cases studied, were not consulted or contacted again once the programmes were up and running.

Two programmes, both in China, were designed as franchise programmes with constant oversight. In both cases, the courses were developed and validated in the UK, the degrees were awarded by the UK institution and a UK-employed member of staff was located onsite in China to teach and oversee the programme. All work was moderated in and examined by UK staff. The level of oversight varied, but the involvement of the UK academic staff was

consistent and diligent. This is the most common practice with UK universities, and there were other programmes in the Middle East that were included in the initial study, but not in the final interviews or in-depth research, which had the same structure of oversight and management in the UK.

The last three programmes were full branded projects by the parent institutions, which created satellite campuses in the host countries, fully validated and accredited by the parent institution and with no local accreditation or relationships with existing institutions. Two of these programmes are in the UAE, and one in Qatar, and all are in special education 'Free Zones' created by the governments in those states in order to allow foreign institutions to function without local oversight.

INTERVIEWEES

Eight of the people interviewed were resident and teaching at the host institution, and eight were resident at the parent institution with oversight of the programme in the host country and/or occasional teaching at the host institution. Two people were interviewed twice, because they had had dual roles at differing times at different institutions.

All of the people interviewed were trained in the Anglo-Saxon world, although not necessarily in the same country as the parent institution of the programme they were involved in. Only two of the interviewees had cultural and familial links with the host country they were associated with, for all of the others their involvement in these programmes was their first contact with or experience of the host country. These two were the only ones who had any ability in the dominant language of the region in which they were teaching. All of the eight people based in the host country were recruited from outside of that country.

Anecdotally, there appears to be a bias against locally experienced journalists and academic staff in these kinds of programmes, especially in the Middle East. The two 'local'

interviewees in the cohort are in the minority in their respective institutions, and when the author was in the Middle East there was a clear indication from the local community that they expected foreign staff at the university, and that the presence of such was a marker of higher quality. Other interviewees in the region concurred.

ISSUES RAISED AND DISCUSSION

One of the interviewees put it most succinctly: "In a country where there's less than a free press, should you be there: Are you making things better by trying to make things better, or do you protest and say we're not going to be there because the press isn't free."

PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT AND RELATIONSHIPS

Most of the staff involved in developing courses and programmes for foreign markets expressed frustration that the decision to enter into such arrangements was taken by other people in the university without the consultation of the specific staff in journalism, and that the decision makers (often university management and senior administrators) expected that the process would be simple, that teaching materials could be simply repackaged and sold at a profit with no additional work.

As one interviewee involved in the development of a programme that was to be sold to a foreign institution put it:

> It doesn't work like that. The material needs to be localised to their own
> conditions, and particularly in terms of journalism and media studies, some of the
> cultural, political, ideological sensitivities, and some of the language around the
> curriculum and around the way we teach things just doesn't fit into a Muslim
> state. There was a lot more work involved in making these courses work in the
> [middle eastern] environment than the administrators thought at first. It became
> an absolute nightmare for all the staff involved.

That institution did a lot of work to localise the material, and the overall project took considerable time from the academic staff who were not directly rewarded for that work.[v]

There is a clear indication that parent institutions' senior management were entering into these programmes primarily for the financial incentives offered (especially in the UK, where universities are under increasing pressure to find additional revenue not linked to local students and tuition fees).

In other cases, the relationships between the parent and host institution were fraught, and expectations differed substantially. It was sometimes unclear what had been agreed specifically. One interviewee said that the host institution expected that their students would be able to participate in student exchanges to the parent country, and that their students' degrees would be validated in the parent country (this was for a bought programme). These expectations could not be met, and when the students learned that the ability of the host institution to attract students was damaged. That programme has apparently since been closed[vi].

TEXTBOOKS AND COURSE MATERIALS

In all cases where textbooks were used, they were Anglo-Saxon textbooks originally intended for use in the parent country. Staff involved in teaching did not rely heavily on the textbooks, however, and tended to teach from their own materials and heavily adapted material from the textbooks.

Some interviewees expressed frustration with the textbooks, especially in contexts in which they were constrained from adapting the material or choosing their own resources: "Don't ask. They are awful. They are too American and counter-culture to this area." Another interviewee characterised the books as: "Totally irrelevant, teaching American-style, first

amendment, fourth estate freedom of expression journalism in a country where these things could never happen."

Teaching staff's liberty to adapt their teaching materials to the local environment varies, but all staff made at last some attempt to adapt. Practical journalism modules were the most problematic, since there appear to be no English-language textbooks relevant to the regions, and the textbooks used (Brooks & Missouri Group. 2002; Harcup 2009; Mencher 2002; Stovall 1985) are all specific to Anglo-Saxon countries, referencing specific media law and practice in those places.

Staff who were constrained by the textbooks had to work to adapt examples to make them meaningful to the local environment.

Materials for theory modules were easier, with at least one course making use of Lawrence Pintak's (Lawrence Pintak 2010; L. Pintak & Ginges 2008) work on journalism in the Middle East, and the various works on Al Jazeera (Rushing 2007; Miles 2005; El-Nawawy 2003). All courses made use of journal articles and asked students to read selections from other books.

Overall, however, textbooks were not widely used: student reluctance to buy or read books, identified as due to language difficulties or to identified cultural reluctance to rely on printed texts ("Students couldn't be asked to buy or read textbooks") was widespread, especially in the Middle East.

However, textbooks remain a source of tension, and at least one institution has a programme to have staff develop and publish their own teaching materials for use in the region.

Journalistic source material (newspapers, television channels, etc) was not a substantial issue. Despite nominal restrictions on foreign media material in the host countries, and restrictions on Internet access, none of the staff expressed any difficulty accessing Anglo-Saxon media

materials, and all programmes had no difficulty asking students to consume news produced outside of the host country.[vii]

All programmes expected the students to consume a similar range of news media, with CNN and the BBC the primary broadcasters (supplemented by Al Jazeera in the Middle East), and the Guardian, the Independent and the New York Times named as the main print titles students were expected to read. None of the staff said that they were pressured to use local English-language publications, although all did. Staff all said that they felt free to criticise state-owned media in the classroom, and several staff discussed variations in coverage between western and state-owned media of specific events with their students.

CURRICULUM

In all instances, the curriculum was developed by the parent country, with greater or lesser degrees of variation and adaptation for the host environment.

In all three of the parent-country-branded institutions, and in one of the franchise programmes, the curriculum was identical to that taught in the parent country (variously, the USA, Australia and the UK), and both institutions went to considerable effort to police that: work is moderated by the parent institution staff, and staff on both sides routinely communicate in order to ensure that content and standards are equivalent. "The mandate here is to deliver the [parent institution] curriculum out here in Journalism and Communication, The courses we offer here is the course we offer in [parent country]." "Curriculum is set in [parent institution city], we're contracted to present exactly the same curriculum in all campuses."

This is not to say that specific assessments and content could not be adapted slightly to the local environment, but this is done within the constraints set by the parent institution. The form, type, scope and content of assessments is identical, specifics, such as target

publications (for practical assignments) or content to be analysed (for essays and research) would be localised, but not much more. " Content-wise it's [parent country] content. We put it into context, global context. In relation with international trends as well, but it's very [specific to parent country]."

Such adaptations were done in consultation with the parent institution, and all changes would have to be agreed. The extent to which the parent institution was willing to adapt varied, although all staff who discussed making such adaptations agreed that it was not simple to do. In one instance, a module dealing with journalism and media contexts proved to be problematic:

> *The aim was to talk about journalism in countries other than [host country], and yet most of the students have never been out of [host country], never worked out of [host country], it was a really hard thing to talk about journalism practice in other countries in a meaningful way to these students ... they had the hardest time trying to see why it was important how the western media operates when they know that the [host country] media operates very differently."*

Attempts to adapt this module were met with reluctance by the staff in the parent institution. It was felt that "the purpose of the programme [was] to look at international journalism practices" and that adapting it to local contexts would change that.

Where the conflict arose around issues that were clearly and widely known to be problematic for the host country, adaptation was easier. Programmes in the Middle East were adapted to exclude material dealing with issues like homosexuality (a section of a media studies module dealing with queer theory was removed in one programme) and alcohol consumption (a discussion of the representation of binge drinking in the UK was adapted).

In the bought programmes, there appeared to be more problems with adapting curriculum, and staff expressed more dissatisfaction with the process. This appears to be primarily the result of not having an ongoing relationship with the people responsible for developing the programme, and with the host institution management's reluctance to permit extensive changes to the programme that had been bought and implemented, rather than with a clearly articulated objection to altering the curriculum on theoretical or pedagogic grounds.

COURT REPORTING

One issue which was mentioned repeatedly with the bought programmes was court reporting. Court reporting forms a key part of the training of any journalist in the Anglo-Saxon world where court proceedings are public and widely reported, but in the Middle East and China, the courts are closed to reporters.

In the franchise and branded programmes, practical court reporting was removed from the curriculum, but in the bought programmes this was more difficult to do and staff expressed frustration with that aspect of the content: "Crime stories, what's the use of [having the students] report [on] a court case. They can't go to the court. You have to make it different, something they can relate to." - "I also find it fruitless to use examples that include public elections, local government activities, reporting court proceedings, open information laws – or anything else that doesn't exist here."

THE SOCIO-POLITICAL ROLE OF THE MEDIA AND ETHICS

Another issue which was raised consistently was the discussion of the role of the media within society and ethics in general. Although this material remained in the programmes, and was not removed, as other material was, staff tended to discuss this in the context of the international environment and not specifically in the local.

Again, as with other issues, staff in franchised and branded programmes expressed less difficulty with these concepts than staff at bought programmes. A lecturer at one programme said that his students had "an engaging and robust discussion" on issues of privacy and identification of victims of crime by journalists. Public interest was also discussed in classes in China, using the Editor's Code of Conduct[viii], and in relation to specific local stories that are being discussed in class."

Despite the greater openness, the full investigative watchdog role, especially vis-a-vis the state, was somewhat elided, as one lecturer put it: "We look at news as educator, at the journalist as the bridge between the public and those in authority .. pose the questions on behalf of the reader"

Staff at bought programmes had more difficulty, and found it problematic to discuss these issues in the classroom. One lecturer felt that the students were unable to comprehend the role of the media in a democratic society because they were so sheltered by their own environment: "In that scenario, how is it possible to talk about fourth estate journalism? I tried to generate discussion in class – it was a foreign concept for them, the notion of the media monitoring power. Power is power." Another lecturer agreed that without an understanding of the whole society the concept of the fourth estate went over their heads.

Other tutors worked hard to make links between the foreign concepts and the students' local experience: "I take what is common, and usually those laws are similar. I take a lot of UAE media law, and they ARE similar [to the US law]."

DIFFICULT SUBJECTS

Journalism is about current events, and a substantial part of any journalism tuition will involve discussion of current issues and events. In the Anglo-Saxon world, journalism tutors

are usually free to discuss any events with their students, and do, but in a country where access to news can be limited, this could prove problematic.

In both regions, there were specific issues and events that remained difficult. In the Middle East, it was the events of September 11 2001, and in China the democracy protests in Tienanmen Square in 1990, and to a lesser extent the issues surrounding Tibet and the Dalai Lama.

Two of the lecturers interviewed were in the Middle East during September 2001, both had very recently arrived. One lecturer was told on the morning of September 12 (the attacks had occurred in the late afternoon the previous day, by local time) not to mention it to the students. On discussion, this was realised to be "silly" and she was told to be "a bit careful". The other tutor was told that the student newspaper (for which he was responsible), could not publish a piece on the reaction to the attacks of staff and students, and "nothing political will be allowed in the student newspaper". He was also told "do not attempt to talk about September 11 in any way".

However, a different tutor in the region was able to hold a class discussion on the row about the cartoons of the prophet Mohammad that were published in 2005/6. The discussion had to be voluntary (ie, students could leave and would not be punished academically if they did), and the cartoons could not be shown, but the discussion about the events was open and frank, and there were no repercussions from it. However, another tutor (not a participant in this research) in a different university at the same time suffered rather more severe consequences (see below).

All of the tutors in the Middle East felt that their students were more cosmopolitan and progressive than the general population, a function of their attendance at university and their undergoing tuition in English, and that they were reasonably free to discuss issues, with one

major exception: " As long as it wasn't about Israel, I felt quite comfortable talking with them about most news subjects."

However, that tolerance ended at the borders of the country: "I certainly never spoke to them about criticising their own system of government, and that wasn't my role to." Another tutor commented : "I feel I need to adhere to the same restrictions that the local media faces: don't disparage the ruling family, the government decisions, or local economy."

In a different middle-eastern country, however, the situation was described differently: "There is no interference at all in what we teach ... zero"

In China, the difficulty of holding class discussions stems more from the students' lack of knowledge. The events of Tienanmen square are not discussed, because officially, the students don't know anything about them. In practice, as one tutor said: "outside of the classroom, they knew all about it", but the tutors and students were also constrained by the popularly-held belief[ix] that there is one 'reporter' – ie, a member of the Communist Party who reports what is said to the higher-ups – in every class. Self-censorship appears to be common: "Reporters in the class report back on everything you say, so you stay away from certain topics ... topics that are problematic – incidents in Tibet. There was very interesting coverage in English within China but I was told not to use that in the classroom, or to draw attention to the issue. "

One tutor disagreed, and said that he had "total freedom in what I teach and how I teach" "In our classes over the years we've discussed Tiananmen, Tibet etc all the taboos – we've discussed them all. I'm given a totally free hand." However, he also said that: "The restrictions on journalism and what they can and can't say – it does underpin everything we do here and we are aware of it."

However, what freedom there is to discuss controversial issues may well be limited by the students' own understanding. One tutor attempted to hold a class debate about the Dalai Lama: "there was no discussion, the students all agreed that he is a criminal".

STAFF VULNERABILITY

The peculiar circumstances in which the host-country-resident staff are employed created some difficult circumstances, especially for staff in the UAE. All but one of the interviewees resident in the UAE mentioned that they were vulnerable to deportation, and that the students occasionally tried to take advantage of this. The system of *wasta* – loosely translated as 'influence' - which allowed students with connections to power to dispute marks with the staff, and which placed staff in a highly vulnerable position.

Staff mentioned a number of well-known incidents in which foreign university staff had been deported from the UAE almost instantaneously for causing offence to the local authorities. One had been quoted in Newsweek magazine referring to the ruler of Dubai as a benevolent dictator, another had [apparently] shown students copies of the Danish cartoons of Mohammad. One interviewee characterised it as: "Some things you can't talk about. We could be closed down, the pro-vice chancellor could be deported ... We have to be very careful not to get into trouble."

Although the staff resident in China all mentioned the Communist Party reporters (see above), none of them seemed specifically concerned that they could face retribution for offending the authorities, and there were no discussions of such fates befalling other tutors.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the range of opinions expressed about these programmes runs the full gamut, and there is little difference between countries as to the range expressed. However, staff at bought programmes (both host-country and parent-country) staff, expressed the most discontent with

the programmes, and felt the least positive about the value of these programmes to the students or the countries in which they were located. Staff in the three fully-branded programmes expressed the most positive opinion of the situation, and said that they had the most authority to alter programmes and to teach what they wanted to.

Likewise, host-country staff who are employees of the parent institution expressed fewer reservations about the value of what they were doing. Since staff at the bought programmes expressed frustration with their working conditions and terms of employment (as separate from specific journalistic concerns), and staff at branded and franchise programmes did not, it seems most likely that the positive impression of the value of the franchise and branded programmes, is at least in part a function of the staff's relative autonomy and rank within the institutions (both parent and host). This is somewhat surprising, since these programmes were the most rigid – requiring the full agreement of the parent institution to make any changes to the curriculum. It seems likely therefore, that the closer the relationship with the parent institution, and the more involved the staff at the host institution are with curriculum decisions, the more empowered, and therefore positive, they are.

However, the strongest concerns about ideology (and especially autonomy) were expressed by the parent institution staff who were developing programmes, and were not actively teaching in the host country. Staff involved in teaching in the host country said that they had more freedom to teach what they wanted than the staff in the parent country anticipated they would. There are two issues here: one is the limited experience of the parent-country staff of the host country, which may have swayed their opinions of the host country, leading them to believe the situation is more repressive than it is; the other is that staff who are still resident in the host country may be unreliable about the extent to which their own behaviour is constrained by self-censorship. A number of these staff made contradictory statements about their autonomy – claiming to be both entirely free and constrained by local laws and culture.

The variation of staff's perception of their own freedom to express themselves appears to be a function of the extent to which they felt empowered by the institution and invested in the programme. Staff who were locally employed by bought programmes expressed the most frustration and criticisms, while staff in similar countries and programmes who were foreign-employed and who had extensive contact with the parent institution felt that they were freer, and that they were more successful in conveying the ideals of journalism as they understood them. Since these staff were otherwise similar in origin and training, this may be the result of self-identification, not objective experience.

All staff expressed concern about the purpose of these programmes, especially with regards to the final placement of students and the overall goals. Although the question of whether the journalism schools worldwide are still truly training people for an increasingly shrinking profession is by no means limited to these programmes (Luckhurst 2009), there seem to be even greater issues with, particularly, the bought programmes, which were characterised by one interviewee as "ill-thought-out". The majority of the staff interviewed said that they did not expect to place students in either the local or the international new news media, and that they were unclear as to what environment they were training students for.

However, a number of staff were overall positive about the programmes, and their role in developing the news media in the region: "The Middle East is moving to a more liberal press. We felt it was valuable to start giving some instruction in those norms, not to say that we did that uncritically."

"[Students] are the stakeholders here and this is going to be something they have to iron out - without me. We help them to become better newshounds and to get a better sense of what's newsworthy"

This study has been a small and preliminary exploration of the issues pertaining to the relocation of journalism courses to countries with more restrictive news environments, but the conclusions are clear: the staff involved in these programmes are working hard to deliver them to their students in a way that is both meaningful to the students and maintains some of the values of journalism as it is taught in the parent country. The closer the staff's relationship with the parent country, the better the programme was felt to be running, and the happier the staff were with the relationship and the overall environment. Staff were the most unhappy with programmes that had been bought and sold in advance, and where there is little or no contact between the staff at the parent and host institutions. These programmes were believed to be 'money-spinners' that had been entered into for purely financial gain, and there was little sense from the staff that they believed in what they were doing, or that the students were being well-served.

The study has been limited by the lack of complete access to materials, and by the nature of personal interviewing which is unable to correct for self-reporting and confirmation biases. However, the similarities across the programmes and countries are strong and clear. Further research into this area could examine the student experience in these environments, or look at the roles played by validation organisations in the parent countries. The similar programmes being run for altruistic and philanthropic reasons in the developing world would also be worth studying, and a comparison between the types of programmes might well be fruitful.

Since it seems evident that many (if not all) of these programmes were set up for purely financial reasons, further investigation into the student expectations and experience of the programmes would be useful, as would longitudinal studies examining the career paths of graduates, and the longevity and applicability of what they had learned.

However, most importantly, in our opinion, this study should trigger a more substantial conversation within the academy as to what we are doing, the impact of these kinds of programmes, and their long-term goals.

WORKS CITED

Baty, P., 2009. Times Higher Education - The world is at the top of the agenda across the UK. Available at: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?sectioncode=26&storycode=408726 [Accessed April 20, 2010].

Brooks, B. & Missouri Group., 2002. *News reporting and writing* 7th ed., Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Curran, J., 2005. Foreword. In *Making Journalists.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Department for Business Innovation and Skills, 2009. Higher Ambitions: The Future of Universities in a Knowledge Economy. Available at: http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/corporate/docs/h/09-1447-higher-ambitions.pdf [Accessed April 20, 2010].

Dunfee, T.W. & Cowton, C.J., 1995. Internationalizing the business ethics curriculum: A survey. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14(5), 331-338.

El-Nawawy, M., 2003. *Al-Jazeera : the story of the network that is rattling governments and redefining modern journalism*, Boulder Colo.: Westview.

Harcup, T., 2009. *Journalism : principles & practice* 2nd ed., Los Angeles: SAGE.

Lenn, Marjorie Peace, 1992. Global Trends in Quality Assurance in Higher Education. *World Education News & Reviews*, 5(2).

Luckhurst, T., 2009. Read all about it: 'element of fraud' in journalism education. *Times Higher Education Supplement*. Available at: http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storyCode=407104&sectioncode=26 [Accessed May 8, 2010].

Martin, J.D., 2010. Journalism Education in the Arab World - The Chronicle Review - The Chronicle of Higher Education. *Chronicle of Higher Education*. Available at: http://chronicle.com/article/Journalism-Education-in-the/64814/ [Accessed April 15, 2010].

McGowan, S. & Potter, L., 2008. The implications of the Chinese learner for the internationalization of the curriculum: An Australian perspective. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 19(2), 181-198.

Mencher, M., 2002. *News reporting and writing* 9th ed., Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Miles, H., 2005. *Al-Jazeera : the inside story of the Arab news channel that is challenging the West* 1st ed., New York: Grove Press.

Pintak, L. & Ginges, J., 2008. The Mission of Arab Journalism: Creating Change in a Time of Turmoil. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13(3), 193-227.

Pintak, L., 2010. Arab Media and the AlJazeera Effect. In *Global Communication: Theories, Stakeholders and Trends.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Reporters Sans Frontières, 2009. Press Freedom Index. *Reporters Sans Frontières*. Available at: http://en.rsf.org/press-freedom-index-2009,1001.html [Accessed April 20, 2010].

Rushing, J., 2007. *Mission Al Jazeera : build a bridge, seek the truth, change the world*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Stovall, J., 1985. *Writing for the mass media*, Englewood Cliffs N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Universities UK, 2009. International: About us. Available at: http://www.international.ac.uk/about_us/index.cfm [Accessed April 20, 2010].

---

[i] We are using the phrase Anglo-Saxon to mean the United Kingdom (with no offense intended to the non-English parts of the kingdom), and the broader English-speaking world: the USA, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. These countries have a largely common cultural heritage, language and level of development, and are ranked in the top 20 of countries in the world press freedom index according to Reporters Sans Frontières. (Reporters Sans Frontières 2009).

[ii] Referred to as host countries in the remainder of the paper

[iii] Referred to as parent countries in the remainder of the paper

[iv] The process of accrediting universities in the USA is substantially different to that of the Commonwealth countries (Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the UK), not being a governmental function; and one which arguably requires less oversight and management. It is also possible to accredit an institution in the USA which has no presence in that country - as is the situation with all three of these institutions - and without a specific and clear relationship with an institution in the USA.(Lenn, Marjorie Peace 1992)

[v] The issues of how staff in the parent institutions are compensated for additional work involved in developing and administering these programmes are highly problematic. It is a far from satisfactory arrangement, however, and the majority of the people interviewed in these roles were at least somewhat unsatisfied with their workload and the expectations of management with regards to these programmes. These issues are unfortunately beyond the scope of this project.

[vi] All attempts to contact the host institution have failed, the website appears defunct and the parent institution has had no contact for a year.

[vii] Aside from the usual reluctance of journalism students to read and watch the news, which appears to be universal, and from issues with language facility, that is.

[viii] The UK Press Complaints Commission Code of Conduct which [voluntarily] binds print journalists' behaviour.

[ix] This was presented as common fact by every person we spoke to with experience of China, but it could not be verified. It does seem extremely possible, since party membership is common, and the students who study at foreign universities are often wealthy and members of the elite. On the other hand, nobody could cite an example of anyone suffering repercussions as a result of having something said in class raising the ire of the authorities.